

Faculty Council Retreat Minutes

Botanical Gardens
August 21, 2002

1. Chair's Remarks:

Dr. Murphy opened with a prayer. She reviewed the agenda for today's meeting, which was approved by Council.

Dr. Murphy reported on her meeting last week with the new Provost, Pete Facione, and other members of the FC Executive committee. She was pleased with the Provost's desire to meet at length and often with FC. He has asked for biweekly meetings with Dr. Murphy and the FC Executive Committee. She has been invited to attend the Provost's Advisory Council meetings as well. She is reassured that he wants to include FC in "the loop." She will also continue to meet regularly with Fr. Garanzini.

FC has lost one member, Lamont Stallworth, who has resigned from FC. He needs to be replaced.

Loyola has hired a new Dean for Mundelein College, although the name has not been announced, yet. One member raised the question of whether there was a search committee for this position. Dr. Murphy said there was, but that FC was not consulted about faculty membership on the committee.

The question was raised about FC meetings with members of the Board of Trustees. Support was voiced for more structured interaction between board members and faculty. Discussion turned to the question of what format should be used for such meetings. One member suggested that board members be asked what format they might prefer. Another suggested meetings focused on specific issues. One idea might be for the board to bring questions to the Council. There was some discussion about the importance of keeping some of these meetings informal. It was also observed that board members' attendance at FC dinners had fallen off and that this problem needs attention.

The new Provost has reconfigured his office. Linda Salchenberger has returned to the School of Business. Linda Heath is now Freshman Dean. John Frendreis now holds the position of Vice Provost.

Dr. Murphy informed council that the Provost would like to change the Academic Calendar. She reviewed the basic elements of his plan. He would like to create a 4-week January intersession by pushing the start date of the spring semester back to early February and running spring semester until the end of May. Under the plan the summer sessions would be trimmed from 6 weeks to 4 weeks. The fall semester calendar would remain the same, but the two semesters would each run 16 weeks. The School of Business would move to a semester system.

In elaborating the plan, Dr. Murphy reported, the Provost stressed the possibility for programmatic and curricular flexibility. Intersession provides a more sustained time for research and an opportunity for departments and programs to offer courses and other academic activities. Concerns were expressed about how quickly this shift can take place, and about the fact that the new calendar seems to be being developed without enough discussion. A number of members felt that 4 week sessions were too short. It was also observed that cutting the length of summer break will have an adverse effect on research. Concern was also expressed about the impact of the proposed change on students and the advising process. It may also cut back on students' ability to find summer employment. One member wondered how this change will effect writing intensive courses.

After much discussion of the pros and cons of the proposed system discussion returned to the fact that this plan appears to be being imposed without sufficient discussion with faculty. It was observed that Academic Council should have a key role to play in developing plans for a new academic calendar, but that since the change will be university-wide input ought to come from a university-wide body. School of Business faculty felt that the proposed change could have a particularly negative impact on the MBA program in terms of scheduling and compressed class-time. Council agreed it needs to warn the Provost that imposing the change may run into significant problems, that he should be careful with this issue because it has the potential to create a great deal of concern among faculty and students. Discussion turned to the Shared Governance White Paper and the idea that it should be used as a blueprint for making the kind of change the Provost has proposed.

Dr. Murphy discussed searches (Finance and Development) with Fr. Garanzini. No search for a replacement for Janet Gibbs is currently underway. The President wants to confer on this matter with the Board of Trustees. The position may be reconfigured. Regarding the search for a VP for Development, Dr. Murphy

reported that Marge Beane and Pat Arbor (board member) are heading up a committee to work with a consulting firm to find candidates for the position. Fr. Garanzini provided the following rationale for such a process: a "stealth" rather than an open search is preferable because development positions are extremely sensitive. Dr. Murphy reported she has contacted Marge Beane to discuss the possibility of including a faculty member of the search committee. There was some discussion of the qualities necessary for an effective head of development.

Dr. Murphy discussed graduate schools with Fr. Garanzini. He has developed a department for professional graduate schools. Recruitment for professional schools needs improvement in order to increase enrollments and revenue. Paul Roberts, formerly with DePaul has been hired to head the department. Fr. Garanzini expressed an interest in making CAS graduate programs more exclusive and competitive. He wants to move from general to "niche" Ph.D. programs. Some members wondered what the implications of this move might mean for graduate fellowships and research support.

The next meeting of FC will be shifted from 9/11 to 9/18 so members can attend the President's State of the University address on the 11th.

Dr. Murphy reminded Council of the upcoming conference on Jesuit Higher Education, co-sponsored by Faculty Council. "Is the Jesuit Mission History? The Sacred and the Secular in Higher Education." Wednesday, September 25, 2002, 10:3-4.

2. Status of Shared Governance

Dr. Murphy asked for discussion of the Provost's paper on the budget process, which she had circulated prior to the meeting. She pointed out he is clear on the importance of "responsible expertise" as the basis for faculty input rather than representation for the sake of representation. She also observed that the paper inadvertently describes many of the past problems at Loyola. She also pointed out that some of the principles here might to be applied to the question of how to proceed on the question of changing the academic calendar. Discussion turned to the importance of FC framing its position regarding shared governance in terms of our expertise and responsibilities rather than on the abstract notion of democracy.

Dr. Murphy asked for discussion of the draft White Paper on Shared Governance issued by the ad-hoc committee on shared governance. She explained that the paper resulted from year-long roundtable discussions of shared governance among selected faculty and administrators. Dr. Murphy observed some "dissonance" between the principles enunciated in the white paper and the way governance proceeds at Loyola. One member asked how administrators and faculty can be held accountable for following such principles. How can we get assurance that the principles will be implemented? Reaction to the paper was positive. We should endorse it at the appropriate time but call for concrete steps to implement its principles, stressing the need to turn attention to finalizing the Faculty Senate Constitution and revising the **Faculty Handbook**. Some concerns developed about the White Paper's assertion that the university "cannot function as a democracy." Members voiced different opinions about the accuracy of this observation. Discussion focused on the idea that the phrase should be dropped. One member stressed the need for checks and balances in decision-making. Another member pointed out the phrase is consistent with AAUP principles. It was agreed that the question of endorsing or proposing revisions should be put on the agenda for the next business meeting of Council.

Dr. Murphy raised the question of what Council should do about the status of the **Faculty Senate Constitution**. There was a consensus that the constitution needs to "be put back on the table." One criticism has been that the constitution didn't go far enough in terms of checks and balances. The status of University Policy Committees was also raised. Should they be written back into the constitution? A question was asked about the relationship of the constitution to the Santa Clara model. Members involved in drawing it up said Loyola's constitution was not specifically modeled on Santa Clara's. Indeed, it doesn't use a model at all. One member noted that the constitution, which should deal with how the faculty regulate or govern itself, got blended in with the issue of University Policy Committees. It was also pointed out that the constitution, having been voted on by faculty, still had to be negotiated with the administration. Others suggested that it ought to go to the new Provost for his response and comment. It was agreed that when Council meets with the new Provost later in the day it would stress the importance of moving ahead with the constitution.

3. Pending Projects

Faculty Handbook revision. It was pointed out that the handbook is both out of date and inaccurate. Revision should be undertaken by a joint committee of faculty and administrators, one member pointed out. The upper administration will have to be part of the process. According to one member, the last revision was done by representatives from CFA, FC, Lorraine Serwatka as an ex-officio participant, and others. Revisions went to CFA and Council for approval, then to Deans and the university lawyer before returning to the drafting

committee, then it was submitted to all parties for approval. CFA's role was based on the fact the committee administers so much of the handbook. A question was raised about who should initiate the revisions, and on what basis? It was agreed that Council would raise the issue with the Provost when it meets with him this afternoon.

Discussion turned to the seemingly diminished role CFA plays in reviewing leaves of absence proposals and merit salary increase proposals. Specific concerns were raised about changes in the process last year for dealing with leave applications and the President's suspension of CFA's role in overseeing proposals for merit salary increases. It was agreed these concerns would be raised later in the afternoon when Council meets with the Provost.

Dean Evaluations. Dr. Murphy reviewed past practice with regard to FC's conduct of dean evaluations. In the recent past, AVP Braskamp began to edit the evaluations before they were released. Questions were raised by FC about the accuracy of the edited reports. Two years ago FC decided to distribute the reports themselves to the deans who were evaluated, and to Sr. VP Braskamp and President Garanzini. This year "hard numbers" were reported rather than a simple summary. Dr. Braskamp protested that this process was unfair and unethical. Dr. Murphy observed that FC needs to talk with the administration about how dean evaluations should be conducted and distributed. It was pointed out that the **Faculty Handbook** mandates that FC "participates" in evaluating Deans and conducts the process. The key issue seems to be whether or not the evaluations should go back to the department faculty, according to one member. Dr. Murphy observed that there needs to be balance between fairness to the dean and fairness to the evaluating faculty. It was observed that the process of evaluation can only work if there is trust on the part of the administration in the integrity of the Council's evaluation process, and on the part of faculty that the senior academic officer will act responsibly on the evaluations. A number of members stressed the importance of accountability with regard to the evaluation process. Council needs to gather information about where there are concerns about the evaluation process. It was agreed that the nature and function of dean evaluations ought to be discussed with the new Provost later in the afternoon. It was also agreed that Council's academic administration committee will be directed to collect information on how the process has been conducted in the past and what the concerns are. It was suggested that Council send a detailed description of how the process works to deans for their comment and response. Support was voiced for this suggestion.

