

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Minutes**  
**Wednesday, January 25, 2012**  
**3:00-5:00 PM – TSC 303-4, WTC**

**Members Present:** Boller, H.; Currie, J.; Derhammer, N.; Dominiak, M.; Embrick, D.; Fine, J.; Fitch, A.; Jay, W.; Jurgensmeier, SJ, C.; Kaplan, D.; Kilbane, T.; Lash, N.; Leone, G.; Lucas, L.; Mirza, D.; Miller, H.; Pollock, M. (for Ortega Murphy, B.); Ramsey, G.; Rose, H.; Ruppman, T.; Schneck, M.; Schoenberger, A.; Wojcik, E.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:09pm by Gordon Ramsey.
2. Invocation – Janis Fine.
3. Approval of November minutes. Correction: see Gordon Ramsey. Motion: Dominiak; Jurgensmeier seconded. Motion passed 11-0-5.
4. Chair's Report
  - Faculty Senate (FS) Task Force
    - Fruitful discussions are continuing. We have almost finalized the wording of the committee structure portion of the plan, and the meeting schedule. Administration requests an initial statement on mission as part of the FS constitution; we are still working on that. Administration (Fr. G. was not at the last meeting) is still strongly in favor of term limits for members. (Though one of the deans said he hoped the “whole deal would not fall through just because of the term limits issue.”) Also there is an issue about faculty caucuses: administrators cannot see the need for so many. If we cannot get all the business done we need to in four meetings per year, we may need to have extra FS meetings. What will happen to the caucuses then? Will they be sacrificed? Will there be extra caucus meetings?

FSTF is aiming to bring the final plan to FC in April. If we approve it, and admins pass on it, it goes to the Board of Trustees.
    - AS: The current draft of the FS plan contains no language about the Caucus. Should it not? (Discussion of whether & how such language should be incorporated in the plan.)
    - Term limits. GR: We have given (what we at least think are) compelling reasons why there should be no term limits on faculty membership—the need for institutional memory among faculty; the regular turnover to be observed already in membership, etc. Administration's only rationale for supporting them has been the claim that some faculty members might not put their names up for election if they had to go up against a colleague who was senior to them and had been on the Senate for a number of years. (Some discussion of the need for a faculty referendum on the matter, listing pro's and con's.)

- Meetings of Faculty-Staff Lounge ad hoc committee are ongoing.
  - The Unified Student Government (USG) has taken it upon itself to propose a University Senate to the administration. I will meet with them and communicate our concerns to them on this. The idea is to have student representation on one of the four standing committees of the Faculty Senate, the Student Affairs and Development Committee. It would also be a good idea to have annual meetings between the top reps of FS, USG, and Staff Council. I will pursue this.
  - Two UPC's (Research and AAUPC) are now working on the teaching load issue. I will work to get others going. Hopefully we will have feedback either in March or April from them.
    - Question: Do the UPC's have guidelines for their work? A: I have sent the guidelines to Rich Bowen, who is on the Research UPC, and to the chairs of the other committees.
  - Elaine Lehman from the Shareholder Advocacy Committee would like to visit FC to address us on her group's concerns. Will schedule.
5. What will be on the agenda for the February FS "Dry run" meeting? Discussion:
- It would be useful to have a discussion on an issue where there is a disagreement or dispute between faculty and administration—a *test* of the process of the real Senate.
    - GR: Hiring issues a possible such topic: (1) Memberships on hiring committees and changes to their former make-ups; (2) Administration's decision not to allow (at least some) departments to rank their finalists in order of preference, but only to address their respective strengths and weaknesses. Much discussion of the latter point. Two salient contributions:
      - One speaker asserted that it was his sense that the non-ranking was intended to assist hiring for faculty diversity.
      - Another pointed out that, when deans send a letter to the Provost proposing a job offer to a candidate, they must include a hiring proposal form, one section of which calls on them to indicate how they think the candidate will advance the Jesuit mission of Loyola. At least in CAS job searches, candidates have to fill out a response form on this issue. Non-ranking may give the deans and Provost some leeway in giving hiring for mission a higher profile if they feel the need.
    - GR: undergraduate research might be another issue. The new strategic plan calls for it. Faculty performance credit for sponsoring such research has not been standardized across departments and schools, nor have supervision loads. For example, in CAS Physics, each faculty member must supervise 9 undergraduate majors doing research. GR: If members have any info on this issue in their own departments or in peer universities, please send it to me.

- AAUPC has addressed the issue of whether or not the new teaching-load categories of “research intensive,” “research active,” and “research inactive” will have the effect of creating a “multi-tiered” faculty, and the effect of this separation on leave applications, merit raises, promotions, etc.

6. Dismissal without cause issue—Faculty Handbook

- GR: Let us postpone discussion on this until Peter Schraeder can attend and contribute to deliberations.
  - (Member: I was on the Faculty Appeals Committee a while back. In one case, a tenure-track faculty member was given a letter of nonrenewal 2 months after having successfully completed a mid-tenure review. The committee recommended that the letter be withdrawn. Fr. Garanzini agreed to do so, but not with the committee’s rationale. The OGC argued (via Fr. G.) that the old Handbook had contained language permitting such a decision not to reappoint, and that its omission from the new Handbook had been an accident. But in fact that was not correct—it had been *negotiated out* of the new Handbook.)

7. Elections

- TK polled members on their willingness to serve a new term. E-mails for nominations go out by 2/20; Jack Corliss at IT gets the list of eligible voters by 3/1; he sends out the ballots by 3/15; on 3/22 he will send a reminder e-mail; 3/29 ballots are due; on 4/99 we contact new members to tell them of their election and invite them to the April meeting.

8. New Core proposal

- The new Core Curriculum proposal has just arrived today—please send GR comments on it.

9. New Business

- Discussion of SSOM Basic Sciences salary issue.

**Motion: An ad hoc Committee of FC should be struck which would include members of the SSOM/BS faculty, and which will approach the President directly to discuss the salary issue.**

**Moved (Jay). No quorum (17 present); general agreement.**

10. Motion to adjourn (Lash), seconded (Kilbane). Meeting was adjourned at 4:57pm.

Respectfully submitted by  
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary