

Comments from the Academic Affairs Retreat

January 13 & 14, 2000

See the Summary Directives to C.A.R.P.

Group 1

Value Most: Academic/Personal "Home" - Intimacy Fit

1. Acceptance of Disciplines - to each other
2. Collegiality - to our students
3. Intelligent and quirky people
4. Congeniality/Humane
5. High level of Scholarship: Teaching and Research; Dedicated Faculty.
6. Chicago Link/Location (Personal and Educationally)
7. Faith & Spirituality Mission
8. Diversity of Experience Student and Campuses

Changes: Do we need so many Ph.D. programs?

1. Better Collegiality
2. Cultural & Structural ethos of mediocrity/not striving to be best over-inflated sense of excellence, e.g., grading systems.
3. Lack of style - low brow - Balance of power (Faculty vs. Administration)
4. Low pay, crappy raises, People leaving/brain drain - BOT ? Grade F? Does anyone care? Assumptions that Faculty/Staff don't want change.
5. Lack of appreciation for faculty and staff.

Economics: Better Development Finances

1. Academics not revenue enhance.
2. Need better Marketing
3. Lower tuition

Vision

1. Convey - Model Community of Trust Intellectual Excitement
2. Use Chicago more as our classroom/laboratory.
3. Identify as Jesuit Institution ? why not play up more.
4. What does it mean beyond the marketing?
5. What does it really mean?
6. Reemphasis on Core Education?

Concerns and Advice

1. Lower anxiety level
2. Difficulty of trying to understand different cultures across university, misunderstanding of value of different academic units
3. Committee must be honest and crystal clear on the why of recommendations
4. Concerns that committee will not receive the data necessary to carry out its mandate.
5. Committee should keep minutes of meetings and distribute on Web
6. Lack of clarity of committee's mandate.

Group 2

Key Advice

1. Committee needs to clearly communicate criteria to departments.
2. Role of deans has to be articulated.

3. Be willing to make difficult decisions and look to our precedent.
4. Use Jesuit principles, measures of excellence, context of competition (discipline based).
5. History ?now? future impact of L2k

Barriers

1. Overload of information being prepared - given overload already on faculty.
2. Since we've expressed lack of confidence in this board and this president and his administration - what chance does this process have?
3. Much of what will/can happen is unknown; fear.
4. Precedence of non-response.
5. Risk hurting feelings with public disclosure>
6. Definitions vary what is meant by open disclosure.
7. Limitations made by tenure realities.
8. Unclear what committees' operationalization of criteria are (e.g., what does the committee mean by Jesuit education?)
9. Bad data.

Concerns/Advice to Committee

1. Include program for graduate study advising
2. Key criterion of education
3. What do we mean by?
 - o "Jesuit"
 - o "Education"
 - o "Excellence"
4. How will you integrate financial realities of today (e.g., can we really have a premiere program in Theology?)
5. Will committee restrict itself to criteria-or-make specific recommendations Assessor Comptroller
6. Could envision model of concentric circles around mission
7. Could identify key programs but also assess it against context of competition
8. Factor in recognition of what we do best regardless of centrality to mission
9. Contributions to "bottom line"
10. Have each dean (with a few colleagues) to present overview Committee will invite lots of people
11. Inventory excellence (ultimately dependent on department judgement)
 - o nationally ranked
 - o Enrollment
 - o Good students (go onto graduate school)
 - o Outside scholarships
12. Relationship to existing accrediting ratings
13. Does it do the "right thing"
14. Does it do things well?
15. How to respond to departments in decline?
16. Not just a synoptic view of University now but History?now?future/vision
17. Consider impact of Loyola 2k & distinguish from other factors
18. Recommendations made public rejection/acceptance made public & justified
19. These Committees are very different than previous committees!
20. More true communication
21. Need willingness to make difficult decisions - we can do this; do this (e.g., tenure decision)
22. Need to be determine balance between quantitative and qualitative factors?
23. Though there is precedent with assessing hiring or tenure candidates
24. More consensus over quality than be spelled out
25. Use criteria used at other schools who have gone through this? (e.g., Northwestern)
26. Use Jesuit Schools

Vision Statements

1. Little to disagree with
2. But too vague ---- need to get to specifics; preferably action
3. Be realistic about shared governance
4. Be realistic about reaching our approach to students (e.g., use of technology)
5. Need to provide useful criteria
6. What's good that we don't do
7. Tension between ideal and practical risk hypocrisy given economic realities
8. Dual Vision - ? ?

