

Faculty Council Meetings
February 24, 2021
3:00-5:00 PM

Members Present:

Artemchik; Baber, Blackmond Larnell; Borys; Brown; Caughie; Cornelius; Dahari; davis; Dong; Elsky; Graham; Holschen; Johnson; Jones; Jules; Lash; Martin; Moore; Moran; Nicholas; O'Rourke; Pope; Raghavan; Rosenblatt; Rushin; Silva; Stapleton; Steven; Tangarife; Ohsowski

Guests:; Dean Michael Kaufman; Patrick Green; Seth Green; Provost Norberto Gryzwac; Susan McCarthy

The minutes from January's meetings are approved without discussion.

1. Updates from the Chair

Jules welcomes Stapleton as a new member from the School of Nursing. He reminds the Council of the provost's presentation in January's meeting, about changes in university organization. The Center for Science and Math Education was one unit that was going to move. Gryzwacz has brought up the prospect that may move to Institute for Racial Justice. Jules wonders if we just leave this matter up to dean, or the Council should address this. One Council member says that they are very interested in consolidation of racial justice in an effective manner, since there are so many ongoing issues of racial justice at this university. Another member asks about the rationale. Jules indicates that his information is secondhand, but he understands that the work of the center deals with large social inequities, especially racial. Gryzwac indicates that the work of the Center has changed over time, and that it now addresses inequities in STEM education and equity across society more generally. Another member expresses their concerns about the move and suggests that it does not seem like a logical fit given the current description of the Center's work on the website. They think that this is a Council matter. Another members suggests that the Council is not in a position to discuss the merits of such a move at this time, but rather that the Chair was asking if we ought to discuss in the future. This member proposes that we invite the Center's director to meet with us at next meeting. Jules agrees.

Jules then addresses the draft report of the Shared Governance Task Force; feedback from Council members is being collated and assembled into a document and will be passed along soon to the Task Force.

2. Strategic Plan Updates

Michael Kaufman begins the discussion by referring to the inclusive process that went into the formulation of the next strategic plan. This process goes back to 2018 under the current Provost's predecessor, which involved some 900 students, faculty,

and staff participating, and identifying some enduring values that should be reflected in the plan. It was congealing at this time in 2020, but then came the pandemic, an awakening about racial injustice, and evidence of the fragility of our democracy. Starting this fall, a 26-member committee was assembled. The goal is that the Board of Trustees will adopt in principle in its June meeting, then work on implementation. Kaufman yields to Seth Green. Green touts the process, particularly the inclusion of student ideas, describing it as “the best of collaborations.”

Kaufman lists the six values that emerged from these conversations, which he hopes align with Loyola’s values and with the universal apostolic preferences. The steering committee wanted to augment these values with more concreteness, as with the question of racial justice, which is inherent in those values but not explicitly named. So it came up with six guiding principles to flesh them out. These principles include the Jesuit, Catholic identity that undergirds Loyola; racial justice in its many dimensions, and shared governance. Kaufman discusses the importance of “design thinking” in these efforts – testing, iterating programs, and not being afraid to fail. Four specific priorities were identified to help incarnate these principles; these can be tied to a campaign to support the strategic plan.

One member asks about implementation – what are the next steps? Kaufman indicates that a committee of implementation after that would come up with benchmarks and way of holding ourselves responsible. In some ways the plan is a vision statement, and the hard work begins after its adoption. Another member asks about the role of design thinking and how that relates to intellectual assets of the faculty – why turn to Apple for models of how to innovate when we have close at home examples at our own university? Kaufman says this form of design thinking begins with empathy, and is an Ignatian model. Who are we trying to serve and what do they need? Kaufman says we are trying to move beyond five year plans, toward sustained organizational growth, which has been accelerated by the pandemic. Seth Green adds that the implementation of the plan is ultimately up to everybody at Loyola; the hope is that the plan helps create a structure and ways to constantly be inviting everybody in.

Another member expresses their pleasure at the comment on how most plans just sit on a shelf and gather dust. They wonder what the priorities are, especially given limited resources. Kaufman says that the committee hasn’t prioritized among the 72 specific measures mentioned in the plan, and that the Board of Trustees will need to adopt and fund. A different member asks about environmental matters, so prominent in the Apostolic Preferences. They note the social and environmental consequences of climate change, suggesting that we need to make a commitment to sustainability and reducing our own carbon footprint. Kaufman affirms the importance of this, and that it can’t all be put on the shoulders of the School of Environmental Sustainability.

3. Arrupe Motion for Tenure Track Faculty

The Council member from Arrupe introduces the following resolution:

Whereas, Arrupe College has been mission-centric to Loyola University Chicago (LUC) and nationally recognized as a leader in serving first-generation Black and Latinx students from the Chicago metropolitan region;

Whereas, Arrupe College was created in 2015, has been in full operation for over five years, and former Provost John Pelissero made comment at an LUC University Senate meeting about considering tenure track lines once Arrupe College was clearly established;

Whereas, some Arrupe College faculty engage in teaching, advising, scholarship, professional development, and service;

Whereas, Arrupe College faculty require career stability and academic freedom to conduct and publish research, to engage in professional development and service, and to serve the Arrupe, Loyola, and Chicagoland communities in long-term capacities;

Whereas, Arrupe College faculty currently participate in shared governance and decision making with the leadership of Arrupe College (e.g., Deans and Associate Dean(s) of Arrupe College);

So be it resolved that the Faculty Council requests that the President and Provost engage with a working group of Arrupe College leadership (e.g., Dean, Associate Dean) and Arrupe College faculty to consider the process and criteria for converting Arrupe non-tenure track lines to tenure track lines while creating criteria reflective of the work in which Arrupe College faculty engage.

The member discusses the resolution and work behind it. They refer to a comment on record by former Provost John Pelissero that the question of tenure would be considered once it was up and running. This member went to their colleagues in Arrupe and asked if they were invested in the issue. There was unanimous support for some kind of resolution. The resolution was drafted in January, presented to colleagues in February, then came to Council. The stress three issues: Arrupe faculty see an inequity in the fact that other schools have process of tenuring faculty. 96% students are Arrupe students of color. They mention a colleague who is doing research on Arrupe students and their expectations. Tenured status allows faculty to apply for grants, gives greater weight for recommendation letters. Moreover, some colleagues have left for other institutions with tenurable path. Most faculty engage in scholarship and professional development, the weight of which would be increased by tenure lines.

Another Council member argues that tenure allows for full participation in shared governance, and that this is one of the primary justifications for the practice. They note that many people balk at serving on bodies like the Council if they are not

tenured or tenurable, and that to have an entire unit without tenure seems to vitiate shared governance from the beginning.

Another member offers their support and invokes their own academic expertise, stating that there is abundant evidence about students responding to ongoing presence of faculty that tenure provides. A different member remembers the former Provost's statements, which came in response to their question about standards articulated by the American Association of University Professors. A different member indicates that the resolution enjoys the support of the Council's Committee on Academic Affairs, and that if we are going to leverage Arrupe for fundraising and the like, that we need to do right by Arrupe faculty. They further note that this would seem to be consistent with the "One Loyola" model, which aims at regularizing practices across the university. Finally, they observe that the language in the resolution is guarded, calling not for the implementation of a particular system but rather the formation of a group to come up with a plan and recommendation.

The member introducing the resolution agrees to a friendly amendment striking "on the record" from the second clause. A vote is moved and held, resulting in unanimous passage of the resolution by 32 votes.

4. Committee Reports

Jules says one matter that fall under the Service and Communications Committee's purview is the Council's Executive Committee (EC). He conveys the Provost's concerns about the Executive Committee, which is that it is not representative of the faculty at large. Describes how it is usually constituted, at a vote of the Council late in the year. Jules also suggests that too much turnover on the Executive Committee hampers the work of the Council. He suggests that we might write in more specific provisions about representation on the EC. How do we factor in gender and diversity, for example? Another member states that clear expectations for service on the EC need to be conveyed. Given the state of race and gender diversity within faculty, and that women and people of color are less likely to be tenured professors, we are likely to have a representation problem on the Council. Another member says that although diversity at every level is important, the overriding question is who on the Council is willing to serve on the EC. The Council as a whole needs to be representative of the entire faculty, but the EC is elected by and acts on behalf of the Council, so in that sense the EC itself does not advise the Provost and need not reflect the entire faculty's composition.

Another member suggests that this is a thorny issue that perhaps can not be resolved in this meeting. They would like to hear directly from the Provost, rather than having his concerns filtered by another party. They also refer to the AAUP statement on shared governance and argue that it is axiomatic that the faculty side of shared governance by conducted by faculty members who are chosen by other faculty members according to procedures developed by the faculty. If the administration wants to honor shared governance, it works with elected bodies like the EC whether or not it might prefer different people from different backgrounds comprise it, just as faculty work with chairs and deans and other administrators

who we might wish were different people or had different background. A different member refers to their past service on the EC for several terms and how rewarding it was, but also demanding. They suggest that EC members be excused from other service obligations to support this demanding work.

The provost acknowledges that it is up to the Council to elect the EC. He also suggests that at times a provost has to go to the Council for quick feedback, and that the EC can respond more quickly. But here the fact that it is not representative, particularly of STEM disciplines and he must take that into account. Another member suggests that their own service on the EC has been very rewarding and encourages other Council members to become more involved. A different member discusses the importance of the EC working with the whole Council; although the Council is working much more effectively than they ever remember, there are issues that need adjusting and continuity and regular communications are part of enhancing our credibility.

Discussion shifts to the logistics of the next election. The Council has updated email lists and will soon be slating elections. The Elections and Communications Committee also works on the process of evaluating deans; a new measure has been implemented by which faculty sit with the Provost and Deans under review.

The Faculty Affairs Committee reports that it will soon be sending out a survey on Aetna and health care. The committee is also putting something together on the trainings that came out of wider conversations the Council had last fall.

The University's Benefits Advisory Committee will also be meeting soon and is one venue for conveying faculty concerns about health insurance.

Updated bylaws and constitution for the Council have been shared with the Provost's office and revisions to the faculty handbook continue.

5. New Business

Faculty members approached the Council with concerns about a document being circulated by some chairs in the School of Nursing. The draft reads as follows:

We have received feedback from department members that creating an environment where all voices are heard is important. In addition, a goal for our department is to foster a climate of mutual civility, respect and support for faculty. In an effort to create a more inclusive space and achieve these goals, the department chairs developed the following guidelines for the department meetings moving forward.

Community Guidelines for Meetings

1. Contribute with positive attitude
2. Confidentiality – share lessons learned but names and identifiers stay in the group
3. Speak your truth – speak from your own experiences and observations; try to avoid generalizing

4. Platinum – treat others the way you want to be treated, with respect
5. We are all accountable to resolve conflicts in our group
6. State views and ask genuine questions
7. Attack the problem, not the person

The concerns express related to both the substance of these guidelines and the process for their development. One member asks why there would need to be guidelines for meetings. Another member indicates that some chairs thought guidelines and norms would be helpful. A different member says similar norms have been developed in the School of Education. Several other members criticize these provisions. One argues that the idea that you have to always be positive particularly silences women and people of color. How, they ask, does one discuss matters such as systemic racism without generalizing? Two other members emphasize the points. Another member suggests that distinguishing between intent and impact might be helpful. Jules says he will refer this back to the EC and perhaps have a meeting with the department chairs or Dean.

A motion to adjourn is made and passed by consent.