



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

**Faculty Council Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, June 24, 2020 3 – 5 pm**

Members Present: Artemchik, T; Brown, J.; Caughie, P.; Dentato, M.; Dong, Q.; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Johnson, B.; Jules, T.; Lash, N.; Moore, K.; Moran, G.; Nicholas, J; Rushin, S.;; Shoenberg, A; Tangarife, W.; Uprichard, S.

1. Quorum and Approval of Minutes from May 27, 2020 Meeting **(-3:15)**
3:08 corrections to minutes (misspelled FC colleague name, one committee not listed). Changes made and minutes approved.
2. At 3:07, moved to President's report.

Jules notes the Faculty Council passed bylaws and constitution and unanimously agreed president should sign the bylaws, reflecting that this is an agreement about shared governance between the administration and faculty, and is practiced at peer institutions. President Rooney declined to do this, indicating that there would be no by-laws or constitution changes before the report of the shared governance taskforce., she wanted to go to provost. TJ mentions he had cleared these discussions with Interim Provost Margaret Callahan, but did not the with the current provost, which he should have and takes responsibility for. FC members notes that the Faculty Handbook says we can propose changes to handbook and other documents, which is what we did. Our work won't disappear, and we will wait for taskforce. Another FC member: the task force report won't immediately become law, so what is interim plan?

Jules responds that this is a good point, and is not sure what happens after Task Force. (Singh arrives at 3:15, discussion suspended)

2. Invited Guest: Mehervan “Sonny” Singh, Ph.D., Vice Provost for Research.

Jules introduces Singh. Part of reason for inviting was statement that we’re aiming for Research 1 status, wanted us to learn more about this goal and also see how we can help as a Faculty Council.. Singh indicates that he was glad to be invited, wants to hear good, bad, and ugly about research. Emphasized broad view of what constitutes research – evidence-based. Introduces self, been at LUC for 16 months, recruited to be vice-dean of research at SSOM. May 15 became vice provost for research. Prior to LUC, in Texas for over 17 years, NY for 8; is a researcher himself, funded by DOD, NIH, collaboration with companies, PI on training grants; wants to help us grow collective research footprint. Was chair, dean, director of institute for aging and alzheimer’s disease research. I am “literally and figuratively an aging neuroscientist.” In first weeks on job, going on a listening tour, wants to hear our perspectives.

Singh points to three domains that could be broadened. 1st pillar is to increase awareness, sometimes we don't appreciate great stuff that goes on in our own backyard. Tries to use data to figure out where we are, how we move forward. One example is pressbook – technical summary of research interests; lay summary; recruitment tool for students, either already here or prospective (students don’t know who to approach if they don’t know who to approach). Book is intended to be put in hands of marketing and development as well as faculty and admin, so maybe can fundraise. Pillar 2 is investment. Chance for project seed grants, subvention pay policy – we want to incentivize research, not unintentionally disincentivize it. This might mean finding best equipment, grants to explore collaborations. The third pillar is mentoring, somebody to

give formal feedback about proposals, even though some may have good advice on departmental level. It is important that Loyola offer this. Doesn't want to dictate, but rather be partner in helping faculty to succeed. Hence listening tour – what are department and program aspirations for research?

FC member: I have a number of questions, some based on experience at R1, others at Loyola. For Carnegie 1, \$40 million per year sponsored research. What are goals and timetables? She points to problems in ORS. The other question is about inequalities having to do with R1 status – what about fellowships and grants that don't come with overhead? Wants to know about plans to ensure that inequalities about what gets counted don't reproduce racial and gender inequalities. How do we facilitate ties that promote all boats rising?

Singh thanks her for that comment and says that there is a lot to unpack. No set timeline has been established by Provost or President, but we want to be reasonable and don't want to create greater gaps in different units and departments, even individuals. Relates to another question – how value contributions? He states that he is not a big fan of formulae that granulate down to an individual. Rather from his office's standpoint, he wants to go down to chairs, allow them to distribute resources. Service, teaching, research have to be recognized in conjunction, that we are part of a whole. Current evaluation criteria are often about individual rather than team/unit accomplishments. Absolutely values grants that don't bring indirect costs. Grants do not only provide financial return on investment, but reputational return. It is probably a mistake to think that in the end research is profit-generating, but you might get more in terms of philanthropy, attracting students, all of which are very important parts of the strategy. He will be putting together research advisory council by reaching out to deans and chairs. Singh then speaks to the ORS question – wants to be seen as an ally and not the police. Part of that might be aligning ORS and SPA (Sponsored Program

Accounting). Glad to be learning about holes in system and wants to create a clear line of sight, can appreciate that it's currently somewhat fractured.