Liberal Arts Core Professional Education

1. Interdisciplinary programs
2. New approaches to graduate teaching break out of traditional structures
3. Have to be truly useful and accessible to student (wide range)
4. Have to be willing to turn away students who don't want what we believe necessary (e.g., not just skill training. Social justice)

Specific Ideas

1. "Rudenstein" idea - Common social justice theme that we work on as a University (get outside funding)
2. Language skill training for professionals (made difficult by new economic model? silo mentality) ?
Though accountability needs to be localized
3. Interdisciplinary not the right word ---- more a matter of distributed team approach
4. All courses should have elements of ideas and application present core prevents this
5. Certain things all students should know (e.g., basic elements of business)
6. Double majoring across schools "impossible".
7. May be done without taking whole 3 hours courses in things - team teaching "punch card" "of lecturers" "intro a course".
8. Meta-issue: on the verge of being a University which simply doesn't work
 - o outdated core
 - o nonsensical accounting principles
 - o can't get financial aid, registration, grade notification right
9. We've said this and are faced with incompetent upper administration who would rather ignore/avoid real solutions
10. Maybe redefine us as academics/academic support/li>
11. Need to be organized around students very early and well into alumni
12. Re: Financial support; need to be able to tell support services what we need and develop prioritized wish list
13. We're amoebae----pulling ourselves apart; unclear who's working for whom and to what end; all activities should be directed toward education of students
14. Build in good teaching and service to faculty evaluations
15. Change tax model to free market
16. Maybe right time to reassess local control (e.g., budgets, Public Relations)
17. <Saying "student centered" is easy but doing it is more difficult
18. Now students live in 2 separate worlds
19. Vision statement should constrain what we offer as education
20. How do we evaluate teaching?
21. How do we integrate research?
22. Acknowledge different student needs, allow flexibility in delivery
23. Broaden concept of STUDENT AND TEACHING
24. Entrepreneurial activities on part of faculty is double-edged (may pull faculty away from students and created hierarchy in faculty)
25. External rhetoric is still "student center" but internal rhetoric has shifted as has attitude toward research (have to tell some faculty not to come here)
26. Need to get the students and faculty who meet our vision
27. Real goal isn't "student centered" but education of the student Problematic for research? Another goal is advancement of knowledge
28. But need to acknowledge nature of student (child) centered society competing with other schools.
29. Centered around the Jesuit education of students by research involved faculty
30. Breaking down organizational and intellectual barriers between liberal arts and professional education
31. Making the University WORK
32. Get students and faculty who meet our vision
33. Structure incentives (tax system, staff and faculty rewards) to meet academic goals

Group 3

Five Essential Themes

1. Loyola University Chicago faculty as the teacher scholar
2. Open to spiritual values and encouraging of faiths
3. Intellectual rigor
4. Service to others
5. Loyola community connects to broader community of Chicago and the world

Group 4

Value Most

1. Commitment to Jesuit ideals/education as way to knowing god
2. Environment -Chicago as (urban) environment - as laboratory
3. Openness in engaging new avenue for growth
4. In line with Jesuit mission
5. Search for truth in service for man/woman
6. "Articulated" mission and potential to purge it
7. High academic reputation
8. Own department - values teaching and research
9. Medium size
10. Student body
11. Support research
12. Comfort with openness to other faith traditions.
13. Freedom to purge any issues (academic freedom)
14. A more implementable vision statement more stability in terms of programs, faculty, etc.
15. Collaborative spirit
16. Reduction in "scarcity mentality ? protectionism
17. C-s are focal

What Differences?

1. Plans and leaders more open to scrutiny by faculty, students, and staff. Who evaluate them? Who/how hires? Retains?
2. More and more enthusiastic support for innovation
3. More thanks for good efforts
4. PARADOX change in culture requires leadership by trusted individuals

What Changes?

