

Faculty Council Meeting

January 18, 2006

Minutes by Alanah Fitch

Attendance: Alanah Fitch, Ian Boussy, Gerry McDonald, Robert Bireley, Ayana Karanja, Rich Bowen, David Yellen, Fred Barnhardt, Nick Lash, Allen Schoenberger, David Mirza, John Makowski, Bell Schmidt, Kim Dell'Angela, David Schwickert, Patti Jung, Thackery Gray, Dawn Lynn, Peter J. Schraeder, Pam Fenning, Gloria Jacobson, Marta Lundy, Gordon Ramsey, Alan Raphael, Janis Fine, Linda Paskiewicz, Tom DeStefani, Harvey Boller

1. Invocation -- Bob Bireley, S.J.
2. Approval of December Minutes 23/0 approved
3. Chair's Report -- Gerry McDonald

Gerry reported that the faculty member of the year award, given at Father G's Staff/Faculty Christmas luncheon went very well. Bob Bireley opened the floor to a more general discussion as to the appropriateness of the venue, in that the audience setting was not conducive to attentive listening. Other suggestions for venue were then mentioned (Rich Bowen, Kim Dell'Angela, Marta Lundy): Fr G's student medallion dinner, a Board of trustee's dinner, a bagpipe and trumpeter (tongue in cheek suggestion of Gordon Ramsey). No consensus resulted.

Gerry reminded FC of the AAUP initiated Forum on Governance Jan. 24, and indicated FC was contributing \$300 for the reception.

4. Committee Reports

Committee on Administrative Policies and Resources (CAPS) -- Nick Lash, on behalf of CAPS put forward a proposal to add the following to the Dean Evaluation Forms:

"The Associate and Assistant Deans are performing their duties satisfactorily (you may explain in the written comment section.)"

The motion entertained very little discussion and passed, unanimously.

Nick Lash indicated that CAPS will send a letter to the Dean's Council asking for the council's opinion on the FC process for Dean Evaluation with a copy of the letter to the Acting Provost, John Frendreis.

Committee on Elections David Schweirark reported that an issue has arisen in that the chair of the election committee could not be someone standing for election to FC and that Alanah Fitch was a) chair and b) standing for election. Allen Schoenberger said that the issue of maintaining

continuity in the committee was far less now that the balloting procedure is primarily electronic.

5. Shared Governance Discussion with Shared Governance Review Task Force Members Peter Schraeder (PS) and David Yellin (DY)

The session opened with a statement from PS and DY that comments made to the committee would be confidential. (Secretarial note: I have therefore removed names from the various comments made, while retaining the original notes for future reference, AF). PS and DY indicated the goal was to gather comments, questions and information that will be used to generate the "final" version of a questionnaire that should go to the full faculty as a formal survey on shared governance during February or March 2006. The survey results and all other information gathered will subsequently be written up by the task force, with an eye to submitting a final report to Father Garanzini by no later than May 2006.

(Secretarial comment: appended immediately below is the set of general questions sent to FC for this meeting. AF)

A. Knowledge of Shared Governance System 1. Do you have general knowledge about the shared governance system?

2. Have you read the Shared Governance Charter, drafted in February 2003?

3. Is information from the University Policy Committees effectively communicated to the wider University community?

4. Are shared governance documents (agendas, minutes, policies) easily accessible to the University community at large?

B. Effectiveness of Shared Governance System 1. Is the University Policy Committee structure (i.e. having a coordinating committee and seven UPCs each charged with specific issue areas) effective?

2. Are the seven issue areas the right ones for our University (i.e. Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, Strategic Planning, Budgeting and Finance, and Research)?

3. Is the jurisdiction of the UPCs effectively communicated and managed?

4. Is it clear which issues are handled administratively versus those funneled to the UPCs?

5. Is the shared governance system relevant to you and your work at the University? 6. Is the system designed to address unique needs of the Lake Shore Campuses as well as the Medical Center Campus?

C. Participation in Shared Governance System 1. Does the system permit and encourage

participation by faculty, staff and students?

2. Is the nomination/appointment process for membership on the University Policy Committees well communicated? Is it transparent?

3. Are the University Policy Committees composed of the right mix of faculty, students and staff?
4. Is the system representative of a diversity of opinions and expertise?

5. Does the shared governance system effectively engage affinity groups, i.e. Faculty Council, Staff Council and the Unified Student Government Association?

D. How do you propose we improve the shared governance system?

Comment 1: (1 individual) Shared governance review is occurring at the same time as revision of the rank and tenure review process. The rank and tenure committee has been split into two committees and the election process and rationale for the separation has not been clear bringing the legitimacy of the committees into question. The shared governance task force should be eliciting comments on this issue and suggestions as to how to create a better process.

Comment 2: (5 individuals) In the questionnaire (above) subject A1, knowledge of the Shared Governance Process. A variety of comments indicated that few felt that there was any, much less, good, knowledge of the shared governance structure and process. As a consequence some suggested that the questionnaire document begin with a very brief written outline of the current process with links to sites for obtaining additional information. In this way the survey itself can be used as an educational vehicle.

Comment 3: (4 individuals) In question A1 (above) does the question concern only University Governance or does it include Governance within a unit. Many individuals may presume that Governance within their unit is mirrored by governance within the University.

