

Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 1, 2023

Locations: LSC: Granada Center - West Conference Rm 291 (in-person); **WTC: Law Corboy**, Rooms 1104 and 1017 (in-person); HSC: Center for Translational Research and **Education**, Rm 304 (in-person); and Zoom Link: <https://luc.zoom.us/j/81066396848>

Members in Attendance: Ahumada; Artemchik; Binaku; Blackmond Larnell (Vice-Chair); Brown, Cohen; Cornelius, Dahari; davis; DeFrancesco; Devery (Chair); Dong; Duffy; Ellis; Elsky; Gawlinski; Goldstein; Haske; Kang; Kaefer; Lee (Secretary); Moran; Ohsowski; Peterson; Pope; Rosenblatt; Sanhueza; Silva; Singer; Todd; Badia.

Guest: None

Absent: Cavallo; Farooq; Holschen; Gupta-Mukherjee; jules; Mirza; Ohsowski; Patel; Sanhueza; Callahan (Provost).

1. **Quorum:** The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm. Next, the January 25, 2023 Faculty Council Minutes were approved.

2. Officer Reports:

Chair Devery reported on activities since the last Faculty Council meeting.

Vice-Chair Report (Blackmond Larnell): The Vice-Chair Blackmond Larnell reported that the Racial Justice Minor is active. A small group put together the topic. The next step is to get more classes added to the minor.

Blackmond-Larnell turned to the email about the 85 line. The Chair suggested saving that for later.

Secretary (Lee): No update.

3. Committee Reports:

Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) O'Rourke provided an update. There is a layout of salaries by schools. FAC should get the information on the ranges. However, after their request for information, they have not heard anything.

O'Rourke referenced a document that Moran put together. The document set forth as an attachment is "The Case for Indirect Cost Return at Loyola University Chicago." After discussion, there was a suggestion for this Committee to bring their resolution back to the full faculty council.

Moran mentioned that there are indirect costs when there is a grant to defray the cost

of research. That money is used in a variety of ways. One of thing that happens is that funds are dispersed, and you are allowed to use the money:

College (15%)
Department (10%)
Investigator (10%)

These funds are particularly critical for the sciences. The document is created to provide some information.

The FAC requested a meeting with Wayne. They will give it a few more days, then bring Chair Devery in to help.

Apparently, there is a version. Chair Devery suggested to reach out to give their version.

Chair, Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Gawlinski provided an update.

The new Academic Integrity Taskforce met February 13th, with AAC Chair Gawlinski serves as the FC representative. Discussions with Robyn Mallett about AI-assisted plagiarism last fall led to broader questions about academic integrity and the formation of this taskforce. An email was sent from the Provost's office to faculty on February 14th, with information about composition and goals. The group is currently gathering information, and Gawlinski will share a questionnaire with FC about how faculty report integrity violations.

Jenny asked why there are no tech people on the taskforce. Gawlinksi responded that they will bring in various specialists as needed.

Qunfeng noted that there was an AI/academic integrity survey in the School of Education.

Pope asked if anyone is looking into faculty responses like switching to in-class blue book exams Pope is now doing bluebooks because of the issue with ChatGPT. Gawlinski responded, not yet, but we can.

Dr. Badia presented information to the Faculty Council on compensation.

Chair, Handbook Committee Cornelius provided an update to the Faculty Council on the Faculty Handbook Committee.

The Faculty Council ad hoc Faculty Handbook Committee was re-convened on 29 January by Jim Devery, Faculty Council Chair. The committee is comprised of eight members.

I list the members according to their role and affiliation to Faculty Council. First,

there are three members of the FC Executive Committee:

- Twyla Blackmond Larnell (Vice-Chair of Faculty Council)
- Patricia H. Lee (Secretary of Faculty Council)
- Qunfeng Dong (Member at Large of Faculty Council)

Second, FC representatives:

- Terri Artemchik
- Ian Cornelius

Third, faculty not currently on Faculty Council:

- Minerva Ahumada (Arrupe College; Chairperson of University Senate; past member of the FC Handbook Committee)
- Sarita Heer (CAS; leadership of the unionized faculty in CAS)
- Tavis Jules (School of Education; past chair and co-chair of the Handbook Committee)

Cornelius is chair of the committee.

The occasion of the committee's (re)-formation is the administration's expression of renewed interest in revising the Faculty Handbook. After taking a full year to review Faculty Council's proposal, the Office of the Provost has announced its intention to proceed with revision, aiming to place a new, negotiated text before the Board of Trustees for approval at their June meeting. The committee's opinion is that the window for meeting that goal is very narrow.

