I. Call to Order - Charles Tocci

Demetri Morgan made a motion to approve the minutes from August 16th, Sue Graham second. Unanimously passed.

II. Introductions

III. Announcements – Demetri Morgan announced that he sent out an email this morning regarding the Provost search. There are ten candidates. Interviews will happen in the next couple of weeks and the public forum will be in mid-November.

Eunju Yoon announced that the CPSY department has a candidate coming in on November 5th. The candidate will meet with the SOE community (faculty, students and staff) from 10:00 am until 11:00 am. The research presentation will be from 11:00 am. until 12:30 pm. She will send out a schedule next week.

Nancy Goldberger announced that the new graduate enrollment counselor Brittney Marshall started this week.

IV. Consent Agenda

Vesna Cejovic motioned to adopt the agenda, Demetri Morgan second. Unanimously passed.
V. Standing Committee reports – updates

Lynne Golomb asked, what is the date for the Diversity committee reception potluck? Charlie stated that they have not set a date. They are working out the logistics.

Charlie Tocci stated that he would like to discuss an item that is not on the agenda. He said that the International Committee is not sure what their work is this year. The Leadership Council had some discussions on whether or not the diversity council would sit better on the leadership council as opposed to being a standing committee that has a set of annual tasks that they perform. There purview is much more strategic to promote diversity, equity, internationalism with more international students. Their work seems a little bit different than most Academic Council committees, which is task oriented. Charlie Tocci stated that he would be open to hear any thoughts about how we might advise them on that.

Noah Sobe asked if those committees were to switch over to the leadership council what would be the timing on that. Charlie Tocci stated that the conversations started at the last leadership council meeting. There were some high level questions raised; which is along the lines of what is the diversity work that needs to be done in the SOE and why is it sitting on one committee? Are there other approaches that will help us meet our goal? There also some technical things such as the leadership council doesn’t have a set of by-laws. A concern is for a leadership committee to adopt a set of by-laws which would and have its own standing committees we may move to have a parallel governed structure which may not be a bad thing may be good but certainly we would have to work through to figure out if that is appropriate. He can’t see that being resolved before the end of the academic year.

Demetri Morgan stated that an idea that came up in the provost search committee conversation was that one of the leadership profile that the candidate have an international focus so in conversation some of the members were critiquing certain websites for language for the way we state how the international students or population were talked about. He also stated that a task for the international community would be to consider how on our website and just in general to do an audit. For example, one website use non-residence alien language and that was a concern for some of the international members of the committee on how the international students were talked about. Maybe we can do an audit to kind of see in SOE on how some of the students are talked about both globally and internationally and how we are promoting that. Students that have research issue due to international issues or that are internationally themselves. Charlie Tocci stated that it is appropriate but it’s their job to set there change. That’s how the by-laws are set up. They can team up with the diversity committee. The diversity committee has taken on supporting international students. Vesna Cejovic said that there is a lot of work that is put in the programming at Rome center and having served on international committee at that time our charge was not just within the school vocally but to think about how we might allow our students to go abroad and have those experiences more regularly so with those programs coming through
maybe its marketing within or getting the word out to our students more actively. That’s maybe something we can think about. Eden stated that she went to Seville last year for educational abroad and she talked to other students to get them interested in international programs. So we should advertise that a little more. Vesna Cejovic stated that she and Charlie Tocci did an international fair before and it is little bit heftier to get all of the students in one place. May we should put together a document that summarizes some of the programs that has been worked on recently so the students will know what the timeframes are so they can start to plan. Noah Sobe stated moving that division under leadership council if there is not strategic or programmatic work. He also stated that if there is no work then there is no work for them to do. Charlie Tocci stated that one of the subtopics is - what is the right size, what are the issues that we are facing? Maybe the committee will get smaller. Charlie Tocci asked if anybody else had any questions on this topic.

