

**Faculty Council Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, May 19, 2021; 3 – 5 pm**

**Standardize capitalizations**

Academic Year 2020-21 Members in Attendance:

Artemchik; Baber; Blackmond Larnell; Borys; Brown; Caughie; Cornelius; Dahari; Dentato; Dong; Elsky ; Johnson; Jones; Jules; Lash; Martin; Moore; Moran; Nicholas; O’Rourke; Ohsowksi; Pope; Rosenblatt; Silva; Steven; Tangarife; Thiruvathukal; Todd.

Academic Year 2021-22 Members in Attendance:

Artemchik; Baber; Berg; Blackmond Larnell; Brown; Cornelius; Dahari; Dentato; Devery; Donoghue; Dunderdale; Elsky; Gawlinski; Gupta-Mukherjee; Haske; Holschen; Johnson; Jules; Kang; McGuigan; Moran; Nicholas; O’Rourke; Ohsowski; Patel; Pope; Rosenblatt; Shoenberger; Silva; Tangarife; Todd; Waller; Heer (ex-officio)

Guests: Provost Norberto Gryzwacz

The minutes from April’s meeting are approved without amendment.

Jules indicates that there is a proposal coming from administration that those faculty declining to be vaccinated would be tested twice a week. Jules supports this and indicated he would rally faculty support for it. Access to buildings would be cut off for those refusing. Jules thinks it fair, given what students are being asked to do. One member says they don’t understand what happens to those not vaccinated – was one test a week too little? Jules refers the question to the Provost. He indicates that the medical reason for twice a week testing is that the incubation period is such that twice a week testing would allos us to catch it before the person becomes contagious.

Jules moves to the question of a speaker contract. The contract has problematic provisions about recording and surrender of intellectual property rights. The Provost is aware of the situation and Vice Provost Sheila MacMillan will be in touch with us, so he thinks we do not need to address issue in a formal resolution.

We will be receiving raises in January of 2022. The Provost asks council members for our advice about the thought process. He acknowledges the difficulties of the last year – hampered scholarship, having to teach online; all of us were effected. When it comes time to decide about raises, should we take into account performance over the last two years? Just the last year? How does one balance differences between disciplines, especially given that some have been more impacted by pandemic than others?

One member responds that an easy issue to address is that of publications, for which two years ought to be taken into account, especially for faculty who may have published major works in the year in which raises were not given, projects that took years to come to fruition. A second member echoes that suggestion, stating it would be easy to take an average of two years. As far as discipline specific issues go, they observe, you could create a ranking within any one discipline that would definite the range of productivity for that discipline. A third member observes that faculty who have not published much during the pandemic should not be penalized, but there should be some recognition of the achievement of those who did. This member adds that not all faculty were evaluated last year. This is probably not important for senior faculty, but it is for junior faculty in so far as it is one part of building a record for promotion.

Jules asks the Provost whether his office will be receiving the same kind of additional funds that it has received the past several years to make adjustments based on status equity and racial disparity. Gryzwacz responds that they will.

Questions about how to deal with students who are not vaccinated and requesting online instruction will be relayed to the Provost later in writing.

Jules then describes onboarding of newly elected members, indicating that the ninety minute program will be repeated in the future. In past inductions of new councils, incoming members have been asked to vote for positions with which they were not familiar. So council positions, the history of the organization, and the expectations of members were all conveyed.

The President is scheduled to join our August meeting. Jules compares this to the Queen of England opening Parliament. We will need to generate questions in advance.

Jules recognizes the Secretary, who mentions the issue of MA student stipends. A new policy was promulgated that we could pay them only an hourly wage and not have tuition remission or other benefits. Some faculty found this quite agitating both as a matter of substance (competitiveness with other programs), and as a matter of process (since there was apparently no effort to ascertain the academic impact of this measure before implementing it). The Academic Affairs Committee took a faculty letter from the School of Environmental Sustainability and approved it. The Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the council between meetings, sent it; about a week later, Emily Barman, Dean of the Graduate School, informed us that the policy had actually been rescinded. The whole process is a bit of a mystery, but the end result is good.

