



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes Wednesday, January 27 3 – 5 pm

Members Present (via Zoom): T. Artemchik; L. Baber; T. Blackmond Larnell; J. Brown; P. Caughie; I. Cornelius; H. Dahari; t. davis; Q. Dong; J. Elsky; D. Graham; N. Gryzwacz (*ex officio*); J. Holschen; B. Johnson; P. Jones; T. Jules, N. Lash; C. Martin; K. Mirza; K. Moore; G. Moran; J Nicholas; B. Ohsowski; J. O'Rourke; L. Pope; K. Raghavan; P. Rosenblatt; S. Rushin; A. Shoenberger; A. Silva; W. Tangarife; G. Thiruvathukal; S. Todd; S. Uprichard (*ex officio*),

1. Call to Order and Approval of December Minutes (3:00-3:10)

The minutes from the December 2020 meeting were adopted. without amendment.

2. Discussion Item: Chair's report (3:10-3:30)

Jules welcomes new member Professor Krishna Raghavan from the Stritch School of Medicine. He discusses the January retreat, emphasizing the idea of planning for succession, and not simply reacting to events as they happen. What happens when members rotate off, and there is similar turnover on the Executive Committee? One member suggests making the next meeting a continuation of the retreat, an idea for which other suggest support. Another member appreciated the retreat, but suggests having it after elections, so that new members could benefit. A recently elected member of the Council says that as a new member they appreciated, including the small groups, which enabled them to meet others. Appreciation for the history of the Council presented at the retreat is expressed, with some members suggesting that it deserves a wider audience.

Jules changes the subject to the resignation of Marcus Mason, calling attention to the response to the Executive Committee's letter from the provost and head of Human Resources. The university is declining to release the report on the allegations of bias and a hostile work environment in the Office of Admission and is proceeding with the new training described in the letter.

Jules' update then moves to the School of Education (SOE). Dean Mailk Henfield, the 7th dean in nine years, is stepping down. The Provost is requesting discussions of a reorganization. This might mean an internal reorganization, in which the School of Education remains a stand-alone unit with some of its current structures and departments; it might mean partially moving some of its personnel and units to other units, or it might mean moving all aspects of the school to other units. The Provost has conveyed the sense that the SOE is important to the mission of Loyola, but assumes that it will not be organized in the way that it is now.

The Institute for Pastoral Studies (IPS) and its integration with the School of Social Work (SSW) is a related topic. IPS and SSW faculty are actively meeting. Jules underscores importance of this merger. His understanding is that other such moves will be happening, and so we need to pay attention to this. Says big changes in higher education. We need to accept some will happen here, but others we might want to oppose or at least shape. Another council adds that lots of such mergers with education schools are happening across the country. Some have to do with changes in teaching accreditation. The comparative advantage of studying education at LUC not as clear as it was in the past

The question of the withdrawal (W) policy is the last subject of Jules' presentation. The Provost came to the Executive Committee (EC) and proposed that Loyola keep the policy implemented last Spring when the pandemic hit, which allows students to withdraw up to the last day of classes. The Executive Committee responded by suggesting that the "W" be extended to no more than 8 weeks into the term or after midterm examination results or midsemester grades have been submitted. However, the Provost still has concerns, suggested that Executive Committee meet with student government leaders. EC will do so this Friday, hope we can come up with medium term policy. One Council member endorses this procedure, noting that in their opinion it is better than simply learning about the educational decisions from the Management, Policy, and Command committees. Another member indicates that the Council's Academic Affairs committee has been talking about this issue, particularly the impact of students who end up dropping nonetheless evaluating faculty members. Jules encourages members to email him or EC if they have concerns. A Council member asks about learning styles and whether that is being taken into account in this decision. Another member argues that Arrupe college could not sustain an 8 week deadline. Jules expresses hopes for solution soon.

3. Provost's Update

Provost Gryzwacz takes the floor. He begins by clarifying about the School of Education. Henfield is moving to become the founding Dean of the Institute for Racial Justice.

Assistant Provost David Slavsky is convening groups about the school, and then a task force will be formed. The possible outcomes are not just confined to the three possibilities that Jules mentioned earlier, but rather will be determined by this process.

Gryzwacz then turns to his discussion of institutional reorganizations. At the outset he stresses the “One Loyola” model, the creation of interdisciplinary units, making LUC anti-racist, making us more research productive, and increasing global engagement. Currently, both academic units and institutes report to the provost, in ways that are not always logical. The Provost displays the current organizational model. Some changes are underway; the Hank Center, for example, is in conversation with the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) about becoming a part of CAS.

He then shows reorganized organization chart, in conjunction with strategic plan. One set of changes concerns the formation and coalescence of transdisciplinary units such as the new Institute for Racial Justice. He mentions the prospect of corporate and other external engagement with these programs. Pedagogical matters – the Office of Online Learning, Faculty Center for Ignation Pedagogy, and the like, could be united into something like a “Center for Advanced Pedagogy.” Then Gryzwacz turns to the libraries, and the need to make them work more along lines of One Loyola. They are not as coordinated as they should be.