Charlie Tocci opened a discussion about the FEC memo. He stated that after the last meeting we discussed what to do with the open seat of professional development. Noah Sobe and Charlie Tocci had some discussion about this and it was decided they can move ahead with their work this year with that seat open. We have to decide this year is whether there should be some by-law revisions or some other mechanisms as to what we need to do with this seat in the future. We also need to decide if we need three seats? Charlie Tocci also stated that there is a new process for FEC evaluations. How did the process go? Noah Sobe stated that everyone on the committee thought that the FEC process should be as transparent as possible. The cover sheet was effective it highlighted the narrative component and more people paid attention to it. When we do the annual end of year remember you will fill out these reports. The other piece that was new - was the faculty self-evaluation. Which has been part of university policy for eight or nine years. School of Ed just did it. Some people under rated themselves and some people over rated themselves. Noah Sobe also stated he would like to talk to whomever is in charge of the FAS reports because they are a mess. Noah Sobe also stated that he is proud of the committee for the extensive narrative evaluations that they provided. They wrote over 6,000 words which is the journal article and it’s all peer review. It represented the directions where they wanted it to go. He is still waiting to speak with David Slavsky end of the process. They are planning another conversation in November. There is one recommendation for Academic Council but he is going to stop to take questions, suggestions, etc.

David Slavsky stated in the last 2 years we made progress on how we do faculty evaluation in the school. Last year he thought was a huge step forward from prior years. This year he thought was even better because his understanding of what FEC was receiving and not receiving. We made sure that FEC would get much information as possible including Quantitative and Qualitative comments from IDEA. Which they did not receive last year. Wendy Wilson spent a lot of time manually downloading the Qualitative comments results for each faculty member putting them in a format useable for FEC so FEC had a fuller data set to work with. The cover page was an excellent idea as Noah Sobe said that the faculty were very careful and mindful in filling out their narratives well. Last year faculty members stated that they didn’t know that they could write certain things down. The Dean stated that they should write things down because we
need to know. The Dean also stated that in his other job he oversee FAS. It maybe the best system out there but what the user see is horrible. It’s not our product it’s a hosted product by digital measures who now owns Livetext. We are trying to figure out how to get around their coding so that we can make it the users end more meaningful to use. Every end user, faculty member, Dean, Provost find it difficult to extract meaningful information from FAS. All of the information is in there but in a format that you can’t easily extracted. The Dean stated although he read everybody’s FAS statement he really relied on your narrative and double checked that you really wrote 27 articles and peer journals that actually showed up in FAS. He predict that in two years it will be better. He read every word that FEC sent and he wrote every word that faculty member wrote now we are getting to the stage that evaluations can be both formative and summative. David Slavsky also stated that he thinks that this is an area of real improvement and we have to fine-tune it for the future.

Charlie Tocci stated that it is important that we make sure structure is in place for the new Dean. The New Dean will start July 1st and they will start on these in a couple of months from that date.

Demetri Morgan asked does any part of this need to be quantified or formalized so it can’t be undone if the new person comes in with new ideas. He is also curious to know more about the process of benchmarking at the different levels. What is exceeding expectations what is average. What is the difference across the schools? How does FEC go about what we consider is average. Some people are teaching 20 plus people some people are teaching 75. What does those conversations look like as you all try to benchmark to get a sense of how to place people.

Noah Sobe stated that this is something we should think about. The FEC noticed a couple of things that is worth reporting on such as The state of the faculty in the SOE and one is we are doing a lot of service that reflected in peoples own description of their work and also in high evaluation to exceed expectation and services. That is a good thing. We also noticed that there are an alarming number of tenured faculty that are advising and directing dissertations. That is against university policy. How can we keep that on the radar screen in the system? Can we ask that this be put on the agenda of the leadership committee?

David Slavsky stated that the SOE goal is to have two publications per year and a peer review journal. Many faculty feel that’s its driving them towards mediocrity. David Slavsky is hoping to continue to be fair and figure out a way that will give someone motivation to finish their journal. David stated that he changed the process when he started and he moved SOE procedure towards the rest of the university. Now the faculty and FEC together has put their own twist on that. He did that because faculty members said that old system didn’t work. David Slavsky doesn’t think that the new Dean will change a system that’s already works.

