Loyola University Chicago University Senate

General Assembly

Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2019

Present: Francis Alonzo, Emily Chin, Ben Feilich, Margaret Heller, Zelda Harris, Michael Kelly, Phil Hale, Diane Jokinen, Goutham Menon, Lorraine Ozar, Tisha Rajendra, Richelle Rogers, Susan Uprichard, Peter Kotowski, Tim Love, Abraham Singer, Steven Todd, Nancy Tuchman, Mario Guerrero, Gabrielle Robinson, Brittany Rebarchik, Kaitlin McMurry, Margaret Callahan (ex of.), Tim Classen (ex of.)

Delayed: Tania Schusler (3:42pm)

Absent: Terence Boyle, Sarita Heer, Daniela Altamirano Crosby, Laura Goldstein, Todd Malone, Sergio Ortiz, Adriana Caballero Mondragon, Jeremiah Martin (ex of.), Jo Ann Rooney (ex of.)

Quorum (18/31): 22 voting members present at start of meeting (later 23); quorum is satisfied.

Chairperson Zelda Harris called meeting to order at 3:04 PM.

I. Review of preliminary agenda and call for motions to amend

Chair Harris asked if there were any motions to amend the agenda. No motions to amend.

II. Review of minutes from January 25, 2019 meeting

Sen. Chin moved to approve; Sen. Jokinen seconded. Voice vote, unanimous but for 2 abstentions.

III. Discussion and vote: Proposed changes to University Senate Bylaws

Bylaws and Elections Committee

The Bylaws and Elections Committee prepared the revisions and additions to the Bylaws.

Sen. Love presented updates to bylaws on behalf of the committee. There are 5 different proposed acts. The concept of an “act” does not currently exist in our Bylaws, but it is a commonly used measure to amend internal procedures in contrast to a resolution. The bylaws will add language to differentiate acts versus resolutions and the types of votes required for each.

They will present the items in 5 separate acts so that the Senate can consider them rather than passing them all as a slate.

Question from Sen. Rajendra about what the two-thirds would include. It would be 20 people total, with 21 present there is little room for abstentions, so with anything that might be questionable we will vote by email to ensure full representation.
The items will be presented in synopsis/summary due to the complexity of the language and time given to Senators ahead of time.

a. Bylaws Clarification Act

The committee acknowledges the importance of the bylaws, and for this reason wishes to update and clarify the bylaws to streamline procedures, professionalize legislation, and improve inclusivity.

- III.B.2: Looking at staff representation as a whole to ensure representation of staff units and campuses.
- VI.B: clarification of the role of ex officio members.
- VI.C: ex officio members should not chair committees.
- VI.E: clarification of the formation of ad hoc committees to show how the Executive Committee forms such committees.

Questions and Discussion:
- Chair Harris asked if the bylaws clarification act should be read together the track changes version. Sen. Love: yes, these should be read together and reference each other. Chair Harris asked that we not go through line by line in this discussion, but rather ask questions about timeline and policy.
- Sen. Guerrero asked about Section 2D (line 99) about whether term limits included student senators. Sen. Love answered that faculty and staff serve for 2 years, students for 1. The term limit is 3 consecutive terms. Sen. G. offers a friendly amendment to strike 6 years from the statement. Sen. Uprichard seconds. Committee accepts this.
- Sen. Tuchman asked about line 73: There are no more directors at the dean level, so she offers a friendly amendment about striking directors from the line. Provost Callahan indicated that if the intention is to specify dean-level positions, the term “director” does not apply any more. Seconded by Sen. Jokinen. Committee accepts.
- Sen. Tuchman asked about including 2 senators from Stritch School of Medicine and only 1 from School of Nursing, given the relative sizes of the schools. Provost Callahan added a point about adding representation from the School of Public Health. Sen. Uprichard pointed out that this discussion should take place in the representation act.
- Sen. Classen asked about the schedule of sending out ballots the first week of March since that was spring break. Getting everything out and scheduling new Senators at the April meeting makes this a challenge. Sen. Uprichard pointed out that this act was not to change just anything in bylaws, and it would make sense to table that discussion. Sen. Love pointed out that removing arbitrary specificity is the intention.

b. Act to Formalize the Procedures through which the Senate Enacts Legislation

Sen. Love presented the intention of the act to formalize and clarify specific requirements and an appendix with a structure to acts or resolutions. The goal is to ensure that all
Senators can feel confident in presenting matters as quickly as possible given the small number of meetings. Codifying that the senate has the power to enact legislation in the form of a resolution or an act, and what comprises each.

Questions and Discussion:
- Sen. Tuchman says that this is enormously helpful and the template is excellent.
- Sen. Ozar added that this would have been helpful to her as a new Senator.
- Sen. Love pointed out that student government was a model for this, and student members made up a sizeable portion of the University Senate.
- Sen. Schusler asked for additional guidance in how to communicate with our varying constituencies, though did not think that this was relevant to the bylaws. Chair Harris suggested that we could add a list of resolutions passed to the website.
- 23 in favor. No abstentions. **Act passed.**

c. **Act to Eliminate the Senate Extraordinary Subcommittee**

Sen. Uprichard presented the intention to remove duplicate shared governance between University Senate and Faculty Council. In all cases, the matters were already being addressed by Faculty Council, and so there was duplicate effort and unclear jurisdiction over faculty-specific matters. Chair Harris read the original version of the bylaws to indicate that the history of this was to replace former committee structures that were no longer relevant.

Sen. Classen added that, while it predates his time, his understanding was that these were take over matters formerly considered by those committees. He questioned if the Faculty Handbook would need to be revised to remove the Extraordinary Committee, Chair Harris pointed out that the handbook did allow Faculty Council to initiate revisions. She asked for discussion about the Senate feeling about removing that oversight.

Questions and Discussion:
- Sen. Classen pointed out that the reading of this could be that Faculty Council could not make substantive changes without the Extraordinary Committee.
- Sen. Love asked students to weigh in on their perspective on getting input on faculty matters. Sen. Uprichard points out that the Extraordinary Committee only holds faculty, so better to bring to the whole body. Sen. Robinson asked if students would still be able to bring matters to the Senate. Answer: yes (per Tim Classen). Sen. Guerrero asked if this would affect standing committee FA and SA. Answer: No (per Chair Harris).
- Sen. Todd asked about the role of Faculty Council and whether there are matters that would affect faculty and no one else.
- Guest Pamela Caughie gave background information: the original structure for UPC had the potential to dilute faculty voice. President Rooney pointed out this issue herself in meeting with the AAUP about not having a strong voice for the faculty. For this reason, Dr. Caughie says that removing the Extraordinary Committee would be a good idea.
• Provost Callahan said that she would be meeting with Chair Harris and Sen. Classen next week to talk about new models for governance that she is working on with President Rooney.
• Sen. Ozar said that she agreed with Dr. Caughie and that it did not make sense to have two committees doing the same thing.
• Sen. Menon moved. Sen. Tuchman
• 22 in favor. 1 opposed. **Act passes.**

d. **Act to Update University Senate Representatives**

Sen. Love indicated the intention was to remove Centers of Excellence, which were located in other bodies and so would give extra representation. Arrupe and School of Public Health were not included. They did not include School of Public Health because it was not yet formed at the time of writing. The intention was not to completely overhaul representation, but recommends that at a future time the periodic review be done.

**Questions and Discussion:**
• Sen. Rogers offered a friendly amendment to strike “S” from the school of communication.
• Sen. Ozar pointed out that the resolution referred to the incorrect paragraph. Chair Harris suggested that the intention was just to amend that specific paragraph, but it is fair if we will add another school (Health Sciences and Public Health) we should consider this. Chair Harris makes a friendly amendment that the act consider everything under B.1 rather than the individual paragraph. Sen. Love asked for clarification if there are other sections that needs to be amended due to their oversight, or if it would be fair to just amend that individual paragraph. Sen. Ozar feels that she understands that it was just that individual paragraph.
• Provost Callahan asked if there was an interest in adding the School of Health Sciences and Public Health. Chair Harris said that would be important to do, but it called into question where it should be located and required larger discussion about proportionality. Provost Callahan pointed out that this would move about 70 faculty out of current schools and governance to have no representation next year. Sen. Singer added that they considered this, but did not feel comfortable making recommendations without a larger discussion of proportionality. Sen. Tuchman asked if the School of Health Sciences and Public Health could be put under “other”. Chair Harris said the issue was voting.
• Sen. Rajendra said that she felt the discussion of proportionality went beyond the proposed act, and should not be voted on at this meeting.
• Sen. Love said that we could add language to reduce School of Medicine representation, but Provost Callahan said that she would retract her question because it required a larger discussion.
• Pamela Caughie said that proportionality was originally based on faculty size, not on student body.
• Sen. Ozar asked if the Bylaws and Elections committee could consider proportionality for the next meeting.
• Chair Harris asked for a vote based on just the language here.
• 23 in favor, no opposed and no abstentions. **Act passed.**

e. **Act to Impose an Attendance Requirement for Senators**

Sen. Love said this was not intended to slight anyone, but that it was important to ensure business could take place. If someone was absent for 3 meetings without an excused absence that they be replaced by the existing procedures.