The charge of the ad hoc Handbook Committee is:

- review the administration's text, once it is transmitted to Faculty Council
- make a recommendation to Faculty Council regarding a response to the administration's text
- identify appropriate procedures for carrying out negotiations in an efficient and transparent manner

The ad hoc committee has met twice, on 13 and 20 February. The principal topics of discussion at these meetings have been:

- the priorities of the faculty in revision of the Handbook. What are the core non-negotiable changes that, in our view, must be included in any new version of the Faculty Handbook? And what changes are we willing to postpone to another cycle of Handbook revision, or even accept as unwinnable?
- the 2022 Faculty Council text. What commitment do we have to the text submitted by Faculty Council to the Provost's office in January 2022? We continue to think that Faculty Council's text was good; we have therefore asked ourselves how the faculty should respond if the administration sets the Faculty Council text aside and returns to the 2015 Handbook as the basis of negotiation.

- the procedures for negotiation. Who should negotiate with the administration on behalf of the faculty and how should Faculty Council – and the corporate faculty of the university – be involved in the process?

The first two topics are related and remain hypothetical until we receive the administration's text. The third topic is more concrete, and the committee has made some progress towards a recommendation.

At the most recent meeting, members of the committee converged in agreement that, once the administration transmits its text to Faculty Council, a member of the administration should be invited to present the administration's text at a regular meeting of Faculty Council. The presentation should be announced to the whole faculty of the university, who should be invited to join the meeting as guests via Zoom. The purpose of the administration's presentation would be to inform the faculty what the administration proposes.

The next available date at which the administration could make such a presentation would be the Faculty Council meeting at the end of this month. The administration's presentation should be followed by open discussion, the aim of which would be to provide all interested faculty with a picture of the current state of play. Faculty Council may at that point decide to empower a "negotiating team" to negotiate with the administration on behalf of the faculty.

The membership of the "negotiating team" is a topic for further discussion. A sensible proposal is that the team should consist of the officers of Faculty Council (Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary). The reason this is sensible is that the officers of Faculty Council have been elected to those positions by the elected representatives of the faculty. Their authority is evident.

The ad hoc committee has discussed a variant configuration, in which I would join the FC officers as a fourth member of the negotiating team. I am willing to serve, but the whole matter of the negotiating team will need to be discussed and approved by this body, Faculty Council. Expect discussion at a future meeting. First, we need a text from the administration.

Chair, Service and Communications Committee (SCC) Silva presented a report on the survey. Library and Arrupe had the highest numbers of participation.

Elections are up and an email is coming related to the elections.

If you have any pieces for the next newsletter, please send along to the Service and Communications Committee. Cornelius will have a section on the Handbook.

Chair Devery has learned from the Provost that the Handbook is coming. They are just waiting for a couple of things. Chair wants the whole council sees the whole document and how we handle the negotiation. Devery suggested a negotiation team. That would involve a motion and it would be specifically approved by the Faculty

Council.

Announcement: Larnell Blackmond was on the news on several stations. The Faculty Council applauded this accomplishment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm. #

Attachment #1:

The Case for Indirect Cost Return at Loyola University Chicago

The Research Advantages of Overhead return

In general, research activity within universities is not a self-supporting activity. Indirect cost recovery acquired from granting activity are intended to defray some fraction of this expenditure. The negotiated indirect rate thus serves to incentivize university administration to support research as one of a number of primary revenue streams. The use of such funds is not restricted to research, however, and the monies are often also used for non-research related operations within a university. It is common among research intensive institutions to disburse some fraction of indirect costs to the units, and individuals that support these activities more directly. These returned funds therefore have the same flexibility as the indirect funds they were derived from. Returned funds can be used for costs that cannot be recovered through direct charges to grants and other contracts and are also best regarded as an incentive for faculty research by providing a means for the purchase and maintenance of equipment, travel, and other unforeseen and unbudgeted research expenses. One particularly important function of returned overhead funds is to bridge between grants and thereby provide a mechanism to buttress and sustain research activity generally. This application of these funds avoids an abrupt cessation of research activity that can, and often does, result in the research program of a single investigator stalling indefinitely.

Jenny O'Rourke, PhD, APN-BC, CHSE
Associate Professor
Marcella Niehoff School of Nursing
Loyola University Chicago
Jorourke1@luc.edu

Minutes approved with one revision: March 29, 2023