Noah Sobe explained the Benchmarks for FEC. Currently there is an annual review instructions document to give instructions as to what a narrative should have. That would be the kind of
document that FEC can prepare and present to academic council for approval. It would be useful because of what David brought up about the journals to standardize it and to make it across the board to establish. There are currently no stated policies on what is acceptable expectations. We picked and choose from various documents. The PNT guidelines provide really broad description of what service work should include and what teaching work should include. With mostly the instruction to the faculty that they should fill out and provide information without indication of what would be acceptable levels. We found that not too difficult. For research expectations we drew from the research active definition that was approved by the school. The research active definition lays out expectations for a three year period. We found ourselves evaluating people’s progress differently if there were research active. A policy document on annual evaluation would be useful.

Charlie Tocci stated that the by-laws give the standing committees charge over their topics and based on the language here is that FEC is responsible for Faculty evaluations and annual evaluations. After considering who would be the correct body to approve an FEC policy document, Charlie Tocci and Noah Sobe agreed that the document should be approved by all faculty.

Demetri Morgan stated that last year that there was certain differences between tenured stream and clinical. Are there any thoughts on adjustments or feedback on the clinical experience? Noah stated the difference is not between tenured stream and clinical. They are between people with traditional research and teaching or service and teaching or service research and teaching positions and non-traditional appointments where they have service or teacher responsibilities. That is applied to tenured and none tenured faculty Noah also stated that we solved that this year by shifting the entity that was responsible for the evaluations. We made some progress last year and formalized it this year. The Greely center people was evaluated by Mike Boyle and David Slavsky evaluated certain people. This process made a huge difference. Mike Boyle stated that he was able to capture the uniqueness of the Greely center it was better to get the Dean perspective. Charlie Tocci stated for the November report if the FEC would draft a policy and we will invite the FEC back to adopt the draft. Noah Sobe agreed he said he would address what Demetri Morgan talked about and get clarity of transparency of how this all works.

The Dean has generously increased the allocation for the Janelle Hutchinson service award to $1,500.00. It matches the amount for the research and teaching award. Now all three awards will received the same honorarium.

a. Administration – David Slavsky stated that we are in closing minutes of the CAEP site visit. He stated that the faculty in Teaching and Learning did a tremendous amount of work. The Standard 4 team did a lot of writing and Siobhan Cafferty and Eilene Edejer did a lot of work. We will get a report from CAEP in two months and we will get the final verdict in April. David Slavsky
thanked Noah Sobe and all committee members on the FEC. They did a very good job. The David Slavsky hoped that everybody had a chance to meet with the Executive search firm.

David Slavsky also stated that we are in the process of an institutional examine. Mike Boyle stated that the institutional examine was brought on from a letter from the Superior general and the Jesuits. There has been discussion all the way up from the Vatican about the identity not just Jesuit institutions but the higher ed institutions sponsored by congregation. We have been asked to engage in a process of self-examine to look at how we are meeting our mission. The university constituted a process of writing focus groups from a variety of voices, faculty, staff, alumni and students to discuss the framework. They asked for names from the School of Education department. There will be focus groups from outside the information will be recorded and that information will be in a final report and they will be sent to the Jesuits and the Superior General of the Congregation.

David Slavsky asked that the Academic Council think about a transitional process to make sure all paperwork is transferred to new program chair. David Slavsky also stated that we are in the last year of the contract for IDEA Campus lab. We sent out a RFP to vendors to submit their ideas and their product. We received six vendors. We have a search committee of faculty and students and technical people to make sure it’s compatible with our systems. The committee is overall driven by faculty. Eilene Edejer is the schools representative.

David Slavsky wanted to remind everybody that he will never send an email with Loyola business through a Gmail account. He encourages everyone to complete the Cyber training.

c. Leadership Council – Nancy Goldberger stated that a number of events will be coming out that she will share to the SOE community.

David Slavsky stated tomorrow in Springfield there will be hearings on changes to ISBE policy. One of them is to make it easier to get certified in Illinois. The quick 18 month training will not meet the needs of the children of Illinois.

