



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

**Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
September 16 2020, 2020 3 – 5 pm**

Members Present: Artemchik, T; Baber, L.; Brown, J.; Caughie, P.; Dahari, H.; Dentato, M.; Dong, Q.; Johnson, B.; Jules, T.; Lash, N.; Moore, K.; Moran, G.; Nicholas, J; Robert, E; Shoenberger, A.; Tangarife, W.; Uprichard, S.;

1. University Senate President Susan Uprichard begins the meeting with a description of the recent meeting of the Faculty Advisory Group, of which along with Tavis Jules she is a member. The university is thinking about phase 3 cuts at this point, since “things are pretty bad.” The philosophy, which sounds reasonable, is that they are going into phase 3 cuts with the idea that things will be this austere through the spring semester. “They want this to be the last shoe.”

In terms of a pay cut, the administration felt that it could not do a general pay cut of faculty salaries legally. Some faculty would have preferred this option, but it appears to not be possible. In the meantime, they went back to the Deans and asked them to figure out how they could make up these savings, looking at part-timers and adjuncts, and to protect the most vulnerable in that group.

Faculty Council chair Tavis Jules joins the conversation. For the rest of the year, and possibly 18 months, there will be no retirement contributions. Other cuts in financial aid are coming. He asks what our message about phase 3 cuts should be; later in this meeting, we will have an update from shared governance task force and one other agenda item. He assumes that the Faculty Advisory Group will meet next week, wants ideas about what we are OK with in terms of cuts.

A council member asks if the endowment could be used as collateral for a low-interest loan? Jules replies that they don't want to. Insurance is a question; second reason is for a capital campaign they hope to launch in 18 months; the board has made it clear they won't touch the endowment.

A different member asks where the big rounds of earlier cuts came from. Jules replies from the elimination of Margaret Callahan's office for innovation, and the first cut of 5% to retirement accounts. In terms of enrollments, the graduate numbers are solid, but freshmen and Arrupe numbers are down. Another member asks if there will be cuts to faculty salaries or additional teaching. Jules says no cuts to salaries now, but that some will be asked to teach more classes; this has been sent to the deans, who will figure out how to have more classes taught. The member follows up, asking for confirmation that the only immediate loss now, besides the foregone merit increase, is the retirement contribution. Jules says that there is no discussion of new contracts as a time to cut.

This member continues, saying that they want to make a statement that they have made before. They do not appreciate fact that Provost and Vice President Wayne Magdziarz are not here. The Faculty Advisory Committee is not elected; it is great Uprichard and Jules are on it, but we have a shared governance structure in place. The member raising this question clarifies that their anger is not directed at Uprichard and Jules, but rather is because they do not feel that the council is respected. They had been collecting comments from colleagues in order to convey a recommendation about budget cuts. The Provost should be in the room having a discussion with, not just having Jules and Uprichard report back.

Uprichard also disappointed he did not come; she asks if he contacted Jules? Jules indicated that he did, he responded, has a lot on his plate, cannot come and spend two hours this week. I assume if he needed us, he would have made time for us.

Another member speaks about the issue of revenue and contracts. One of their collaborators has a contract pending. Some of these contractors are bringing cash into Loyola; in this case, we are working with an industrial company that wants to pay us. A different member says that they have a \$1 million contract pending. The first member says that they haven't spent start-up funds, are willing to postpone the spending, almost like lending money back to the university. Jules asks if he can have the start-up funds. The member declines, saying that they are selfish. Another member discusses the key role of indirect funds, and the mysterious ways in which they are accounted. The member who raises the question indicates that we want to be cautious about spending grant money, but if it helps to spend it, some of us are willing. The spirit here is of brainstorming.

Another council member wants to second point made in the chat box chat – they do not understand where we are with respect to what decision has been made by whom. Different things are decided in different meeting. They have heard nothing from their Dean or Department Chair on current status. What are we deciding and how would it be conveyed? There are also questions of equity and justice. Are they looking at the demographics of cuts for people?

Uprichard clarifies the way we got to this point. Many faculty expressed concern about the looming cuts to adjuncts and the questions of equity they raised; they would prefer to take a small cut across the board rather than laying people off and seriously affecting their lives. So the administration considered this as an option; they went to legal, and there was somebody from legal at the Advisory meeting, and they thought they could do it. But it turns out they cannot. Discussion about how many courses are going to be cut ensues.

The member who raised the equity question says this is helpful. This shouldn't be a decision that the council makes. Inputs have been funneled to this committee. Many of their colleagues would prefer to have salary cuts that are equitable and fair, rather than cutting some. Also concerned that white

men finish graduate programs the fastest, so there are equity questions there, especially with PhD programs.

Uprichard indicates that she does not feel like she received complete information about this. The idea was that each unit would make its own decisions. She asked ed if that included the idea that a unit could decide to do small salary cuts across the board. The conversation moved on, and this was never clearly answered. She would hope that individual units would be able to take this course. The one answer we got is that that would have to be on an individual basis, each person would take a cut voluntarily. The member who raised the equity question says that this does not seem viable to her. Better to cut by salary range. Jules says that legal is saying that they can't do that. The member replies that they checked with national AAUP on this, and with a UIC attorney; it cannot be that each person negotiates contract, we can't all make our own deal, how would that work. We need something equitable for everybody, wants more clear legal system. Jules says that this question has been left right now at the level of the deans. The member replies that the word lawsuit is coming to their mind. This is a nightmare, they would file a class action lawsuit. They joke that they are ready for a communist revolution.

Uprichard says that she has an issue to raise that might worry the member even more. She says it was phrased to us that the decisions are made at the Deans, but they are not deciding who teaches. It has been stated that the extra teaching is voluntary and the trend is that more women say yes. The member says they just wrote a document precisely about this, the consequences are well-documented. Uprichard says that came up, they will track it, but that is not sufficient.

Uprichard says it would be very useful to find out what legally is doable. Could a dean say for a school that people are willing to take a salary hit, as a way to recover that unit's s money? We don't understand what is legally possible and what is not. A member points out that the provost, not deans, sign contracts.

Another member jokes that the minutes will record who has pledged to join the communist revolution, and that this will be helpful when it comes time for promotion. They argue that this conversation, as a member noted in the chat box, demonstrates the inadequacies of the practice of shared governance that we have. There is a lot of complicated information we ought to have provided to us in writing and in a way that breaks down the cuts and just says this is what we are in these are the options that we're considering. We don't even really have a good grasp on what we are debating. They discuss the vulnerability of adjuncts, at least some of them. They also question how much discretion in practice has been given to the deans, given that some proposals for making these cuts offered by departmental chairs in CAS. Perhaps requesting accurate written information about where cuts have come from and where more could come from.

Another member says that the governance issues here are part of a larger trend on anti-racism, Research1 status, and other issues. State universities dealt with austerity a few years ago; there is a blueprint, starts with shared governance; senior administrators took the deepest cuts, best paid faculty took more cuts, not even debatable or controversial. There is good faith you can see in this room, but gets harmed when administrators do not come to meetings. There is a level of disrespect there, has to rise above the moments we're in. There is a blueprint. State schools have lawyers and are AAUP institutions.

A different members says that like others, they are confused. Their dean has not said anything, so they would not know any of this is happening if they were not on the Faculty Council.

A different member indicates that in the School of Social Work, faculty were told that they could move forward with 3 searches, new certificate programs, and \$80,000 was mysteriously found; then they were informed that all electives were cut for spring semester. There was no consultation with faculty.

A different members says that according to AAUP guidelines, within shared governance curriculum is where the faculty voice should be most

strong, so that report is disturbing. Over the long run, the curriculum is harmed when faculty are cut out like this.

There is then a discussion of whether the council wants to meet with the provost next weekend. Jules suggests that there is still widespread confusion about what we know; the only clear statement is that cuts will be made at the level of Deans. The next Faculty Advisory Group meeting is October 1. Uprichard suggests that we could ask for specific information. Especially if that were given in advance, then we could start to think about things more concretely. A council member underscores this point; they argue that using a recording of this meeting and chats, the executive committee should draft a letter to provost with our specific concerns and questions; we could assemble that in a few days and get it off to him.

A different member suggests that one important question is what is the justice principles on which these decisions are being made. We know the financial pressures, but what are the principles being protected – it seems not to be governance, curriculum, or equity. Another member suggests that we get some concrete information, and then decide whether or not we want to meet with the provost. A different member replies that they do not want an email exchange, they want the provost to be here. Jules agrees that an open-ended conversation is not the best way to proceed. The merits of asking for a clarification about the legal constraints on possible salary cuts are discussed. MD: Agrees he should be in front of us, format worked well with Jo Ann; we could do the same with Norberto, but he is long-winded. They can talk you into a tizzy and you don't know where you've been. Another member suggests that there should be discussion of shared governance in the questions.

The discussion then switches to a consideration of what, if anything, the council is in a position to tell its colleagues. One member suggests the council convey that there are no across the board pay cuts, no contributions to 503 B till end of academic year, and some staff furloughs. Another questions whether or not we even know that with certainty. Jules says that the only thing with certainty is that there is still \$1.8 million in cuts from academic programs.

The possibility of discussing revenue enhancing measures is the subject of the next change. Several suggest that faculty are resourceful and creative and could come up with ways to attract wider enrollments, especially now that teaching is mostly online. One member expresses frustration that initiatives that could have been brought online, like a digital ethics symposium, have just been cancelled.

Several members and the chair then discuss the viability and desirability of opening council meetings to the general faculty. The consensus is to have the communications committee discuss.

Jules changes the subject to an update about the shared governance task force. The task force has met and discussed a draft of its report. The report looks OK to him; some things the task force is still trying to agree on, like how much history should be put into the report, what bodies should be streamlined or proposed. New format being proposed – yet another committee above shared governance, where heads of individual committees would meet with president and provost and head of HR. One member objects to that specific idea; they thought that the report would go to the Faculty and Staff Councils for discussion and that it will not simply go straight to the administration. Uprichard says that is her understanding as well.

Jules suggests that proposals currently paused, like handbook and by-laws, will not start soon. A member says that we should go ahead and talk amongst ourselves, a sentiment that is seconded. Jules says yes, but ultimately we need the administration in these talks, and they are not ready yet. The secretary says that documents about the handbook revisions will be posted soon.

A member asks their colleagues to post information about cuts if their deans make any announcements, as was done for the CAS information.

Uprichard returns to the shared governance report and adds that there was also the idea of trying to include a recommendation that Deans or heads of

units also have guidelines about how shared governance should happen in those individual units.