Jules turns over to a member to discuss the issue of graduate faculty status. This member states that Graduate Barman had approved a change in which those hired to tenure track positions in departments with graduate programs would automatically be granted standing as graduate faculty. The reasoning was that this is usual practice. Dean Barman did not consult graduate council because she thought faculty council would weigh in with new handbook, which is in the process of being updated. Currently the handbook language is being updated. So that issue resolved. But in handbook committee meeting, there was debate over implications of this new language. It is a complex issue, but up until now, some faculty teaching in graduate programs not in the graduate school have not had to have graduate faculty status. This member thinks new language should be in draft of new handbook.

Discussion turns to the question of which graduate programs will be under the graduate school. The member’s understanding is that all PhD programs, and all graduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, would be under the auspices of the Graduate School. But there will remain programs that are not. Another member indicates that their understanding from Barman’s visit in the past was that we wanted consistency across programs and quality control rather than a free-for-all. Another member replies by observing that there are considerable differences across disciplines; in some STEM disciplines, for example, it is common for junior faculty and non-tenure stream faculty to direct disciplines. Another member observes that without standardization, untenured and non-tenure track faculty can be exploited by doing extensive uncompensated work chairing graduate committees. A different members says this issue will be taken up in the fall, will require the council’s feedback, given its complexity.

Jules mentions the departure of Erin Moriarty as Director of the Office of Admission, in the wake of accusations of racial harassment by Marcus Mason. The Council had raised numerous issues with the investigation of those charges.

The Secretary reads an update from the chair of Academic Affairs. We will hear about the core when we discuss a resolution later in the meeting. The other updates is from the Benefits Advisory Committee. The committee met again recently and has now drafted a more expansive survey that will be going to faculty and staff across the university. It will give administration more insight into how folks view the trade-offs involved in different healthcare options. This member communicated the thoughts they received from members of faculty council to the Benefit Advisory Committee and will continue to keep everyone updated as work with the BAC continues. Another member indicates that they added question about an HMO option, which they think the administration is not interested in.

 Faculty Affairs reports that a letter about the frequency, timing, and quality of the trainings mandated by the Human Resources Office has been sent. No response has been received. They will also look at the question of converting non tenure track positions into tenure track positions. The committee has worked with the Research Advisory Council about measures needed to move the school to R1 status.

Faculty Service and Communications reports that nominations for faculty of the year have been received and that council elections are done. One person had not heard the results of elections, which was an issue with LUC and LUMC emails. There is a bit of additional work to be done with regards to the evaluations from deans.

The handbook committee reports that it has concluded its second year of operations. In the fall of 2020, the council charged the handbook committee to review of Loyola’s current handbook and propose revisions and updates to it. This continues work begun by the committee in the 2019/20 academic year. Loyola’s Faculty Handbook was last revised six years ago, in 2015. This 2015 text is significantly out of step with the structure and practices of the University, the recommendations of the AAUP, and the regulations and practices of peer and aspirant institutions. The committee’s work is in accord with chapter nine of the current handbook, which identifies “Faculty Council” among the bodies that may “initiate” changes to the Faculty handbook. The committee has had twelve members, eight of whom sit on the council, and includes members of 9 of LUC’s 12 academic units. It has held weekly meetings throughout the spring semester, including weekly subcommittee meetings where new text was drafted. It aims to have a clean intermediate draft that can be circulated to Provost’s office and this body for discussion. Jules notes that we still have not received report from task force on shared governance. They did have discussion about composition of the committee. Two members stepping off of the committee, hopes to replace them but bring others in, especially from school of Continuing and Professional Studies and SES and Arrupe College.

A member discussed the importance of Dean evaluations. They are concerned that results are being shared only with administration, and not the faculty as a whole. Jules indicates that he has been working with the provost’s office on different ways of doing these, but the results will be distributed. The delay is because the deans have been asked to respond to the results in terms of what they would do over the course of the next five years.