Charlie Tocci stated that the leadership council want to review the process of our graduate programs and ways strengthen our programs and increase enrollment. This discussions is at early stage we should wait to hear from leadership council. I don’t know if there is any action for us to take.

Charlie Tocci stated that the leadership council stated that the administration will take a keen eye on reducing the amount of money allocated for faculty travel. We have to think about how to take a different approach on this if the budget line is reduced.

d. Staff Updates - Susan Graham said that Wendy Threadgill has been doing wonderful work as the office manager.

e. Student Updates – Max stated that there is a lack of clarity of what we should be doing. They will be meeting with G –SAC (the graduate student advising committee.) to discuss this issue. Charlie Tocci asked that Eden be added to the discussions.
VI. New Business

There is an open seat on the award committee. Seungho Moon will be happy to fill the seat.

Demetri Morgan made a motion to approve Seungho Moon as a member, Sue Graham second. Unanimously passed.

Charlie Tocci invited Debbie Sullivan into the meeting to discuss online education. Charlie Tocci stated that we should take a look at what our online education in the SOE and what online education look like in the future. Some suggestions were: we want to avoid ad hoc creation of online programs with just one on. What are the bench marks? What are the quality indicators? There should be a sense of the branding. What should the branding of the SOE online experience for students be? How can they feel a part of our campus? What online learning for SOE should look like?

Charlie Tocci stated he, Lenny Golomb and Debbie Sullivan think that the curriculum council should lead this work to produce a product. Give us a bench mark. What are your opinion on what steps should take to make progress?

Lynne Golomb said we should look into making sure that there is continuity in our course and not completion with our online courses. We want to start an inventory on what is in the SOE. We get more focus on technology than the actual course. For example, how to download a form? We want to get away from that. Mike stated that he met with the instructional designers to develop something to help create something like in introduction to online campus a 5 minute video on how to use this. Michelle Lia stated that the videos can be used face to face classes as well. Vesna Cejovic suggested modules on how to use the tools online. Mike Boyle we should come up with a strategy. Debbie Sullivan stated that we start with the practical element and see where it goes. She is happy to engage with curriculum committee to discuss this further. Charlie Tocci stated for the time being we should not focus on the technical aspect. This is about what is the framework document that our program instructors can use or evolve or develop existing courses for high quality online programs. The request is that curriculum council produce a report outlining the framework for the development evolution of the SOE programs and courses delivered online. The committee is asked to survey SOE programs. Demetri Morgan asked that the leadership council begin a conversation for the revision of online programs moving forward that hopefully would involve the entire school.

Noah Sobe motioned to approve the charge to curriculum committee, Vesna Cejovic second. The text of the motion: Request that Curriculum Committee provide a report that would inform the development and evolution of online programs and courses for the SOE. The Committee is asked to survey SOE programs regarding their current online learning practices, review best practices from other higher education institutions, and seek information from university administration about current resources and future direction for online education at LUC. The Committee is asked to synthesize these findings into a general framework to include suggested best practices, standards for quality, consistent branding practices, and identify common resources for instructors (e.g., a series of short videos explaining how to use VoiceThread and other basic tools). Finally, the Committee is asked to recommend a proper timeline and any necessary resources to complete the report.
Demetri Morgan made a motion for request to leadership council to begin conversations with revision strategy for SOE online programs, Michelle Lia and Vesna Cejovic second. Unanimously passed.

VII. Old Business – Charlie Tocci referred to the email from Kate Phillippo re: by-laws revision planning. Where would we like to go? Vesna Cejovic suggested that we set aside a few minutes of these meetings to discuss by-laws. Demetri Morgan stated that our by-laws are a mess. We need to figure out how to come prepared for it.

Sue Graham made a motion for Academic Council to prepare for a special meeting for the by-laws in the spring, Demetri Morgan second. Thirteen in favor, one opposed.

Demetri Morgan made a motion to adjourned Wendy Threadgill second. Unanimously passed. Meeting adjourned at 12:59pm.