1. Added flexibility in response to change
2. Restored confidence in upper administration
3. Tone down "strong Jesuit/Catholic" line
4. Less top-down bureaucracy - decentralize
5. Better job skill sharing: only one person trained per job
6. Faculty to be more responsible and appreciative
7. Become competent, courageous, creative (all constituencies) less exclusivity
8. Less emphasis on students as customer/consumer
9. More faculty centrality, more faculty ownership, more faculty creativity
10. Culture has to support/reward creativity, more focus on community (faculty club, student union)
11. More openness/accountability in finances and administration.

Greater Emphasis

1. Interdisciplinary Work
2. Remove institutional barriers to more horizon thinking at all levels: program, department, college
3. Review financial (and other) models to bring into consonance with goals
4. Improved facilities (teleconferencing, transportation) for collaboration
5. Academic decision making based on academic criteria
6. Schools' autonomy
7. Structures flow from/grow out of values

8. Value of teaching, and emphasis on scholarship in service of teaching
9. Relational justice facet of social justice
10. More emphasis on new programs etc.
11. Life lone learning
12. Responding to future challenges
13. Community focus
14. Intellectual rigor
15. Commitment to Ph.D. Education
16. Liberal Arts base with professional competence in professional schools

Common Themes

1. Jesuit Catholic tradition (uniqueness of embracing new technology.
2. Knowledge in service of others
3. Community of diverse scholar/learners
4. Search for truth/meaning of God
5. Chicago as resource/laboratory
6. Commitment to liberal arts core
7. Commitment to educating person whole
8. Research valued
9. Respect for individuals/cura personalized
10. Centrality of students
11. Interdisciplinary cooperation

Group 5

What do I Value Most?

1. Provide a terrific undergraduate education, graduate education and professional education
2. A home for all faiths
3. A warm place, good faculty-student relationship; good faculty, staff and student relationships
4. Commitment to philosophy and theology
5. Commitment to values and to value based decision making
6. Solid academic reputation of the University through the Country
7. The diversity of the institution
8. Possibilities that are offered to faculty and to the University Community
9. A place where person are valued
10. We care about teaching and we teach about caring
11. Culture of going out of one's way to care for students
12. Emphasis on the quality of teaching
13. A large institution that functions as a family, even if at times dysfunctional
14. The strength that graduate programs bring to the University generally
15. Supportive of faculty interests and research projects and developing teaching
16. Range of programs and possibilities for interactions among them.

What Would I Like to See Changed?

1. Recent eroding of values and caring
2. Need to reinforce continued commitment
3. The list of "what we value most" is threatened by recent events and unilateral decisions
4. The pain felt by faculty of not being respected by the President, leading to withdrawal from things other than their course
5. Expectation of becoming a national research university without the infrastructure and support needed to accomplish this, including elevating the position of Director of Research to a Vice President (i.e., expectations need to be watched by the University commitment to their support)
6. Advancements office needs to be more productive in raising funds (this may be tied to creating a better student service climate so that graduates remember fondly)
7. The many attempts to say "who we are" have not (yet) yielded a workable consensus
8. Decide whether we are going to run the University in the traditional sense of an academy or as a business
9. Decision making in isolation and, apparently, without attending to implications
10. Administration appears to fear faculty input

11. The potentially oppressive atmosphere of expecting faculty to do more and more

Vision (Personal) of Loyola University Chicago

1. Sleeping giant and hidden strengths that need to be made known
2. Address the technology questions

Concerns and Barriers

1. Time table - to Marshall department input effectively (especially over summer)
2. Relation of priorities to available resources
3. Data used in making judgements about programs be made available to Department Chairs and program directors
4. Self-assessments by departments and the criteria to be used in deciding priorities
5. How will "relation to mission" be used? University wide? School wide? Department wide?
6. That this is a research allocation process and this should be acknowledge
7. Graduate programs at the Medical Center are not part of the review process
8. To exclude LUMC programs is to question the integrity of the process
9. Implications of this process for our status as a Caragie Research/Doctorate I Institution
10. How will the assessments proceed? From program to chair to dean to CARP or directly to CARP?