An FC members asks about Carnegie designation of Research 1. Are they to be met by Maywood and Lakeshore combined? Singh replies: yes, combined, not just for one or another. The FC member expresses surprised that we don't already meet the criteria. Singh indicates that we do meet some, but might need to harmonize how data is presented. For me, R1 is a great aspirational goal. FC member replies that given this goal, why decrease entering PhD student admits. Singh replies that this was a temporary austerity decision, painful to take, but not an ongoing or sustained directive.

The same FC members wants to emphasize the earlier comment on ORS. In their experiences, ORS is not good on timelines. A colleague recently had everything except for supporting letter ready for a grant, and the proposal was sent back for lack of the letter; ORS didn't seem concerned. Singh has learned from David Slavsky about an ongoing self-study of ORS, has started reviewing, is meeting with ORS team members to figure out how to make things move faster, allocate expertise in best way, and develop skill set. FC member indicates that they would be happy to participate.

Another FC members speaks as a clinical faculty and indicates that they are having trouble getting statistical support and that it seems in general that there is a reluctance to assist our clinical faculty if the students have graduated or if there is no grant money tied to the project. Asks Singh if he can share ideas on how we can improve access to statistical support in general, and especially for our junior faculty and clinical faculty who may not have federal grant money to support their projects? Another FC member underscores the point that we we need more biostatisticians. Singh agrees that we are short-staffed and that austerity has hurt. Indicates that LUC did get recent gift for biostatistics support, at least for people who went through Star program. Also looking for ongoing collaboration with biostatisticians at lakeshore campus. Interns another way of expanding capacity. Another FC member adds that

capitalizing on grad student resources at Lakeshore could be viable, although there are details to work out about credit and the like. Singh agrees and indicates that this is part of his learning about hidden resources on campus.

FC members argue that all of this goes back to needing to create support. They wonder if Singh negotiated anything when he took the job and observe that we have people who want to pay us to do work, yet we have to beg for years to get a position, and have repeated trouble with ORS support. Singh says that he wants to draw on what has worked at his previous institutions, but also find out what hasn't worked. The reflexive idea that we can't do things, that being audited is a problem – we need to fix that soon. Happy to come back, invites people to send him emails. Thanks the Council for bringing forward our experiences and those of the people that we represent.

3. Chairperson's Report

Discussion of the letter from President about Bylaws and Constitution Revisions resumes. (see Attached letter) One FC member suggests that we invite somebody from the shared governance task force to speak to us about where they are in their deliberations. Numerous FC members point out that they are on the Task Force. FC member who made the suggestion notes that it is odd to ask you to wait for the conclusions of a committee that you are currently on. Another FC member notes the hostile tone of her response, characterizing Jules as having been "misleading," and suggests that this is part of a general pattern of paralysis under President Rooney's leadership, which is being somewhat reversed with our new provost. This was a good faith effort to reach out and show that we're trying to have a more engaged faculty; the response is dismaying. And we have a shared governance system currently, which isn't being honored.

Another FC member observes that the Task Force is not meeting over the summer. The handbook committee, which they are on, was disappointed that there is no report forthcoming soon. A discussion ensues about the timing of a potential report. Another FC member on the Task Force expresses uncertainty

about procedure for getting a report. Another FC member, also on Task Force, says no decisions have been made so that there must be some discussion before a report is forthcoming. Another FC members says it's not even clear that Task Force leadership knows that Rooney is putting so much on hold until the report is forthcoming. Jules reiterates that right now everything is at a standstill until the report comes out.

Jules turns to a discussion of the Faculty Handbook Revisions Committee. Says that this is more substantive than the FC constitution and by-laws. Started revisions, informed Rooney, Callahan, now Norberto. Current handbook allows for FC to initiate revisions. Significant amount of work on handbook, has kept President in loop about moving beyond just changing to allow for one-provost model. President now unhappy with process, we were supposed to meet with Norberto, but that meeting was cancelled until shared governance taskforce. The Executive Committee is now working on letter, will be changing composition of handbook committee.

