September 14, 2005
Invocation - Patricia Jung

Alanah Fitch; Alan Raphael; Allen Schoenberger; Chris Kendrick; Patricia B. Jung; David Schweickart; Harvey Boller; Linda Paskiewicz; Rich Bowen; John Makowski; Fred Barnhardt; Pam Fenning; Janis Fine; Nick Lash; David Mirza; Gordon Ramsey; Robert Bireley, S.J.; Gerry McDonald; Kim Dell’Angela; Ian Boussy

The meeting was brought to order by Gerry McDonald.

An invocation was offered by Patricia Jung.

The May minutes were approved subject to the following revisions:
- Discussion of security patrols should substitute the word “required” with “authorized” with respect to carrying firearms. Nomenclature with respect to UPC and UCC is mixed

Chair’s Report from Gerry McDonald
- Jim Calcagno of Anthropology, chair of faculty affairs UPC, has indicated he will communicate closely with FC. The executive committee has met several times with John Frendreis, Acting Vice President for the university. He has encouraged FC to reinstate the committee on committees as he would like to draw committee membership from FC’s suggestions. He did so for the Rome Center committee. (Some discussion ensued as to whether we want to let administrators have veto policy; or the ability to “cherry pick” our list - suggestion was made to keep the list so short this is not a possibility).
- President of FC is a member of the University Coordinating Committee (UCC) which met Aug. 23, 2005 to select members of a task force committee for the review of the shared governance structure. The committee is moving at an apparently “leisurely” pace.
- A special meeting was held on Aug. 25, 2005 with Father Garanzini, members of the Loyola lakeside campus chapter of the American Association of University Professors, Paul Jay, prior chair of the Faculty Affairs UPC, and a variety of upper level administrators and a gaggle of deans. Meeting was an “airing” with “no rebuttal” of issues around the table. Major discussion points were whether there should be more elected committee membership.
- With respect to FC motions of May concerning issues related to the Rome Center and with respect to decisions about the Core courses, those motions were not responded to by the past Provost Faccione, the acting Vice President John Frendreis has only seen the motion for one week.

New Business:

Meeting Dates were approved unanimously.

Faculty Council Committee Membership
- A sign up sheet was sent around to express preferences for committee work and membership.

Grievance Document
- Jim Calcagno will come to FC next meeting to discuss the draft document for the Grievance procedures. Comment suggested that the procedures should be more clearly defined. Examples: Should have a written policy that there should always be two, one, none members of a school appointed to the Grievance review committee from the aggrieved faculty member’s home school. Many other examples of specificity requirements were offered. The appropriate FC committee was charged with getting to work on this immediately.
Shared Governance Review

Discussion of some similar issues as were raised at the retreat took place with respect to the role of FC with respect to the UPC structure. The Faculty Senate model was raised, particularly as AAUP will be pushing for a full senate. The general sense of the FC was that a senate is only as effective as the control it has over vetoing and/or vetting policy and that we could accommodate that power within FC by aligning our functions with the UPCs. In particular FC needs to have the ability to review, veto, remand for reconsideration policy moving through all, several, or some of the UPC. In particular FC needs to have direct input and/or alignment with the Faculty Affairs UPC. This brought up a discussion of the motion made last May - should this not still be in place - or can it be tweaked to cover the current Shared Governance Review (Bob Bireley). David Schweikart had worded the motion of May and volunteered to look at that motion in the context of the full Shared Governance Review. Linda indicated that the key ideas have already been articulated: veto power over policies coming from faculty affairs; control of nominations over the membership of the committees; expansion of the number of faculty on the committees; staff council ability to veto policies arising in the staff affairs UPC and control nominations for population of that committee.

Evaluation of Deans

Some discussion of the role of FC in evaluating the Deans took place. The ability to do so is clearly articulated in the 1992 Faculty Handbook. Regular reviews took place up to the “The Troubles”. Since the Braskamp period reviews have been in hiatus for two reasons - one the rapid revolving door and two, Braskamp did not approve of the methodology so therefore it seemed pointless to move forward on our own. Schoenberger pointed out that was irrelevant because the very existence of a document produced by this body could have legal implications whether it was heeded or not.

A committee to be chaired by Nick Lash will begin the Dean evaluation process. The Dean eligible for a review is the School of Nursing.

Awards Committee Rich Bowen reported that he has heard that Father Garanzini would like to have a larger profile venue for the Faculty Member of the Year - this could be at Staff Christmas lunch or at the January Convocation

Motion to Adjourn : Rich Bowen, Seconded by Nick Lash; Passed 17/0

Minutes prepared by Alanah Fitch