Advice

1. Develop the questions to the department in three weeks and send to department then
2. In addition to internal data, relevant data from "competitors".
3. Be as specific as possible with respect to criteria given to units - a "base set"/criteria, even if additional criteria my be added for uniqueness and returned to the CARP in a uniform way
4. Receive reports on the basis/programs rather than departments and review programs
5. Recommendations from CARP with respect to resource allocation be utilized publicly
6. Committee Assumption: total resources will not be diminished
7. Consider closing a program rather than significantly cutting its resources
8. Seek a realistic future connected to our strengths, rather than a wish list
9. Do not start out with a list of untouchables

Criteria (Supported by Data)

Assessment

1. Qualitative as well as quantitative
2. Assess all units
3. Have a basic set/common components
4. Have room for variability's from department to another

Missing Themes (or at least not common enough)

1. Relation of undergraduate education to graduate education and professional education
2. Differences between graduate A&S programs and graduate professional programs and between doctoral and masters programs.
3. Not clear whether emphasis is (or ought to be) on the faith component or on the philosophy component of being Catholic and Jesuit
4. Role of research as scholarship, not simply as a source of funding
5. Need to highlight our distinctiveness and articulate it to students and their families
 - o with respect to the overall character of the University and how one impacts the other
 - o and with respect to some specific programs
 - o and with respect to each school and college with respect to their competitors
6. Need to educate all segments of our public (including the Board of Trustees) about the relationship among our programs and school
7. Need for the different parts of the University to come together in cooperative projects: conferences, symposia, etc., and for the University to capitalize on the cooperating between schools.
8. Current fiscal models are disincentives to working across departments and schools
9. Since both faculty and staff are working to capacity, the question becomes: How best to match resources with current programs since new initiative will require new and additional resources or reallocation of existing resources.

10. Can administrative structure that lacks flexibility and agility and fosters dissonance

Common Themes

1. Jesuit Catholic University
 - o a. as Jesuit: emphasis on intellectual rigor; inclusiveness; knowledge for service? as a style of being Catholic
 - o b. or Catholic: unclear
2. Connection to Chicago
3. Education of the whole person
4. Interaction across units: interdisciplinary; cooperation between A&S and professional schools.
5. Service
6. Technology
7. A question about are we Catholic or catholic and how related to Jesuit?
8. Importance of liberal arts education
9. Value - centered
10. Tuition cost may be closing out some potential students

Essential Themes

1. Communalism and integration across Schools and Colleges while acknowledging differences.
2. Need to address the range of issues about technology and to decide how the University will position itself.

Group 6

Environment Affairs

1. No pigeon hole/no straight jacket
2. Faculty can grow
3. Teacher's
4. Research
5. Academic interests

Collegiality

1. Good people students* and faculty*
2. History hierarchy patriarchy
3. Waiting for "father" (God)
4. Sense of waiting - filled with blame and negativity (leadership vacuum)
5. Openness and transparency of information
6. Reward system to encourage excellence

History of Inward

1. Need outward focus culture Multicultural global
2. Institution re-shaped to: Enable Loyola University Chicago to achieve goals (would be radical)
3. A "Yes" mentality toward innovation rewards for initiative. Culture
4. Examining the balancedness of Jesuit Catholic in vision
5. Goals:
 - o Small classes
 - o More undergraduate (programs, enrollments, and Ph.D. programs)
 - o Limited # of strong research focused
 - o International programs
 - o 10% ?in tuition
 - o 25%?in assistantships
 - o More revenue generating M.A. programs
6. Greater integration of all facets of the university ---- services division with academic
7. Also enhancement of culture: Better congregating areas/opportunities

Missing Themes

1. Investing in people and programs not buildings
2. Building more connections - Partnerships
 - o Associate degrees
 - o Distance Learning
3. Digital Education (not distance learning) - Enhance traditional teaching not replace it
4. Commitment to Life Long learning
5. Global learning
6. Program development - bottom up not top bottom
7. Survival and Prosperity - through servicing students excellent teaching, caring

