FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, March 26, 2014
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC


1. Meeting was called to order at 3:12pm by Gordon Ramsey.
2. Invocation by Charles Jurgensmeier, SJ.
4. Chair’s Report
   o I recently had a meeting with Provost Pelissero and representatives of the USG regarding the proposal that CAS faculty post syllabi for courses in advance of each semester’s registration period. The meeting was useful, and several important points were clarified. It was stressed to me that the understanding is that past versions of the course syllabi may be posted. Faculty are not to consider themselves bound to teach the upcoming course in accordance with these syllabi; the only binding syllabus will be the one distributed by the instructor at the start of term. Second, according to Provost Pelissero, posting of syllabi is “encouraged,” but not required. Finally, USG would like to know whether Council supports this; if so, by what vote; and they would like to know if we have any critiques of the proposal. We can take up these issues later on in this meeting when we deliberate and vote on the proposal.
   o At the next meeting, we will have Dean evaluations, seat the new Council, and vote on the new Council’s officers. In addition, we will take up the travel funds proposal (Boller).
5. SSOM/HSD: No report.
6. University Senate report (TC)
   o Our most recent meeting was March 21st.
   o Elections are currently underway.
   o We’ve also approved our new bylaws.
   o We’ve approved a new office of Veterans Affairs.
   o We’ve begun an initiative to construct an institutional diversity policy and to hire a chief diversity officer at the associate provost level.
We spent some time deliberating the teaching load issue in CAS, and approved the workload/evaluation format for the faculty evaluation system.

7. Elections (TR)

- There were 10 units open; only five had elections. (Four had only one nomination; one (Law) had none.) CAS is missing one. So Council is currently down two members in total. Those elected will be contacted this week. GR: many thanks to Tracy and the hard work of the elections committee.

8. Executive Session (NL): Dean Evaluations for Don Heider (Comm), Darrell Wheeler (SSW), and David Yellen (Law). Thanks to all the Council members who did such careful work on the quantitative and qualitative reports for these evaluations.

9. Discussion of Syllabus proposal

- Motion: to approve policy calling upon faculty to post syllabi for courses before registration the semester previous, on the understanding that (1) the posting is voluntary, not obligatory; and (2) that the syllabi posted can be of previous iterations of the course, and are non-binding, that is to say, do not take precedence over the syllabi presented to the students when the course actually begins. (Vote: 12-2-6. Passes.)

- Discussion of concerns and reservations:
  1. The policy has been presented as implemented, before and without faculty consultation, as a fait accompli, to the CAS Academic Council, the provisional University Senate, and the Faculty Council. This is not how “shared governance” works.
  2. In schools (such as Marcella Niehoff School of Nursing) where this has been a practice for several years, there has been considerable student dissatisfaction over any differences between the “pre-posted” syllabi and the syllabi that actually are presented on the first day of class.
  3. Faculty are deeply concerned that students will use pre-posted syllabi to course- and section-shop, attempting to find those courses (and sections of multi-section courses) which appear to have the fewest assignments or have the types of assignments they prefer (e.g., avoiding courses with too much essay writing or mathematics). This was in fact explicitly admitted in discussion of the proposal by student reps at the last meeting of the provisional University Senate.
  4. Faculty have concerns over the misappropriation of their intellectual property, which these syllabi represent. While the USG presentation attempted to address these concerns by noting that the syllabi will be accessible only to Loyola members with valid accounts within Sakai, some faculty are not reassured. Once digitized
content is made available to everyone within a domain, anyone who accesses it can easily copy it and pass it to anyone outside that domain, and the content author has no control whatsoever over that transfer. In a classroom setting, or in a Sakai shell, an instructor at least knows the identities of those who have access to his or her syllabi, and if he or she spots them elsewhere has a good chance of finding out who might have passed them on. With universal access that is impossible. Some faculty who have been pre-posting syllabi (e.g. MNSN) for years now have already seen what is clearly their own work popping up at other schools. In a competitive market for students this dilutes the uniqueness of our course offerings: competitor schools can say, “Oh, yes, we have something like that here, too.”

10. Provost Pelissero Visit
   o Updates to the faculty handbook: OGC (Pam Costas) going through it now to update; once the review is done, we will send it to Faculty Council and University Senate. GR: is there a timeline for this? JP: it should be complete by fall of this year.
   o Salary data update (see handout): the 2012 column represents fall 2012 through spring 2013; the 2013, represents fall of 2013 only.
     1. Question: can we see salary breakouts by gender? JP: every year we do an analysis of salaries, testing for significant variations on a number of criteria. When it comes to gender, the trend of the past six years continues – gender difference is not statistically significant. What is more significant is (1) years at the University, and (2) years in rank.
     2. We are at or near 60th to 70th percentile of salary by rank compared to peer institutions.
     3. Question: How successful has Benefits been with the new 10% matching program for faculty retirement savings? JP: Extremely successful; we’re at almost 100%.
   o New engineering program: the new program will begin with five tracks: biomedical, environmental, software, applied mathematics, and engineering management. The concept paper for the program was reviewed by BUS at the end of last term. It is also been reviewed by other institutions and by consultants. We are presently looking for a Director of engineering science. Plan is to initiate the program in the fall of 2015. If successful, each track will migrate to a full major, and we will seek accreditation.
     1. Question: What about neuroscience? JP: it is now minor, but close to moving to a major. We’ve held off due to faculty and labs. We
now have the faculty; we’re working on lab space at Quinlan Science Building. Question: what about possible interaction with the Maywood campus? JP: I think this is necessary.

- Question: Where’s the funding for this program coming from? JP: We are working on that now. Temporary space has been allocated in the Cuneo Building. Consultants have suggested a distributed-space model, not a dedicated facility. But this is a bridge plan. Ultimately we will need a building if the program succeeds.

11. Motion to adjourn: Moved (Classen); second (Ruppman). Meeting adjourned 5:01pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary