



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes Tuesday, August 4 2020 3 – 5 pm

Members Present: Artemchik, T; Baber, L.; Brown, J.; Caughie, P.; Dahari, H.; davis, t.; 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.; Schoenberger, A; Tangarife, W.; Uprichard, S

1. Invited Guest: President Jo Ann Rooney (3:00 to 4:00)

President Rooney opens by thanking the faculty for our work in the transition to an online semester. She reiterates consistent messaging that health and safety are the foremost priorities. Knew from the beginning that students would drop if had to transition online. Some pre-emptive moves have been made to save money.

President Rooney acknowledge receiving the Council's questions but explained that she had not had much time to examine them. In response to the question about future budget cuts being contemplated because of the Covid crisis, she indicated that there were no current plans for a Phase III of cuts.

She reiterated the extent to which the university's budget is driven by tuition. Loyola has lost about 110 freshmen with the move online, a development that was not unexpected and is being watched carefully. The administration similarly knew that there would be a drop in the use of resident halls and thus income.

She does not anticipate across the board cuts and closures of programs. The question about furloughs prompted her to wonder if it was prompted by staffing cuts at Trinity Health, which does overlap with Stritch School of Medicine (SSOM) faculty. Numerous clinician lines have been eliminated, which was a surprise to the university and unfortunate, given that many were new faculty with unique expertise.

Looking ahead to the future, she reiterated that the school has made no plans for further financial retrenchment. They are watching data and will continue to be transparent and keep information flow.

As for the question about fundraising and what metrics are being used to evaluate the progress of Advancement, Rooney noted the new Vice President for

Advancement, Karen Paciero, appointed last August. Metrics for progress are being developed and the target set for last fiscal year has been exceeded. Loyola is planning to enter a fundraising campaign, going full speed ahead, despite the economic circumstances. Although it is harder to secure commitments, especially for large gifts, we are continuing.

Faculty Council chair Jules then opened the floor for questions. One FC member asked the President about one of the questions provided to her in advance about the national reckoning with racial inequality currently underway, and how she sees Loyola playing a role in that task. Rooney replies that we will be hearing soon from the provost's office on the subject and that she does not want to get ahead of those messages. She emphasizes the importance of trying to coordinate staff and faculty efforts.

Another FC member raises the question of whether it is possible to make targeted donations to specific schools in annual and other giving. The President indicates that it is.

A different FC member raises the question of shared governance, particularly the President's recent messages declining to examine the new Faculty Council bylaws and constitution and indicating that discussion of those documents and a revised faculty handbook will have to wait until the Shared Governance Task Force reports. President Rooney responds that the Council should work directly with the deans and provost and wait for substantive changes until the report of the taskforce in the fall. It is hard to set a specific date, especially given the enormous energy that the online transition has required.

The conversation shifts to the Loyola University Museum of Art (LUMA) and the Council's resolution that it be shifted from the Department of Administrative Services to the College of Arts and Sciences, since the latter is an academic unit and LUMA has an academic mission. She indicates that she does not have too much to say about the subject, but that an earlier proposal to bring it into CAS was dismissed for lack of funding. But there is a new CAS dean and she has spoken to the provost about this subject, so the question is being looked at again.

An FC member returns the conversation to the question of shared governance, noting that many FC members are also on the shared governance task force. This member expresses understanding that the report ought not be rushed, but wants assurances that the President is abiding by current shared governance framework until a new one is approved. They ask for an indication of support for the current framework and state they don't want to feel like the Faculty Council and shared governance are on hold in the meantime. Rooney insists that there has been no change in the shared governance arrangement or suspension of it. The FC member then states that as a member of the faculty handbook revision committee, she would like to vet what we have done so far. Rooney indicates that she wants this to wait until the task force report is in, as she has stated in the past, which in no way indicates that we have suspended shared governance. She reiterates the need to work with the provost.

