

FACULTY COUNCIL
Agenda for Meeting of Wednesday, December 9, 2009, 3:00-5:00 PM
Meeting (3:00-5:00): Beane Hall (Lewis Towers)
Holiday Party (5:00-6:00): CURL Conference Room 1030 (Lewis Towers)

Members present: H. Boller, R. Bowen, H. Cannon, D. Castignetti, M. Dominiak, K. Egenes, D. Embrick, J. Fine, A. Fitch, W. Jay, C. Jurgensmeier, S.J., D. Kaplan, T. Kilbane, N. Lash, J. Lieblich, H. Miller, E. Myers, G. Ramsey, B. Schmidt, D. Schweickart, A. Shoenberger, N. Sobe, M. Udo

Called to order 3:00 pm.

1. Invocation—Janis Fine
2. Approval of November Minutes. Motion: Lash, Second: Miller; Passed unanimously. (19-0-0)
3. President's Report (Walter Jay for Peter Schraeder)
 - Upcoming Meetings with Senior Academic Officers (Father Garanzini and Paul Whelton & SSOM/MNSON Deans) were announced: Monday, Jan 25th.
 - W. Jay introduced and welcomed the incoming Chair of the Academic Affairs University Policy Committee (AA-UPC), Bren Murphy.
 - Provost Office Update on Summer Stipends, Leaves of Absence, Sabbaticals (see attached update from Provost's Office). N. Sobe: The Provost added one more female faculty member for gender balance. Only 22 leaves were applied for, which seems too few. Some faculty apparently assumed that the new sabbatical policy would pass and postponed their application. A small pilot program of sabbaticals is being tried (about 4 faculty) for those who have not had a leave and were in rank for a number of years without a leave. Discussion ensued: sabbatical and leaves of absence may be for different audiences. Perhaps notices should go out to faculty on leave info.
 - Christine Wiseman has been hired as president of Saint Xavier University in Chicago. The provost search committee has been selected (see attached list), while John Pellissaro is serving as the acting Provost. It was noted that most of the committee members have administrative responsibilities. It may be possible to add more faculty members to balance the representation.
 - Motion: We request that Fr. Garanzini add two additional faculty members to the Provost search committee, in consultation with the president of FC, to balance representation between faculty and administration. Moved: M. Dominiak, Second: H. Miller. Passed unanimously. (23-0-0)
 - The resolution on faculty benefits was reworded by the Executive Committee of Faculty Council and submitted to Father Garanzini on December 4.
4. Faculty Teaching Loads (see attached document on "Faculty Instructional Responsibilities")
Resolution: A. Schoenberger – FC was stunned by the failure of visible consultation with faculty, failure for the administration to submit this policy change to the UCC for study and consideration and unclear application of the policy to disparate academic units. As such, we offer the following motion:

Motion: Faculty Council recommends that the October 20, 2009 document approved by Fr. Garanzini, entitled “**Principles and Normative Guidelines on Faculty Instructional Responsibilities**” be put on hold for the period of time needed by both AAUPC and FAUPC to review, evaluate and make recommendations regarding this policy. Such a review would provide documented rationale for these guidelines and an assessment for the intended and unanticipated outcomes of such a policy.

Moved: M. Dominiak, Second: A. Fitch; Passed unanimously. (23-0-0)

Discussion points:

- We request that (i) the new policy for implementation of the new faculty guidelines for faculty teaching loads be postponed to allow due process to be followed, (ii) the goals of this policy and specific guidelines be provided and (iii) that the administration follow the procedure outlined in the Faculty Handbook for changing policies (submission to UCC and AAUPC and FAUPC). The goals should include anticipated outcomes and what possible unanticipated outcomes may there be.
- The teaching load memos (and update to 3-2 standard) were sent out without faculty consideration (FAUPC) and departments were asked to define “research intensive”, “research active” and “non-research” faculty. New faculty have 2-2 loads for the first three years.
- The motivation for the change has not been publicized.
- It is unclear what effect this would have on faculty development and productivity.
- The measure of what a course consists of is not uniform and is unclear. Class sizes have not been taken into account.
- The purpose of this change and uniformity across the university has not been communicated to faculty. What are we trying to fix? Let us define the problem and decide on possible solutions. Is this meant to be truly uniform across the university, or certain school dependent? Is retention the issue? There are no data to show that new teaching load guidelines will improve retention.
- What are productivity assumptions for teaching and scholarship? Involving students in research and faculty service loads have not been included in teaching considerations.

5. Faculty Senate Update: David Schweickart gave a briefing and a handout regarding faculty governance at peer institutions. If a Faculty Senate were to meet, the senior administration would have to be present, not delegated representatives (W. Jay). Further discussion was postponed for next meeting due to time.

6. Gender Equity Update (Bren Murphy for Linda Heath, on leave): when Fr Garanzini and C. Wiseman arrived, noticed a lack of female representation in the senior administration. The situation has improved. There is a concern about the lack of regular updates on this issue from senior administration (none since 2006). There is a need for more transparency on diversity issues, facilitated by better communication. In fact, females have left higher administrative posts. B. Murphy asked the senior administration to establish a task force to make sure gender equity was considered in hiring, but this was turned down. The salary disparity issue was considered by the committee and there seems to be equity present. There have been considerable hires of female faculty. B. Murphy will draft a motion and bring it to FC as to what issues should be considered regarding gender equity in hiring at all levels. Family leave and assistance policies

have also not been put in place. It was noted that members of the FC benefits committee should be listed on the Web site.

7. Adjournment: Promptly at 5:00 Motion: Lash, Second: Ramsey. A holiday party with the Provost followed.

PROVOST SEARCH COMMITTEE

Attoh, Samuel. Dean of the Graduate School

Daffron, Justin, S.J. Associate Provost for Academic Services (Co-Chair of Provost Search Committee)

Geraghty, Diane. Professor of Law

Heider, Don. Dean of the School of Communication

Kelly, Rob. Vice President for Student Development (Co-Chair of Provost Search Committee)

Schraeder, Peter. Professor of Political Science and President of Faculty Council

Tuchman, Nancy. Professor of Biology and Director of CUERP

From: Timothy O'Connell
To: Schraeder, Peter
CC: CW
Date: 12/2/2009 7:21 AM
Subject: Updates on Faculty Matters

Peter,

As we come toward the end of the semester, I thought you might find helpful an update on several matters.

1) Summer Stipends: Yesterday the Provost's letters responding to the proposals for summer stipends were issued. Her "approval" letters included the following paragraph, which I thought might interest you:

This year the University Faculty Development Review Committee considered 59 proposals, the largest number in recent years, and recommended University support for 43. This number exceeded the funding available for this year in Academic Affairs. However, in light of the prominence given to summer support in Loyola's new Strategic Plan (Strategy 2, Tactic 4, <http://www.luc.edu/strategicplanning/strategy2.shtml> (<http://www.luc.edu/strategicplanning%20/strategy2.shtml>)) and in support of this faculty initiative, the President has agreed to provide additional funding so that, for the first time, all the proposals found deserving of university support by the peer reviewers are being approved.

Thus the summer stipend process, at least for this year, parallels the Leave of Absence process in being evaluative but not competitive. I'm very pleased about that.

2) Leaves of Absence: Those proposals will be considered by the Faculty Development Review Committee next week. The Provost intends to communicate her decisions to the applicants before the holidays.

3) Alternative Sabbatical Program: You will recall the Provost's proposal, developed in the summer of 2008 and discussed last year, to provide a program of special support for faculty who have been research inactive but are interested in reinvigorating their research. That program planned an implementation at the rate of about 15 faculty a year, but was not implemented this year because of the uncertain economic climate.

However, the Provost remains committed to this plan. And toward that end, a small pilot project is going forward right now. At her direction, my office developed objective standards of selection -- the focus has been on faculty in rank and without a leave for 15 years with an effort to include faculty across the schools -- and issued personal invitations. A couple of faculty declined, because of other commitments, but a cohort of four faculty, representing three schools, is currently participating in the project under the leadership of Dr. Ida Androwich. Having worked as a group and individually, in the spring these faculty will deliver to their deans proposals for semester-long activities designed to reinvigorate their research. With the approval of their deans, they will then receive one semester Leaves of Absence during Academic Year 2010-11.

Hope this information is helpful.

Tim

Timothy E. O'Connell, Ph.D.

Principles and Normative Guidelines on Faculty Instructional Responsibilities

Introduction

Central to the mission of this or any great university are the twin responsibilities for its faculty to teach and to do scholarly research. The delivery of quality academic programs depends on the dedication of faculty who develop courses and co-curricular opportunities for students and who remain current in their field of specialization. Faculty expect that the workload will be fairly distributed among them in a program or school. Students expect full-time, dedicated teachers to deliver their major part of their curricular program.

1. The commitment of Loyola faculty to both teaching and research has been a hallmark of the institution. Known for the superior quality of instruction delivered here, Loyola has remained strong in its reputation and the respect of the wider academic community. That reputation and respect require, from time to time, a renewal of our commitment to teaching and an examination of curriculum for relevance and coherence.
2. It is understood that teaching involves instructional activities beyond didactic presentation. It involves mentoring of students and advising, research supervision, and supervision of field-based experiences. While some of these duties are shared with professional staff, they nevertheless are obligations that fall within the umbrella of our duties as teachers.
3. Instructional responsibilities involve a range of activities. These include posting a syllabus for students which explains how the course will be presented, the requirements and assignments of the course, how grading will occur, and how the student will be able to contact the professor (regular office hours would be a minimum).
4. Loyola expects faculty to fulfill a minimum of contact and credit hours each semester. A 3/2 course load is the norm for tenure-track faculty at Loyola and a 2/2 load represents a minimum course load. This norm includes an expectation of research/scholarship. Academic units may differentiate research-active faculty, but such faculty must engage a pattern of research that is *exceptional* by departmental standards (i.e., beyond that expected of tenure-track faculty at the various ranks). Teaching loads otherwise are higher for those faculty who do not perform exceptional research. A faculty member may teach only one course per semester with the permission of the respective Dean and Provost, and Department Chairs should carry a 2/1 teaching load. Everyone otherwise teaches two courses per semester.
5. Supervision of masters theses, supervision of dissertation research, reading course supervision, or other duties which fall under the category of "teaching" are not generally considered as substitutes for teaching regular courses.
6. Undergraduate courses that enroll under 10 students do not generally qualify as fulfilling this course load, except with permission of the Dean as may be necessary to delivery of a particular program. Also, unless pedagogically designed and approved by the Dean, large sections do not qualify for double counting (e.g., simply placing 80 students in a section rather than 40).
7. Those who are expected to take on extra duties and especially those who will need to work and be regularly available on campus beyond the 9-month contract period will be offered a stipend for these extra month(s) of service. In addition, some duties may qualify for a course reduction. The following list is illustrative:

- Major School or College administrator
 - Department Chair/Affinity Group Leader
 - Faculty on Provost's staff
 - Endowed Chairholder
 - Center Director
8. The University's policy on a buy-out of teaching responsibilities is generally described as follows: a single course buy-out will be granted provided that the external grant or organization seeking a faculty member's time supports 15% of the faculty member's salary plus benefits.
 9. Externally supported leaves of absence require a full buy-out for the period when the faculty member will be unavailable to students at the University. The salary remaining to the school or department will be used to enable the department or school to hire a full-time replacement. An exception exists for a university-granted paid leave of absence. A program of competitive leaves now exists and the University hopes to expand that program. Nevertheless, the summer stipend program more usually supports faculty research, allowing faculty to receive a stipend to support their research during the summer.
 10. Internally supported course-reductions must include a commitment to pay 10% of the faculty member's annual salary. In no instance will a faculty member be allowed to obtain two course reductions in a given year from internal sources.
 11. Each School or College should revisit/revise the annual evaluation form used for faculty reviews to ensure that teaching performance indicators are adequately captured.

Final Draft: October 16, 2009

Approved by President: October 20, 2009