Senior Status for Faculty. There was background discussion on the senior faculty program and recent revisions that have been made resulting in a cutback in the teaching opportunities and compensation for faculty with "senior" status. Concerns were expressed about the fairness of these changes. The program's budget has been withdrawn and compensation for senior status faculty must now come out of department funds.

Part Time Faculty. Dr. Murphy has been approached by some part-time faculty about the possibility of giving part-time faculty a stronger voice in university governance, and about Council focusing attention on the status of part-time faculty. One member recalled a committee devoted to issues related to part-time faculty that has since been disbanded. Some members observed that perhaps it should be reconstituted.

Graduate Students. Dr. Murphy wondered whether there were issues related to the teaching workload of graduate students that Council should discuss. It was observed that there was real variability in the training of graduate students for teaching and the amount of teaching they do.

Faculty Workload. There was general agreement that it would be important for Council to be informed about the progress of the Task Force on Faculty Responsibility. One member pointed out that there are no science faculty on the committee, and that this is a problem.

Research Support. Council will discuss the question of research support with the new Provost later in the afternoon. One member suggested Council get some feedback on how well research support services are functioning. Some members complained that the support was "substandard." One member reminded council that it had objected to merging research services and the position of Graduate School Dean into a single entity. It was suggested that this might be a contributing factor in terms of poor service. Grant accounting procedures are problematic, according to some members. Concerns were also expressed about the recent cutback of laboratory space at the Medical Center. It was agreed that Dr. Murphy would invite Dean Yost to meet with Council to discuss these matters.

Discussion then turned to prioritizing issues for discussion with the Provost.

Committees. Dr. Murphy said she would soon be sending out an e-mail inviting council members to volunteer for standing committees. She also reported that Fr. Garanzini expressed an interest in Council exploring the value of adding a student affairs committee.

Gender Equity Study proposal from Pamela Caughie, Director of Women's Studies. Council discussed the proposal submitted by Dr. Caughie that the university undertake a study of gender equity. There was broad agreement that such a study is long overdue and should be conducted as soon as possible. There was a suggestion that the study be expanded to include Medical Center faculty.

4. Meeting with Provost Facione

Dr. Murphy introduced Pete Facione, the new Provost of Loyola University Chicago. She told him that in its morning and afternoon meetings Council found itself in broad agreement with his thoughts about shared governance as contained in his paper on the process of drawing up budgets, and that it very much supported the principles outlined in the white paper on shared governance.

The Provost offered an upbeat assessment of changes instituted at Loyola over the last couple of years, particularly the significant increase in enrollments. He outlined three beliefs that guide his decision-making: 1. Everything is connected to everything else. The system is big and changing one thing will have reverberations. No problems are isolated and discrete. 2. Every system is perfectly designed to produce the results it is getting. Strife isn't just bad luck; it's a system thing. Unacceptable results require correcting the system. 3. We are working in a Catholic, Jesuit university that needs to make decisions strategically to advance our mission. We need to envision what we can become together.

He asked Council members to think for a moment about which Catholic schools they would rank among the top six. He speculated that Notre Dame, Georgetown and Boston College would immediately come to mind. He would like to see Loyola on that list.

After the Provost's opening remarks, Dr. Murphy turned discussion toward the topic of shared governance. She noted that Council has worked hard to enter into genuine dialogue with Fr. Garanzini about this and that now it is time for us to look at concrete mechanisms for governance such as the proposed **Senate Constitution** and the **Faculty Handbook**. She noted that Council would be interested to hear his thinking about shared governance, what works and doesn't work. Council, she pointed out, wants to move forward on these two documents in close consultation with the Provost.

