



*Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives*

**Faculty Council Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, May 27, 2020 3 – 5 pm**

Members Present: Artemchik, T; Baber, L.; Brown, J.; Caughie, P.; Dahari, H.; Dentato, M.; Dong, Q.;; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Johnson, B.; Jules, T.; Lash, N.; Martin, C.; Mirza, K.; Moore, K.; Moran, G.; Nicholas, J; Pope, L.; Rushin, S.;; Tangarife, W.; Uprichard, S.  
Guest: Norberto Grzywacz, Provost

1. Approval of Minutes from April 29, 2020 Meeting

approval moved (Brown) and seconded (Graham), passed by unanimous acclamation.

2. Chairperson's Report

- COVID-19 and MPC. We have not received a direct response to our letter to Vice President Kelly, the Provost, and the President from Kelly about the new MPC structure. But Susan Uprichard and Tavis Jules did meet with the President and Provost and think that new faculty advisory committee they have announced is their response. Our concern with the new MPC structure is about lack of faculty and the identification of administrators as faculty members. The working group that Jules is on gives feedback to another committee that gives feedback, he is not in decision-making loop itself. The purpose of new committee is to directly advise president and provost, rather than integrating faculty across all MPC committees. Jules sent follow-up email about a week and a half ago about whether president and provost are appointing people, or FC or University Senate was appointing some of members. He has not received response to email. He believes that the advisory committee meeting next week, when he knows, will pass along information to Faculty Council.
- Benefits Advisory Committee. This committee should be up and running, and will be doing a significant amount of work over summer. The committee will look at the transition to Aetna and

whether it has lived up to its promise, including whether possible to switch back to BCBS. As of now, the university is sticking with Aetna through next open enrollment period. Jules thinks that the Aetna contract will run for two years, but is not certain. Stephen Rushin and Alan Shoenberger have been appointed from Faculty Council, and we will be getting updates from them.

- Faculty Council Website. Jules has been working with a work-study student to improve our website, make it more functional; almost have a completely new site; he asks the Council to go through current website and see if everything that we need is there, or make other suggestions.
- Jules asks for questions. FC member asks if President and Provost are aware of Faculty Handbook stipulation that the Faculty Council represents the corporate faculty to the administration, asks about passage in handbook that FC “appoints members to important university committee.” This FC member notes that the Handbook has legal standing and cannot simply be ignored.
- Another FC member notes that according to Vice President Tom Kelly, the university is obliged by the federal government to have this new “command structure.” Yet this member wonders why other universities do not have a kind of structure like this. Jules notes uncertainty as to whether Faculty Council and other pre-existing bodies are part of this new structure and relays concern of the Executive Committee that there are so few faculty members on the MPC.
- Susan Uprichard notes that she and Tavis are very far removed from decision-making in their roles on MPC committees. The President and Provost are still making all decisions; their thought is that having faculty advisory committee puts us at the point where decisions are being made, rather than on lots of committees that aren’t making decisions. FC member asking question responds that it is good to have an advisory committee, but the issue is how it is constituted.
- It is further noted that there are complications in having us on some of higher committees. Those committees initially meeting every day for long meetings, now down to 3 days a week; so also an issue of time commitment. Committees getting into fine-grain detail like how much hand sanitizer, etc. They wanted to make sure all schools, campuses represented on each small committee. Getting people from Council and Senate would not achieve that goal.
- FC member states that the real issue here is the process, which should have been explained early on. And some of these mundane details turn into important issues – how many seats in a room, does the class go hybrid; in this professor’s classroom, keyboards are shared. Another FC member seconds this point, in SOE talking about classes, online, he wondered is this going through

faculty council. These details in effect add up to pedagogical decisions.

- Another FC member notes the short time available for many of these decisions: Arrupe College, for example, just started summer session, some decisions need to be made on the fly.
- A different FC responds that faculty can help decide what questions are relevant for us and which are not. The University Senate and Faculty Council already have representation from across the school. Just learned things from this conversation; there are many things that administration could learn from bodies like ours. The concern is that this process is setting us up for bad decisions.
- Jules affirms that he has heard the concerns, especially about process, and will follow up on issues can. Next week will be discussing with Provost, will report back.

### 3. Unfinished Business

--Jules now FC members have had 3 weeks to consider the new drafts of the Bylaws and Constitution. The only feedback so far has been about term limits. Heopes we can pass today, including renaming ourselves as a Faculty Senate.

- Term Limits. TJ: it is still unclear if we still keep to 2 year elected terms, with one year terms on the Executive Committee. Opens up to floor for discussion. FC member observes that most committee commitments are for 2 years, so this framework seems viable. TJ: most peer and aspirational institutions are 3 years. Another FC member: it is unclear whether we are talking about term limits or length of terms. Jules responds that there are two issues here here, term limits (can't serve more than 2 consecutive terms); the other one is term appointment (2 years on FC, 1 year on Executive Committee) and that we need to address both. Jules clarifies that for peer institutions, the standard practice seems to be 3 year terms for 2 consecutive terms. Another FC member asks about the rationale for term limits. Jules responds that one reason is to get fresh ideas and new people coming onto Council. Second aspect for length of term long under discussion is that it was hard for the executive committee to get going when only had 1 year in office; hope is that 2 year terms on EC would let them operate more fully. The FC member replies that the latter makes sense, but limiting terms problematic because if elected, Council members are getting mandate from colleagues. Comments in the zoom chat box are read, including the observation that we have many vacancies. An FC member points to the School of Law as an example, and that a current Faculty Council member has served long time, but had term limits been in place, would have no representation at all. There is a real potential that nobody from

Law or Business would sit on the FC and furthermore, aims to be had from having long-serving colleagues. Jules responds that he's hearing the idea of 3 year terms but no term limits. An FC member observes that since after VTIP there are fewer tenured folks, we need to reach out more, as others have observed. ; encourages more outreach. Question (Moore) and seconded (Graham). The measure to extend length of term on FC to 3 years and 2 year terms on Executive Committee passes

- Discussion about when this will take effect follows. In Spring 2021 will have election for 3 years
- Now term limits question: question called (Moore), moves to vote for term limits. 5 in favor, 9 against; 1 abstention; the motion to add term limits fails.
- Elections: TJ: with the council's permission, would like to hold summer elections for 10 open positions. Asking for Council's blessing, receives my acclamation.
- Jules notes that an outstanding issue is the question of Rome Center. He has brought up Rome Center with President; she asked if including all Centers in constitution and by-laws? Her second point is that Rome faculty are also faculty in other divisions.
- Jules asks for joint vote on revisions to constitution and by-laws, including name change to "Faculty Senate." Unanimous vote yes – 18 votes.

4. Resolutions. Jules notes that two resolutions, one on the Loyola University Museum of Art and the other commending the *Phoenix*, are up and asks if they may be considered as a package. Passage of both is moved (Dentato) and seconded (Caughie).

TJ: can we vote on resolutions collectively as one vote? Graham: fine. Dentato moves approval, Caughie seconds. The question of the timing of the resolution is discussed, given the departure of the current CAS Dean. Resolution is passed unanimously.

5. Committee Assignments

•Jules notes that "I know how much we love this." President Rooney couldn't meet with us because number of meetings, and her schedule. Have asked executive assistant to name time when she can meet, we will schedule around her. FC member points to the irony of not having time to meet with us, as she establishes new advisory committee, with which she presumably won't have time to meet.

•The discussion changes to the question of committee assignments, pursuant to the new bylaws and constitution.

--TJ we would like to constitute the committees as they are, under the new by-laws and constitution we have, would like to appoint. Four committees need to be constituted: 1. Faculty Service and Communication, Faculty

Affairs, a committee combining the Faculty Handbook, Bylaws, and Constitution, and Academic Affairs. The committees are staffed as follows:

- Faculty Service and Communication: Jessica Brown, John Nichols, Nick Lash, Chris Martin, Lavar Pope, Harel Dahari, Ben Johnson, Susan Uprichard.
  - Faculty Affairs Committee. Kelly Moore, Lorenzo Baber, Graham Moran, Kelly Moore, Qunfeng Dong.
  - Communications and Service Committee
  - Faculty Handbook, Bylaws, and Constitution. Pamela Caughie, Darren Pierre, Kelly Moore, Ben Johnson, Michael Dentato, Ian Cornelius
  - Faculty of the Game (to be staffed later, pending resumption of athletics).
  - Academic affairs: Daniel Graham, Walter Tangarife, Terri Artemchik, Stephen Rushin, Tavis Jules.
  - Holschen not yet assigned to a committee.
- Jules notes that we may need to send call for Faculty member of the year, call would be drafted by communications committee. Also need monthly newsletter going out, telling them not only what we're doing, but informed about Faculty Senate; will also be responsible for building up our reputation.
  - TJ: will follow up with other committees, but needed to explain faculty service and communication committee. Asks for questions or clarifications: FC member asks if monthly too often? Jules responds that it can be up to discretion of committee. Need to make sure Health Sciences school part of that list serve; we don't need to bombard them, but we need to communicate with them. One thing coming out thanks to Jessica's work is survey about FAS system. FC member expresses hope that all work not on communications committee and service committee.

## 6. Shared Governance email to Faculty Colleagues

- Jules introduces subjects and refers to online discussion by FC members that the language of the draft was too strong. One reason for sending out letter is to let faculty know who we are, especially with new constitution as Faculty Senate. Many do not know what we do and how much we have been doing. Thought should preface letter by stating our concerns about lack of shared governance. That's why the letter started out that way; also a kind of call to action for those who feel or want to write to President emphasizing that there are shared governance structures in place that should be consulted. He expresses the hope that we can all agree on something.

- One FC member notes their effort at revising shared governance letter, wanted to shorten and tone down a bit, sent to everybody; hope we can address these changes?

- Another FC member raises the possibility of quoting recent statements by the President and Provost statement about supporting shared governance would be one way to be positive, even as we point out that those promises

haven't been lived up to. A different FC member expresses curiosity about underlying matters -- why systematically ignore shared governance? This person assumes that the administration sees it as inefficient, and need and want to move quickly. How can we make them see that that is worthwhile? They don't see it that way, that's why they're acting the way they are. Is it easier for them to have us disgruntled than to consult with us? Expresses wonderment at decision to reduced PhD admits, change MA admissions. A different member argues that these issues are even more troublesome from a shared governance standpoint, since the Provost seemed to be at odds with Kelly and the MPC structure; in effect these decisions are coming from finance people.

- A different FC member suggests that the best way to get administrators to embrace us and deal with us more comes from how we approach and interact with them. It is not viable to badmouth the administration to the faculty, and then expect them to turn around and work with. Sometimes have to bite tongue. Other FC members express agreement with this point.

- Another FC member says that it is very disrespectful of president that she has not met with the FC. This person points to our new provost and likes the idea of using his quotes about shared governance. Challenge them to actions that live up to statements. That conveys both respect and a challenge. Then we wait, hope for respect; then we go to faculty, that's the process we should go under.

- Agreement is expressed about the wisdom of highlighting the positive, like training dog or kid. Endorse formation of the Faculty Advisory Committee, don't slap them in nose for doing something good.

- Concern about the last FC meeting with President, in which we were direct, and wonder if she will feel ambushed when she comes.

- We might say upfront that we appreciate the formation of the new committee, point out existing handbook still in effect; and then be specific about things that we want. Loyola doesn't have a long history of an involved faculty; bottom line is we need to do better on this.

- One FC member says that in their time on the FC, it has always been reacting; we need information beforehand, get feedback before decisions; otherwise, we're just responding weeks later. Whether we like it or not, we need to bring them on board, we need to be friendly.

- Perhaps it is possible to be more candid with provost than President? Callahan willing to have give and take more than Rooney. May be able to be upfront with Norberto.

- Concerns are expressed particularly about the decision to truncate PhD admissions, which did not involve any consultation with people who run those programs.

- Jules emphasizes the need to send out an update to our colleagues; that letter could focus on what we're doing, maybe separate letter to president and provost expressing frustrations around shared governance. We need to reach a consensus in the next 16 minutes.

- Discussion about how to be positive in tone, and how to make the FC more nimble, follow. Some sentiments in favor of online voting and polling are

expressed, but also cautions about the dangers of taking positions without discussion and information. A few members agree to take on the question of revising the letter by splitting it into two, one to be sent to the faculty, the other to provost and president making case for exclusion from decision-making process. The University Senate might be a partner if the tone is right.

- the question of whether the Provost and President have faculty appointments is discussed, and several FC members reiterate the dangers of being confrontational. The difference between tension, which can be productive, and conflict, is discussed.

A motion to adjourn passes by unanimous consent.