A number of questions from Council members follow. In response to question, says Arrupe started off more professionally oriented than it ended up becoming. Another member asks about mixing of centers and who involved in conversation, and who would run them. Another member asks about structures of these places and internal leadership. Gryzwacz cites the Gannon Center for the study of women and leadership as an example, why it makes sense to have it paired with say Institute for Racial Justice; idea is not to change the nature of that or other centers.

One Council member expresses concern about these conversations about reorganization. They stress importance of library resources to a great university, especially the importance of universal access to resources, and wonders about plans to expand resources and ensure access. The provost considers libraries critical and agrees with this. The members emphasizes problems with multidisciplinary research and current limitations caused by the pandemic.

Another member expresses that there is sense of alienation in health sciences. Health Sciences faculty don’t know about many benefits and programs, from newspaper descriptions to transportation benefits. Other units don’t take advantage of the existence of the medical school, even for Covid testing. The provost says that he does not mean to slight the medical side, and indeed feels strongly we need to be one Loyola. A discussion of the role of the medical faculty in the current on-campus virus testing ensues. Some medical faculty express frustration that the university hasn’t taken more advantage of medical expertise, while others are happy with the current system.

Another asks if reconstituted units are all academic units, wondering particularly about the prospective Institute of Advanced Pedagogy. They also wonder about finances; what happens to financing of existing academic units when centers absorbed are into them? The provost replies that the prospective new pedagogy institute is not just a service unit for the rest of the school, but he also hopes that it will become a center of research. He speaks to the financing question – yes, some things cost more money, like library (though they could be more efficient with better integrated operations). He also sees opportunities for fundraising, as with the new Center for Anti-racist Education. He further notes that we have not been so great at Loyola with corporate relations, which could be another revenue stream. In the end, he does not think that this reorganization will cut off institutes from funding.

4. Discussion and Action Item: Shared Governance Report

Jules opens discussion of the draft report of the Task Force on Shared Governance. He wants recommendations and some kind of endorsement from the Council. Jules reminds us that constitution and by-laws a part of this larger change; the Faculty Council approved new by-laws and constitution last year, but they have been stalled since. He calls attention to the report's recommendation that the Provost sit on the Faculty Council; that the FC chair and University Senate chair sit on other one another's assemblies. Moreover, the report commends that the head of the Faculty Council sit on Board of Trustees' Academic committee. Two other important changes are proposed: a reconstitution of University Senate to be less faculty-centric; and the creation of another committee, with chairs of Faculty, Staff, and Student Councils, and the head of HR, to determine jurisdictional matters. The idea is to give back to FC what ought to be under its purview.

One member asks Jules for his baseline reaction: does this report strengthen the role of the faculty and Faculty Council in university governance? Jules expresses satisfaction with the report. Although compromises had to be made, he thinks that it as good as he could get. His preference is to see the recommendations enacted by the President and Provost, for the university to operate like that for a few years, and then to reassess.

A Council member says that they think it is an excellent report. They calls attention to section on page 17 – that FC should be added to rainbow chart. They argue that it should actually replace the University Senate, so that academic issues are addressed by a faculty body. They are concerned about this coordinating committee, because they don't want a few people deciding where a particular issue should go. The flow chart referenced in section 3 needs to be changed, because the Faculty Council does not report to University Senate, as flow chart suggests. Finally, they note that there are so many responsibilities for chair of Faculty Council and University Senate. So instead of those two people filling so many roles, it could be "the chair or designee or executive committee member."

Susan Uprichard indicates that there were concerns expressed from University Senate members about this body deciding where issues get address. Jules responds that the concern was that every issue could not be anticipated in advance and listed. One member expresses a desire for more time to consider this report, while others respond that there has been plenty of time. Jules indicates rather than voting on particular provisions now, that a survey or vote will be prepared in the coming weeks. The Council is amenable to this approach.

GT says needed more time, etc. KM says doesn't like uber body, too much work for US and FC; says need more time. Also tons of work, wants to thank people who worked on this. SR echoes concerns. TJ says rather than voting now, will prepare some kind of survey or vote. Also raises wider question of whether folks think this takes us in the right direction. People seem amenable.

5. Discussion Items: Other Committee Reports (4:30-5:00)

Jules turns to committees, asking if there are urgent things that we need to know. The handbook committee will continue to meet, also the constitution and bylaws committee now that draft report of the Shared Governance Task Force is completed. The Chair of the Faculty Service committee indicates that there have been good conversations with the Provost and Associate Provost Badia Ahad about reviews of deans. Jules raises the question of regular evaluations of medical school Deans. The Provost responds that he wants those done in the same way as other dean evaluations.

5. New Business

A Council member raises the question of whether or not Loyola could vaccinate on campus, especially since we have a medical school. They also ask about death notices and whether we are still releasing them, which seems critical in a pandemic. The Provost replies that the university is still issuing notices of death of community members; it has just been the case that communications of overworked because of the pandemic crisis. On the subject of vaccinations, the faculty and students of the Health Sciences Campus are slated to be vaccinated. The university is constrained by state and municipal guidelines and cannot vaccinate outside of that prioritization.

A move to adjourn is seconded and passed by acclamation.