Divergent Themes

1. How Jesuit tradition is expressed.
2. Does our Catholicity run against our diversity
3. Drawing from and giving to Chicago

Common Themes

1. Knowledge in service to others
2. Organic Unity of the discovery of knowledge (research) and the dissemination of knowledge (teaching)
3. Connection to Chicago
4. Diversity & Community

Group 7

Value Most

1. People - (entireness)
2. Generous collegueship
3. Respect for one another.
4. Sense of community within departments.
5. Community of scholars
6. Justice/faith/ethical/spiritual ethos
7. Altruism in student
8. Freedom to do my research
9. Not constrained by economic constraints in prior years
10. Appreciation of Rome Center.

To Be Changed

1. Return to social company with sense of mutuality and co-responsibility
2. Stop talking about mission/vision and let us get back to being faculty
3. Let a new administration run the University so we can get on with our jobs.
4. A feeling of trust that the administration knows what its doing
5. A difference about priorities in faculty
6. Faculties are not governors; they must stay within their own zones of competence.
7. Stupid idea to "Go National"
8. We must not be afraid to pursue issues that might have negative political ramifications
9. The administration must show greater competence than they have.
10. Board members appear more like visitors and this only adds to our feeling of need to have a greater competence in the administration.
11. Cease viewing our students as customers/consumers to whose desires we must pander vs. seeing them as "scholars".
12. A uniformity about faculty strength vs. ?????? the measure to the individual faculty.
13. Reward our best practices
14. A sense of our financial jeopardy pervades our institution and leaves us insecure about future planning

Group 9

What We Value

1. Ethnic & Religious Diversity / Cultivation of Diversity
 - o Commitment to social justice
 - o Comprehensive - e.g., law, school of business, school of education
 - o Small class size
 - o Feminist/non-catholic? "comfortable environment"
2. Variety of Student's Abilities
 - o GSU ? NW Loyola
3. Partial orientation to teaching about social change
4. Supportive to building - "Community linkages" e.g., geographic groups, environment
5. Research? e.g., Social Justice Issues and Highly valued just like chemistry!
6. Intense Loyalty of student, faculty and staff to the institution! ?eroding
7. Values people "personal is" ?eroding
8. Education of the "Whole" - Holistic Education
 - o Inter/Intra Personal
 - o Interactions best
 - Faculty:faculty
 - Faculty:student
 - Staff:students, etc.etc.
 - o Friendships made over the years
 - o Loyola's been good to individual faculty
9. Emphasis ?Dual Teaching and Research
 - o Commitment to teaching?Faculty
 - o Good all around education (basic)
 - o Nice local?Chitown
 - o "Potential"

What We Want to See Changed

1. Hierarchical structure
2. Heavy handed emphasis on being Catholic should be a University not a church
3. Intellectual emphasis not pastoral.
4. Improvement in support services
5. Attitude and style of Administration
6. Decisions and processes of decision making done at lower levels
7. Recruit honestly from Chicago Schools
8. Be an institution for all faiths
9. Academic functions should be central and non-academic departments should not determine academic functioning (e.g., IT)
10. Board of Trustees assigned differently than from the President
11. Increase for Research infrastructure
12. Faculty Senate empowered to make decision for the University
13. Lets move on
14. Need for inter-disciplinary efforts
15. We're not a mini - University of Chicago - National and global research given more emphasis rather than local - need more of a balance
16. More explicitly integrate research teaching and social justice
17. Redefine Loyola as its own rather than modeling after other universities
18. Get finances in order
19. Attitude shift back to a University rather than corporation
20. Financial support for students as well as learning assistance
21. Improve fundraising and marketing
22. Improve government relations offices

Multicultural Programs Funded: "Teaches the World, Not Just a Part of the World"

1. Global Focus - e.g., Asia, Latin Americans
2. Nationality more "?" in schools (?60% projected)
3. "Common technology transcends all educational efforts
4. Fair salaries for faculty
5. "Workload" for staff