Another FC member asks for Rooney's overarching view about inclusion and diversity on campus. Rooney says that this could be long conversation. She believes that she has made the importance of diversity and inclusion clear since she came to campus, emphasizing the need to look at student outcomes. Early on, "nobody" wanted to have that conversation. There were also problems with faculty retention and lack of diversity with the deans. She has focused on diversity in hiring pools. How we are recruiting, retaining, and creating a sense of responsibility and support is crucial. The other aspect is engaging with what goes on outside the university. What are we doing to engage with the larger community? She points to differential healthcare outcomes, which she discussed even before pandemic. Rooney invokes Arrupe College and its mission. She would like to see a transition to talking about building this mission out and making it part of the university's academic focus. She is more hopeful now that with working groups there will be more accountability and progress internally and externally.

An FC member follows up on the question of public engagement. They emphasize the importance of this but want to know how it will be incorporated into tenure and promotion standards, especially since faculty of color do much of this work. Rooney responds that this needs to be part of a concerted effort, and that she is confident that the Provost is aware of this issue, and indeed mentioned even while interviewing. It is similar to supporting interdisciplinary work in that it is all part of making sure that tenure and promotion standards evolve.

Another FC members asks if she envisions funds to support these kinds of programs. They notes that working groups are being formed, but that reaching outside of university takes some financial support. The President acknowledges need for funding. She points to the academic innovation fund that existed for four years and that these funds have now been designated them for these diversity initiatives. The FC remember responds that it would be helpful to have funding possibilities publicized and thus made easier for faculty to access. Rooney indicates that this is an important consideration and notes that there are some staffing pieces in these proposals and that we do need to identify funding and match it with initiatives.

Another FC member follows up on the earlier point about tenure and promotion criteria as they relate to outreach. In Quinlan, they note, when we assess faculty member, 40% of the emphasis is teaching, 40% research, and 20% to service. They wonder if service could be greater than 20%, and whether that would be something the President would consider seriously? Rooney answers that she has seen no proposals or concrete ideas, so that would have to come up through faculty and deans. This kind of discussion does have to start by being focused on how we support the faculty of the future. She has no specific response or goal, faculty have a much better sense of where we might be able to measure this.

Rooney closes by reiterating her thanks for the flexibility and work that faculty have shown in dealing with the Covid crisis. Students acknowledge the differences that come with a changed format, but believe the instruction they receive is still strong. Loyola's stance is that the academic rigor is still there, and that our education is every bit as valuable. We are working with students who are facing new financial hardship.

2. Discussion of President's Visit (4:00 to 4:15)

Jules opens the floor to discussion of the President's comments. One FC member expresses a lack of awareness of the medical school faculty loss, tied to Trinity. Another, from SSOM, replies that this was not the first wave of cuts, but is the first one focused on faculty. Although they have university appointments, they are Trinity employees, so not clear LUC could every employ or pay them. On research side, "we are devastated by this," because faculty leaving were doing research. "It's terrible." A different FC member asks about the criteria for dismissal. Clinical productivity seems to have been Trinity's criteria. A different FC member points out that these dismissals might complicate the goal of trying to achieve R1 status in the Carnegie designations. Another from SSOM reiterates that concern and says that the "campus is reeling."

Conversation changes to the issue of shared governance. One FC member argues that she does not respect the current system, so the whole idea of waiting for a report from the Task Force and developing a new system is not compelling. Another FC member says that we ought to take her up on her response about us working with the provost.

An FC member invokes her comments about tenure and promotion criteria and the new emphasis on external outreach and diversity, and expresses concern about the lack of nuance in her answer. They worry that the emphasis on service will conflict with the emphasis on research in promotion and tenure criteria and the overall emphasis on the university's rankings. Another member wonders if we can maneuver through our own departments' promotion and tenure criteria, and seconds the questions about shared governance, noting that it is hard for faculty to hold deans accountable. A different member argues that the new Vice Provost for Research is crucial to this – people do not just chose to focus on service or research. Simply pushing research is likely to marginalize the anti-racist education proposals being advanced.

The discussion closes with one member saying that we need to think through how the FC communicates with the President. We should work with the provost on the Faculty Handbook and a new set of bylaws, especially with Badia Ahad, the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs.

3. Chairperson's report

Jules indicates that reports of problems from individual units do not always reach him, making it hard to raise pressing questions in meetings with the Provost and other top university administrators. One example of such an issue are concerns about encroachments on academic freedom and shared governance in School of Communication, Quinlan, and the School of Social Work. Faculty in these units have expressed concern that university preparations for online teaching in the fall have imposed one-size-fits all standards for online course design and have insisted on access to Sakai sites for administrators that raise intellectual property and student privacy concerns. This is consistent with the lack of faculty appointees to the university's emergency management committees. Jules described the process of bringing these concerns to the Faculty Council's Executive Committee and indicated that he has met with the Provost to convey these concerns. His understanding is that the provost has met with the Deans in question about these matters.

A discussion about publicity and communication ensued. One FC member wondered how we could make faculty aware of our access to the Provost and our intervention on such matters. Another spoke of the need for regular communications with the entire faculty. Another expressed a desire for brief written reports of these meetings. Jules emphasizes the benefits of having a direct channel to the provost and points to the backing off on the insistence of a July 31 deadline for having syllabi ready and the possibility of delaying tenure and promotion clocks as tangible changes made as a result of the Council's initiative. One longtime FC member says that they have heard colleagues question for decades whether or not the Council ever accomplishes anything important. That FC member applauds the interventions that Jules mentioned. A different FC member cautions that Social Work faculty have not heard anything substantive about their concerns and emphasizes the importance of visibility, especially so that non tenure track faculty understand that they can turn to us for help and intervention. Another member suggests that we create an anonymous way of raising concerns and questions

An FC member notes that some of what we discussed with the President would require rethinking of tenure and promotion standards. Should departments and schools change, we may need to incorporate use of online teaching platforms and such. Also applauds Jules' leadership.

Jules raises a new question that he has been asked to discuss by Sheila McMullan, the new Executive Vice Provost, that of how to make the "One Loyola" model successful. McMullan and the Provost want explicit input from the Council about how to design the "One Loyola" policy to make it a reality. Currently there is a huge disconnect between the Lakeside campuses and the Medical School. The Provost and Vice Provost feel confident that administrative aspects have come together, but from a faculty perspective, what can we do to make this model a lived reality?

One member points to difficulty in automatically pulling up emails on medical side and notes that there is no shuttle between the campuses. Library resources and parking passes are also not integrated. Another member argues that topics and programming in common would help tremendously with intellectual integration. Another member notes that the IRB and SPAC boards are still problematic and divided by campus. A medical faculty member underscores the importance of the email question – many medical faculty do not know how to get into their LUC email, even though it can be connected to their LUMC email. A different member refers us back to the handbook discussion and emphasizes that an updated handbook would be a part of making the model a reality. They also point out that different campuses have access to different library resources, which should be fixed. Deans and chairs could share events with crossover appeal on other campuses. Another FC member follows up on these comments and suggests that successful implementation of the One Loyola model is not just a matter of small things, but of a concerted strategy from above. They describe fruitful experiences working with the bioinformatics program on the Lakeshore Campus, but cautions that SSOM faculty often do not know what resources might be available on the other campuses. They proposed to Vice Provost Singh a university-wide computational biology conference.

Another medical faculty member observes that the SSOM has a research day, but that it should be easy to have internal conferences that include all campuses. A different member suggests that conferences could go beyond research to shared questions of teaching and pedagogy. Another points out that the question of enabling joint teaching is critical to a real integration of the campuses. A different council member echoes this thought and indicates that the medical school should be able to appeal to pre-med undergrads. Another faculty member suggests that in addition to physical separation, the primary barriers are the systemic ones – the libraries, research pools, IRBs, and the like. This integration must be intentional.

Jules nods to work of communication committee and suggests that committees should meet and report back at the general FC meeting at end of August. An FC member expresses their pleasure that we are having this conversation about linking up across campuses. Another expresses thought that bullet points on meetings, agendas, and a list of committees and members should be up on the website as well.

4. The meeting is adjourned.