FC members asks for clarification – how do we know President unhappy with process? Jules says that this was relayed by third party. The key point is she's not looking at our work or summary until after shared governance report. FC members says that we wanted to move beyond just changing a few things in the handbook for the one provost model. We know we have to deal with admin, but wanted to work with the faculty first.

An FC member notes that the current handbook is really out of date, we're doing good service for the school by revising it. There are dead links in the current version, and all sorts of descriptions of policies that do not accord with reality. And there is a grievance. A different members notes that a new handbook also revitalizes faculty participation, which is good for the university. Both the substance and process are important.

Jules turns to the resolutions from May meeting, about the *Phoenix* and the Loyola University Museum of Art. These have not yet sent been sent, will do so July 1 because of new administrative appointments becoming effective.

Jules then turns to the prospect of a Joint Statement on Anti-Racism. He notes that there are only three Black full professors at the University, and that no Black faculty member in School of Education has gone up entire promotion ladder. He asks again for 2 volunteers. BJ and KM: others need to step up. One FC members says that they think there are 4 full tenured African American profs at Law School. Graham Moran and Daniel Graham volunteer. Jules turns to the Faculty Advisory Committee, set up under the new structure (MPC) to deal with the Covid crisis. The committee has now met three or four times with President. He reminds the Council of our last email about the lack of faculty on the MPC committees, never responded to but in a sense this committee is a response. Asks for people to send him questions and concerns. Illinois is moving to phase 4; LUC not opening up yet, but moving toward it. Jules has document with many, many details – masks, sanitizer, elevators; will be distributed soon. Big aspect is freshmen on campus, term ending before thanksgiving. Specific locations of classes still being discussed. FC member asks how is committee working? Jules says that it is working pretty well; President and Provost are listening more than talking, so kind of input that we would like to have. One FC member asks about wearing masks, even when lecturing, and thinks that this will be a real problem. Jules says that this has been raised and discussed. Said he recommended screens and plexiglass. But assumption is that you will wear a mask when teaching. Also talking about hybrid classes. Will take up question of consequences for student who doesn't want to wear a mask. FC wonders again about limited student engagement because of of masks.

An FC member asks about process school is using to make these decisions, notes that students coming from all over, including places with high rates of infection. Will they quarantine? Jules says that he is not sure, but that LUC has been following IL guidelines. Another FC member states that Locus doesn't show format, but students asking her. The SOC has been loaning equipment; worked but they had tech support which most people don't; recommends putting things online. Jules recommends checking locus, seeing new times.

Friday evening, Saturday, Sunday slots now opened, just learned of this. One FC member says that they thought the planning committee got rid of Sunday classes. Jules says Sunday still on. PC: points to statement from PA that faculty don't have to teach when masks taken off etc. Her department asked early on if willing to teach on campus and told large classes could be split in half. Told different things than what has happened. Jules says that they need to check with Dean or Chair.

Academic Continuity Group and Campus Continuity Group

In other matters, Jules talks about president's upcoming visit. He does not know if she wants questions in advance or not. Also notes a small calendar change – the April 2021 FC meeting date moved to April 21 (from April 28). Calendar invites will be sent.

4 . Committee Reports

- Faculty Service and Communication (Jessica Brown, John Nichols, Nick Lash, Chris Martin, Lavar Pope, Harel Dahari, Ben Johnson, Susan Uprichard)
- Faculty Affairs Committee (Kelly Moore, Lorenzo Baber, Graham Moran, Kelly Moore, Qunfeng Dong)
- Faculty Handbook, Bylaws, and Communication . Pamela Caughie, Darren Pierre, Kelly Moore, Ben Johnson, Michael Dentato, Ian
- Academic Affairs: (Daniel Graham, Walter Tangarife, Terri Artemchik, Stephen Rushin, Tavis Jules)

5. September Retreat

- Jules asks if are we going to have a retreat and what would it look like? What would goals and possible dates look like. One FC member expresses skepticism, says an awful lot going on. Another echoes this sentiment. A different FC member says that a retreat could help the Faculty Council to play offense and set some goals. Another member

agrees, says that it could give the FC the chance to develop a sense of where we are.

6. Adjourned at 5:02.