The Provost responded that he had looked at the **Faculty Handbook** and will be happy to look at the **Senate Constitution**. Council briefed him on the background of the constitution's development and why it has been put on hold for a year. The Provost stressed the importance of getting Fr. Garanzini's support for the constitution, pointing out that if the President endorses a plan for a constitution it will have a much stronger possibility of success with the Board of Trustees. Dr. Murphy asked him to discuss his impressions regarding the Santa Clara model and its use of university policy committees. The Provost described how the committees function. The system works well, in his view, when the issues are worthy of policy attention and not trivial or overly massive. It works well when good people are appointed to the committees and rules are followed. The model has worked well, but some things didn't go to policy committees that should have because issues weren't defined as policy issues. Policy committees shouldn't be staffed on representative principles, he insisted, but based on spheres of expertise.

Asked whether this model would work at Loyola, he observed that the three main campuses don't know enough about each other and how policies relate to various campuses. This is a complicating factor, but it doesn't mean university policy committees can't work at a complex institution like Loyola. Some members noted that the past administration seemed to feel that faculty wanted to run the university, but this wasn't the case. The Provost observed that he doesn't think most faculty want to run any university.

Asked about the need for revisions of the **Faculty Handbook**, the Provost commented that it was important to look in particular at the research leave process and the process related to promotion and tenure. He proposed regular meetings between his office and the Executive Committee of Council to develop a process for revising the Handbook. He stressed the need for a specific timeline for the revisions (perhaps a year or eighteen months). He also pointed out that the faculty evaluation process needs to be discussed in this connection.

Discussion turned to levels of support for research. The Provost stressed the need for stronger collaboration between research scientists at the Stritch School of Medicine and Lake Shore campus science faculty. Dr. Murphy asked what his relationship with the Stritch School of Medicine would be. He is still working on understanding the relationship between the medical center and the medical school. There is a complex set of relationships. Questions were raised by Council members about the role the Graduate School Dean plays with regard to research at the Medical School. The observation was made that it hasn't worked well. The Provost confirmed that the Graduate Dean has authority over Medical School research. He observed, as well, that the university can do more in terms of concrete support for research. Council members passed on their concerns about the quality of support and assistance at research services.

A question was asked about balancing the need for cost cutting with the need to protect the academic integrity of the university. Concern was expressed, in this context, about the steep decline in the number of research leaves granted faculty in recent years. He responded that he is trying to frame questions like this in operational terms. How do we get Loyola to fiscal year 2014 and 2024? Loyola needs to make investments that shake resources loose. Our most critical investment long term is the faculty. We need to hire the right people, grow them, and help launch their careers. We need to build structures that make that happen, figure out how to mentor people, provide leave support, etc.

Discussion then turned to the Provost's interest in changing the academic calendar. Dr. Murphy and others reviewed Council's discussion earlier in the day about the plan and the concerns that were expressed. She pointed out to the Provost that Council had a number of questions about the substance of the proposal but also about the decision-making process that had led up to its formulation and that would determine its implementation. The Provost responded that he isn't sure whose call it is to change the calendar, but that he wants to move ahead with a plan if it is "his call." One member asked if this was already "a done deal?" In response, the Provost sketched out the plan in more detail, stressing the opportunities it would create. For some learners there should be no change, for others (adult learners, for example) a change might be beneficial.? As to where things stood in terms of process, he reported that he had asked the registrar to do a mock up of the proposed calendar for academic year 2003-04 so that there could be discussion of the plan.

One member pointed out that the proposal increases faculty teaching responsibilities during regular semesters (from 15 to 16 weeks) and may have an adverse effect on the MBA program. The Provost responded that he doesn't want to make the semesters longer. He wants to focus on the advantages of this change and to take advantage of those changes as soon as possible. One pressing imperative, he observed, is the efficient use of the Water Tower campus. He reiterated that he wants to engage in discussion and feedback but that he also wants to get this change done quickly because of the advantages it offers. He expressed a willingness to work on the process. Discussion then turned to what concrete steps ought to be taken in terms of how the decision-making process will unfold. The Provost proposed working on the plan with both his Advisory Council and the Faculty Council's Executive Committee. He stressed his desire to do this work in a timely fashion so that the new calendar could be implemented for academic year 2003-04. If it is to be implemented for 2003-04, which he would like, the plan needs to be finished and ready to go in one month.

Discussion concluded at 6:00 p.m.

*Revised September 2002 by Patricia Xia (pxia@luc.edu), University Libraries
<http://www.luc.edu/resources/faccouncil/reports/retreat02.htm>*