

January Faculty Council 2008
Alanah Fitch recording

Minutes edited without Meeting Documents – due to physical immobility from an ice fall. This means that the attendance list may be incomplete with name misspellings and, also, that various motions may not be correctly worded.

Present Linda Heath, Tony Castro, Harvey Boller, Gordon Ramsey, Linda Paskiewicz, Walter Jay, Bill Cuthbertson, Heather Cannon, Janis Fine, David Schweickart, Allen Shoenberger, David Posner, Marc Hayford, Gloria Jacobson, Paul Jay, Pamela Caughie, Bill Schmidt, Nick Lash, Marta Lundy, Paul Schreckenberger, Terry Williams, Jaweed Fareed.

I. Invocation - David Posner

II. Approval of the December Minutes

Corrections submitted by Gordon Ramsey. Correction for Father Salmi and attendance 17/0/0

III. Chair's Report (Gerry McDonald)

Gerry McDonald (GM) said that Pat Simpson, chair of Faculty Affairs University Policy Committee (FAUPC) has not heard from provost about vetted Faculty Handbook (FH).

GM asked for some blood from stone: The Faculty Appeals committee needs to be constituted. Faculty Council (FC) submits nominations of individuals to the committee, which the president accepts. Tony Cardoza was not present so he was volunteered for continuance. Linda Heath commented that it seemed inappropriate to reconstitute the committee assuming that a case has come up, and suggested that the committee should be kept as constituted. General Consensus on her suggestion followed.

IV. Committee Reports

1. Administrative Policies and Resources Committee Dean Evaluations (Nick Lash)

Nick Lash indicated that the various Dean's evaluations were moving forward. He asked for guidance on who(m?) should be surveyed given the degree of individual contact that the faculty may have with the Dean of the Graduate School. It was suggested that he contact the School for a list of Graduate Faculty. Linda Heath also pointed out the Global Initiative started by Dean Attoh reaches large number of faculty. There was some discussion of the timing of the results. It was suggested that results should be back by March so that FC could adequately discuss them before the end of the term.

V. Old Business

1. Family Policy - Ad Hoc Sub Committee (Marta Lundy)

Marta Lundy passed out a document from the Subcommittee on Family Leave Policies with motions. Each motion was accompanied by a short statement of rationale. The committee members indicated that the motions are not fully developed as the policy committees will need to

“hash out” the details.

Motion

Faculty Council proposes two tenure clock extensions for tenure track faculty for the birth or adoption of a child, and/or when the faculty member experiences a serious health condition, and/or when the faculty member is caring for a spouse, son, daughter or parent with a serious health condition. A written request from the faculty member will automatically activate a one-year tenure extension. Tenure clock extensions(s) will in no way affect the tenure and promotion process. The faculty member will be notified in writing that the request has been received.

Some questioned the number of faculty and staff affected and the cost accruing to the motion.
Passed 23/0/0

Motion

FC proposes 14 weeks of paid parental leave for all full-time faculty and staff for birth or adoption who have been employed full-time for at least three months. The leave begins at the point the employee initiates it, and can be taken regardless of when it falls during the calendar or academic year.

Discussion clarified that the motion applies to both full time faculty and staff.

Question - what about medically required bed rest? Marta that would be different – it would fall under the category of a medical condition which is covered by different laws and policy. This policy is directed toward allowing parents to be with new child.

There was a question from Paul Schreckenberger about why 14 weeks are proposed instead of 12. The response was that 14 weeks is also related to a semester in that returning at 8 weeks will require a complete change in faculty in the class room. He also clarified that this paid leave without medical condition and applies to either parent.

Harvey Boller (self identified as “E. Scrooge”) – said that it seemed that three months time of work seems pretty short to qualify. Marta Lundy said that the committee was thinking about new faculty hires that arrive pregnant. She emphasized that this motion is intended to make the university more competitive at recruiting and retaining new faculty members. She said that if you compare the cost of 14 weeks of parental leave to new recruitment and hiring of new faculty - it is probably less expensive.

Linda Heath proposed a scenario in which a baby is born in June. Could a faculty member start the leave clock at beginning of fall semester?. Marta - good questions - should be hacked out in the policy committees.

Passed 22/0/1

Motion

FC proposes that the adoption assistance be increased to \$5,000 for each child.

Tony Castro asked how many people are affected. Terry Richards said only a handful. Walter Jay said that he thought that Fr. G. would like us to reflect Jesuit values of justice. There was a long and detailed discussion of the financial implication of the motion and a discussion of the time period to which this bill could be applied. Allen Schoenberg stated that adoptions take a very long period of time.

Passed 23/0/0

Motion

FC Recommends the establishment of a “Commission on Family Policy that is comprised of full time faculty and staff and administrators. The charge to the Commission includes but is not limited to”:

- 1. Examination of issues relevant to family and work life:*
- 2. Assessment of the current status of the University regarding nursing mothers in the work place and University compliance with the Nursing Mothers in the workplace Act:*
- 3. Recommendation of strategies to promote compliance with the law in Illinois; and*
- 4. Examination of the establishment of child care centers and/or family resource centers for faculty; staff and students across all Loyola University Chicago campuses.*

Passed 23/0/0

Walter Jay proposed a round of applause to reflect the sense of FC of the total amount of work done by the committee.

2. Ad hoc committee on Faculty Leave (David Schweikart)

David Schweikart reported. The committee received an informal positive response from Father Garanzini. The survey is to go to the faculty tomorrow. The medical center is still “up in the air”.

V. Benefits Discussion – (Tom Kelly of Human Resources, Special Guest)

Tom Kelly provided feedback on the Faculty and Staff Survey (Fall 2007) - large booklet of mostly faculty response.

The University used an external firm in order to have “bench-mark” comparisons. Additional questions were presented, which could have been better framed. There were three University comparisons in the firm’s pool (U of F, Notre Dame, U of C) which FC did not feel was “robust”. Tom Kelly is talking to other Jesuit schools about possibility of benchmarks.

The remainder of the session dealt with benefits. Walter Jay voiced the opinion that a) a finding a web page for information was difficulty and b) that the material was not framed in a fashion conducive to decision making. Tony Castro advocated a table format which indicates

what degree of benefits (both health care and retirement) can be obtained at xyz years of service and at uvw years of early retirement. Linda Heath said that an individual appointment with a TIAF CREF representative results in very good counseling. Nick Lash concurred saying that they did a full analysis for him and that he should be able to retire sometime near the age of 93.5.

Tom Kelly tried to clarify some of the information. Early retirement health care is very expensive (particularly for spouses) as there is not a large risk pooling group.

Allen S. stated: two years ago you wanted to raise us from 8 to 10% employer contribution to retirement but that didn't go anywhere. Tom Kelly said, yes but that was when we were in huge turmoil, but there is some room now. But the comparison schools may require contributory match from faculty. The issue we are struggling with about 35% of faculty and staff are not saving any of their own money for retirement. Our plan does not encourage savings. If we might have an automatic opt out instead of opt in payroll deduction the default would be individual saving.

Tom Kelly said that they need to have an advisory committee to help figure out how to communicate better.

VII. Adjournment