Comment 4: (6 individuals) The Task Force should elicit questions/responses as to the role of FC in shared governance. This should be in light of the resolution of last spring in which FC called for the power to append its voice to policy emanating for the FAUPC. Another issue that should be explored is how membership of the UPCs should either mirror or overlap with membership of FC. Is there a question which elicits a response on what the relationship of UPC to FC is or ought to be?

Comment 5: (2 individuals) Role of the UCC in reviewing and monitoring the work of the UPCs - e.g. why did the Research UPC never meet? Is it because there are no policies to be discussed or is it because of bad oversight?

Comment 6 (1 individual): How do people who do know about shared governance find out about it? (E.g. do new faculty get information on shared governance as part of orientation?)

Comment 7: Have faculty name one thing that UPCs have accomplished and a statement as to whether or not they agreed with it.

Comment 8: Many large changes have occurred on campus in the last three years, but not all of them seem to have come through the UPC process. Why?

6. Question and Answer Period with Father Michael Garanzini

Gerry posed the first question: What is happening with respect to the academic vice presidential search? Fr. G. -(not verbatim, AF) a) In the past year LU got 6/10 new deans, so Fr G wanted to wait a bit to bring in new leadership and to have a "calmer" year than in the past three, although he did warn that he is himself the driver of much of the change and will continue to have a major set of agenda items he wants accomplished rapidly. B) He would like to set up the process first - should LU use a personal "headhunter" who can dig up candidates that may not have thought to present themselves for a variety of reasons (confidentiality, not enough info on the opportunities at LU, etc.) He will consult with FC EC and the Dean's Council on point "b".

Rich Bowen asked about the variable length of semesters and timing of the semesters both with respect to student planning and faculty work loads. Fr. G. Indicated that he has had no role in the calendar other than to intervene because of complaints. John Frendreis, said the issue has been brought to the academic affairs UPC and that they have made recommendations for a policy of procedures about how to define the academic year and make changes to it. This will be implemented after Spring 2007, since schedules are set that far in advance.

David Schweikart asked about a sabbatical leave policy a motion in support of which was passed by FC. Fr. G. Indicated that more money needs to be devoted to reducing teaching loads in support of faculty for research leaves. He is not in favor of an automatic seven year leave because the quality of the leave time granted on an automatic basis is not good, and then there are logistical problems of backloging of the automatic time, can it be deferred moved forward etc. He is in favor of getting more money down to the Dean's level to support faculty who make well documented requests for support for course reductions and/or full leave at any period of time. David S. Responded that people get discouraged if it is a competitive process. Fr. G. Indicated that he would be open to changes based on a best practices survey.

Bill Schmidt asked about the decision to arm the security force. Fr. G. Indicated that the decision was made by comparison to UC, NU, and UIC, and DePaul. Of the 4 only DePaul has not created an armed unit. The reason for the armed units is the increase in number of students living in and around campus and a corresponding but not necessarily related increase in violent crime. Security officers are placed at risk if they attempt to intervene in violent crime while wearing uniform but while unarmed. The uniform escalates the situation but the officer does not have the corresponding tools to deal with the escalation. Officers are sent to a regular training process for use of arms, the problem will not be untrained officers, but the ability to retain the officers in face of demand from the local police force for trained officers

Allen Schoenberger raised the issue of the total number of personnel required for security with

sharing the building "Clare" at WTC with frail and elderly. Fr. G. Indicated that they have their own security force but that, AS was correct in stating that there will be an "assumption" of LU security enhancement.

Kim Dell'Angela asked about how the new health sciences campus model was proceedings. Fr. G. Felt that it was going reasonably well.

John Makowski asked for an update on the Rome Center. Fr. G. Said that he was sympathetic to the idea that because students receive CAS LU credits for classes the courses and faculty should be run through the departments. He further indicated that the course work should be set for several years so students can plan. He felt there is less need to staff for core classes and that the academic program should be tailored to the site itself.

Fr. Bireley asked how future large changes could better incorporate faculty consultation. Fr. G. Said that the current report being generated on the future of the library is excellent and includes real data from 4 different systems, best practices, money to librarians, books, maintenance, square footage - he views this document as the kind of consultative document that will make an impact in decision making. Fr. B. Pushed a bit on the idea of how faculty have input to the decision making. Fr. G. Indicated that he prefers task forces to standing committees when there is an issue of a brand new project that he wants to push forward. Another example was that of the core revision. Fr. B. Asked how that fits into the UPC structure. Fr. G. Answered that "that is a tough one - what is a policy or a what is a program decision." He was referring particularly in this context to a campus plan.

A question was asked about how we can successfully get faculty salaries on par with other institutions. How do we prevent regression? Fr. G. said that because of bench marking LU is now competitive. "You can quibble about comparable schools" but the list of schools was carefully thought out to match tuition and endowment. He felt few people were unhappy as evidenced by the fact only one faculty member appealed. As the caliber of students and the value of the endowment goes up will look to a different set of schools. With respect to preventing regressions 4% of the gross has been put away to deal with inflationary pressures.

A question was asked: are the North Central Association (NCA) comments on consultations on or off target? Fr. G. Indicated that many of the issues raised will "continue to plague us." LU is a more complicated institution than the one from which the shared governance model is derived. Three major campuses means that there is a significant problem with communications. A new communications officer is attempting to figure out best ways of communicating as faculty do not have time to read stuff put out. Fr. G. Thinks we lost 8 to 10 years during the Time of Troubles and that we need to move quickly to catch up and get ahead which does lead to problems in consultation.

7. Adjournment