6. ?more, more

Five Major Themes

1. Leadership
2. Academic excellence with Jesuit values, a "rigorous and benevolent institution that adapts Jesuit values to the 21st century
3. Infrastructure - which includes support for interdisciplinary hiring and programs; technology; learning assistance--- i.e., become more **entrepreneurial**
4. Global emphasis in curriculum, research, and recruitment
5. Changing the demographics of the student population

Common Themes

1. Academic excellence with Jesuit values
2. "rigorous and benevolent institution
3. support for undergraduate professional but divergent views on emphasis
4. attention to Chicago

Missing Themes (or rather emerging)

1. Leadership
2. Adapting Jesuit values to the challenges of the 21st century
 - o a. support for interdisciplinary hiring and programs
 - o b. entrepreneurial/building/change
 - o c. more emphasis on technology
 - o d. global emphasis: curriculum, research, recruitment and act locally
3. Infrastructure

Group ?

Common Themes

1. Need for change (a. more global issues).
2. Address whole student.
3. Jesuit Catholic Institution.
4. Value diversity and see it as strength.
5. Concern with costs and realities they impose.
6. Concern with distinctiveness.
7. Chicago = Strength.
8. Critical thinking.
9. Core values, which we want to continue to convey.
10. Fostering of relationships.

Divergent Themes

1. What counts as whole student? Emphasis (body and sport) varies.
2. Contemplative vs. activist visions of education.
3. General excellence vs. uniqueness (market niche).

Missing Themes

1. Role, importance and support for scholarship. (a) Infrastructure of support for scholarship.
2. Model to address problems. (a) individual department (b) universal
3. Lack of context.
4. Failure to address faculty dissatisfaction and distrust with university leadership.
5. Clear analysis of how we got into the current situation.
6. Clearer focus on centrality of faculty as teachers and scholars.

Essential Themes

1. Teaching scholarship and academic freedom must remain at core.
2. Realistic, collaborative process/
3. General excellence vs. uniqueness.
4. Vision not dictated by finances alone.
5. Advance diversity at all levels of the university.

Vision

1. Communication
2. Strong graduate and undergraduate programs
3. Clear understanding of who is a Loyola student
4. Commitment to substantive education (e.g., liberal arts education)
5. Ethic of care/spirit of cooperation
6. Think outside the box
7. Positive forward looking, vital

Change

1. Reaffirm human values
2. Participatory decision making
3. Communication
4. Stabilize/grow enrollment and finances
5. Accountability for all units
6. Look at key processes/services
7. Better coordination among units (including academic)
8. Decent faculty support (\$, travel,\$)

Value Most

1. Concern for individual person; Civility and kindness (afraid we're losing this)
2. Collegiality & Community
3. Recognition that people here have lives ?worry we may lose this
4. Caring for whole person (not just students but entire community)
5. Opportunity to teach and other options flexibility
6. Value lost of roles - good teacher; valued
7. Prominence of social justice concerns
8. Don't have to feel embarrassed to treasure knowledge
9. Staff treated with respect (not universally believed)
10. Commitment to broad liberal arts base (even in professional schools)
11. EXPECTATIONS to share faith spirituality
12. Value on academic freedom
13. Design own interest flexibility/adaptability
14. Work with students
15. Encouragement to raise issues that concern ethics/values in classes
16. Intellectual openness; ability to speak honestly
17. Supports personal growth at every level
18. Jesuit ethos - intersection of intellectual rigor/action/social change
19. Link with Chicago

Things We Want Changed

1. Talk about separation; disparagement of other schools
2. Paternalism within structure hierarchical attitude
3. Power resting in personal relationships allies more important than channels
4. Hard to enact change in "family"
5. Isolation among schools/programs of services (e.g., financial aid efficiency and efficienct
6. Leadership development
7. Resources for infrastructure
8. Ability (\$\$) to keep good people

9. Hypocrisy about Jesuit ethos (we need to walk the talk)
10. More resources/?base
11. Determination to hang on good people
12. Lack of information (e.g., alumni list)
13. More efficient information systems
14. High level of tension - including for students
15. Need for support systems to become more student oriented
16. Stop blame/fix problems
17. Failure of upper administration to acknowledge petitions, ideas, channels
18. Inter-disciplinary efforts