Questions and Discussion:

- Sen. Ozar asked about the three meetings without permission. She does not feel that “permission” makes a difference. If someone cannot attend their constituents are not being represented regardless of the reasons. Sen. Singer said that this was intended to not bind the Senate in the case of extraordinary circumstances. Sen. Uprichard said that this was intended to allow for very active members to remain. Sen. Rajendra added that she felt that absences were a challenge no matter the reason, especially with the option for remote attendance. Chair Harris said that remote had to be a last option given difficulty of technology. Sen. Ozar asked if it would be possible to add “may be considered vacant” to give discretion to the Executive Committee. Sen. Kelly added agreement to this point about adding “excused” or “unexcused” required parsing in detail. Sen. Uprichard said they were trying to give some flexibility.

- Discussion of friendly amendment: strike excused and replace “shall” with “may.”
  - Sen. Guerrero asked who would make the determination. Chair Harris said that the Senate would have to trust the Executive Committee to follow up with this. Sen. Schusler asked if we could add language for extraordinary circumstances.
  - Sen. Menon asked about teaching schedules. Chair Harris said that the schedule was made available in advance, but this could and did happen.
  - Sen. Love said that he wanted to restate the two arguments as either allowing for extraordinary circumstances, or to recognize the reality of the situation that regardless circumstances
  - Sen. Rajendra pointed out that attendance in the Senate wasn’t critical to grades or jobs, if someone couldn’t attend they should resign and find someone with time to do this.
  - Sen. Kotowski said that he was uncomfortable with allowing ambiguity.
  - Sen. Classen said that this should be rhetorically allowed based on existing measures.
  - Sen. Singer said he wanted to allow for some flexibility for certain circumstances, particularly in the case where it’s difficult to find people to run from that constituency.
  - Dr. Caughie asked why it was a dean appointment rather than election. Chair Harris said that this was logistically difficult, and added that the example of Sen. Goldstein should show an example of why flexibility was important. Dr. Caughie asked if it would be possible to add a measure for a substitute. This is allowed by the current provisions in Subsection 4.
  - Sen. Hale stated that section 4 that referred to a semester could be changed. Chair Harris said that it did apply in the case of Sen. Goldstein, but we should consider beyond this individual case.
Sen. Ozar said that she felt a change in teaching schedule or medical leave arranged with Executive Committee was substantively different than missing three meetings with no notice. She felt that it had to be clarified to
Sen. Tuchman asked about “shall” vs. “may.”
  ▪ The tendency was in favor of “shall be considered vacated”, but there was some debate on this.
  ▪ Sen. Robinson asked about students with class schedules. This would require going back to SGLC or GSAC, which is the same for substitute.
  ▪ Sen. Love proposed that we vote on the original act and if that failed the committee would return with a new version of the act.
  ▪ 15 in favor. 5 opposed. 3 abstentions. Vote to be conducted via email.

IV. Discussion and vote: Resolution to Support Transparency and Inclusivity in University Decision-Making
   Faculty Affairs and Staff Affairs Committee

Sen. Rajendra moved to table and re-work the resolution to meet the needs raised in discussion, to be presented again at March meeting; seconded by VC Uprichard. Motion passed unanimously. Matter tabled until the next meeting.

V. New Business and Announcements

Chairperson Harris made an announcement about the process for putting senators on committees. She is working on including senators on other working groups

Sen. Classen announced that the Parking Committee needed representation and that during the Senate meeting the University’s media relations policy had changed and encouraged all Senators to review it.


---

**Senate Meeting Schedule for Academic Year 2018-2019:**

- **University Senate Schedule:**
  - **September 7** 3-6pm Institute of Environmental Sustainability, Room 123/124 (*combination first general meeting and closed orientation*)
  - **October 5** 3-5pm Information Commons, 4th Floor, LSC
  - **November 2** 3-5pm IES Room 123/124, LSC
  - **January 25** 3-5pm IES 123/124, LSC
  - **February 22** 3-5pm IES 123/124, LSC
• Executive Committee Schedule:
  - August 17  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC
  - September 21  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC
  - October 19  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC
  - January 11  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC
  - February 8  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC
  - March 8  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC
  - April 12  3-4pm  CLC 1233, WTC

- March 22  3-5pm  IES 123/124, LSC
- April 26  3-5pm  IES 123/124, LSC