A motion to move to executive session is made, seconded, and passed. The council goes into executive session to discuss the process for revising the core curriculum. After discussion, unanimous approval is given to sending the letter below (which is sent on June 4, 2021):

Dear Acting Provost Kaufman and Professor Garbarski:

The Faculty Council writes to express concerns regarding the proposal for the revised Core that was presented at the Faculty Council meeting on Wednesday, March 31, 2021. On April 12, 2021, The College Leadership Council (CLC) voted unanimously in favor of a motion expressing its concerns about the lack of faculty input, the speed at which this major change is taking place, and the framework and approach of the proposed revised Core. The Faculty Council would like to express similar concerns, and was glad to learn that the process will indeed be revised so that a new proposal will be created by September 2022, with the input of Core development working groups during the academic year (email of April 27, 2021), and with permeability (to use the language of the email) regarding content until 2025. Although an extension to the process will occur, the initial omissions should be brought to light so that they do not happen again. We hope that a broad range of faculty members, department chairs, and directors of interdisciplinary programs will be consulted as the proposal is drafted for the revision of Core. This change will have an impact not only on academic programs but also on students for years to come.

**Process**

In November 2020, departments were asked to provide feedback on the Core, with a committee to consider that feedback constituted without nominations from the Council or, so far as we are aware, chair and directors. Librarians, whose work is substantially impacted by the nature of the core, and who have been involved in core revisions in the past, were not included in this process. Since then, there has been no consultation with college leadership, including chairs of departments and directors of interdisciplinary programs. An email was sent to faculty on March 31, 2021, with the proposal and a form for feedback. In addition, on April 7, 2021, a call for participants in faculty development groups over the summer went out. While the deadline for feedback was on May 31, the deadline for applying to be in a development group was on May 1.

Given the original timeline, groups would have been formed before the committee received a complete set of responses. The timeline on the proposal states that the goal of the working groups is not to provide feedback, but rather to populate the framework with content (p. 11). Instead, the task of incorporating feedback is listed as an administrative duty. This implies that the framework was already set. According to the original timeline in May (before receiving feedback from faculty), rubrics for the designations “Engaging Diversity in the US” and “Global Perspectives and Citizenship” would be drafted; development on the Interdisciplinary Capstone teaching workshop with FCIP already began in March. This seems to imply that faculty would have had about two months (April and May) during an extremely difficult semester to email feedback for what should be an inclusive project to revise Core. In addition, many faculty members with active research agendas cannot devote summertime to working on Core. This work should take place during the academic year.

On April 27, 2021, an email from Fac-Post was sent, outlining a revised schedule: now working groups will meet during the academic year 2021-2022; the new Core will be implemented in 2023; “Core content will still be permeable until 2025.” Despite the welcome changes to the timeline, some concerns remain. The new deadline for joining working groups is now May 15 (still before feedback is due). It would be helpful to get clarification on the role of the development groups. According to the timeline, they are meant to populate the framework with content. However, faculty working groups should instead help create the framework itself.

The process outlined above shows a lack of consultation with faculty members on issues that directly impact their programs. It goes against the AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities:“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process” (<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>).

Faculty Council hopes that in the next phase of the revisions every effort will be taken to include faculty members and Faculty Council in this crucial work, for which the faculty “has primary responsibility,” to use the language of the AAUP.

**“Explorations” Phase**

We would like to provide feedback on the proposal that was shared with the Faculty Council, in the hope that they will be taken into account as we continue to think about revising Core requirements.

The proposed revisions to Core marginalize the Humanities at Loyola. This goes against the goals of Ignatian pedagogy, which places a strong emphasis on the liberal arts. The proposed new Core has removed from the “Explorations” stage in a student’s education the requirements for literary knowledge, historical knowledge, and philosophical knowledge. It has replaced the entire field of philosophy with ethics, without explanation for that significant shift. As students can place out of literature and history courses at the “Foundations” level, this means that some Loyola students would now be able to graduate from Loyola without taking a single course in literature (modern or ancient, US or global) or history. The marginalization, or even elimination of courses in history, literature, and philosophy from a student’s program is a disservice to students.

Furthermore, the changes made to “explorations” go against the goals of the Core revision itself--namely, a focus on interdisciplinarity and engaging with global perspectives. For example, LITR (Literature in Translation) courses at the 200 level--which are now part of Core--regularly fill with students and lead to minors in interdisciplinary fields such as Latin American & Latino Studies, Islamic World Studies, and Asian Studies. In the new Core, students would not have to take literature at all, and this will harm enrollment and threaten the interdisciplinary programs that are already in place and successful at Loyola.

**“Integration” Phase**

The integration phase poses a number of difficulties. First, in terms of content, the “Integration” phase seems to point to social sciences and preclude other fields. It addresses only issues of the immediate present--using a presentist language--indicating a narrow view of what types of courses help in the goal of forming socially responsible students. This again is a disservice to students. Understanding the past, understanding the different cultures and communities (including in terms of their languages, histories, literatures--now threatened due to changes at the “Explorations” phase) is necessary for even beginning to propose solutions. In addition, the capstone does not focus on skills learned but rather on an idea of social justice. It is unclear how the panel can judge solutions to urgent societal problems in this format or assess students’ skills. It is also unclear why presenting a solution to urgent societal problems is the capstone of a bachelor's degree. While the goal of forming socially responsible students is certainly central to Loyola’s mission, it is one element of a college education.

Second, the model suggests the creation of panels of faculty members and the reliance on guest lecturers from faculty members for the many 35-student capstone courses. It is hard to see how the work of guest lecturing and engagement on panels can be allocated equitably and at scale.

Given the above concerns, the Faculty Council calls for an inclusive group of faculty members to first identify the issues with the current Core and then come up with a proposal that better fits Loyola’s mission.

Jules shifts discussion to the election of Executive Committee members and committee Ccairs. A nomination of Tavis Jules for Chair is made and seconded. Jules indicates that this is not his first trip to the rodeo, as he took on this role two years ago. He is willing to continue to struggle for a more robust system of shared governance. Making the Council’s work more visible is critical. He is elected unanimously.

A nomination of Michael Dentato for co-chair is made and seconded. Dentato accepts, indicating that he is excited and willing and that it has been an honor to serve in the past two years. He is unanimously elected.

A nomination of Benjamin Johnson for secretary is made and seconded. He indicates that he is willing to serve, but is a poor substitute for his predecessor Hugh Miller. He apologizes for oversights this past year and praises the work of Jules and Dentato. He is unanimously elected.

Qunfeng Dong, Graham Moran, Twyla Blackmond-Larnell, Julia Elsky, and Abigail Silva are nominated and seconded for at-large positions. Dong says that he has become more involved in the Council in the last year and values working with his colleagues across the university on issues of shared governance. Moran indicates that he also values shared governance, and that administrators tend to walk around faculty so we have to assert ourselves in order to maintain a good balance. The executive committee can work to make the Council responsive. He is also interested in expanding research. Blackmond Larnell says that as a political scientist, she is interested in how decision-making happens. She stresses the importance of equity issues, especially improving representation for all those groups who have been traditionally marginalized. Silva expresses her appreciation of how much she has learned this last year, and that serving would deepen this process as well as allow her to contribute to shared governance. Elsky says that she is more junior than others but very interested in learning more about how the executive committee works and that it has been an exciting time for Faculty Council in the last few years and that the body is a good way for faculty to have a voice on campus.

A link to a ballot generated by Qualtrics is circulated, and voting commences amidst jokes about hanging chads and Russian interference. Dong, Blackmond Larnell, and Moran are elected, with a precise tie between Elsky and Silva. Discussion of either Elsky or Silva instead serving as chair of the Academic Affairs Committee ensues. Jules suggests that Silva serve on the Executive Committee, since greater representation from the health sciences might be helpful in convincing administrators that we are a representative body. Elsky agrees to chair Academic Affairs.

Jules discusses the need for some work to be done over the summer, despite the fact that faculty are on nine month contracts. The council then splits into committees in zoom breakout sessions to elect chairs and plan their next steps. The meeting is adjourned.