

Minutes (Alanah Fitch
Faculty Council
January 17, 2007

Present: Gerry McDonald; Kim Dell'Angela, Bob Bireley, Alanah Fitch, Ayana Karanya, Pamela Caughie, Walter Jay, Paul Jay, David Mirza, Nick Lash, Hank Rose, Marta Lundy, Patricia Jung, Ian Boussy, Mike Zinaman, Harvey Boller, Gordon Ramsey, William Cutherson, Heather Cannon, William Schmidt, Gloria Jacobson, Allan Shoenberger

I. Invocation: Gordon Ramsey - Carl Sandburg on "Government"

II Approval of Dec, 2006 Minutes

No minutes were available to be approved.

III. Chair's Report

Gerry McDonald (GM) reported on some personnel changes affecting the Faculty Council. Dawn Lynn who has resigned from the University was the web liaison. That position will be taken by Bill Cutherson. Thackery Gray accepted the position of Dean of a medical school in the Caribbean. He was on the Faculty Handbook (FH) committee

GM indicated that the chair of any University Policy Committee (UPC) has the ability to set the agenda and control the committee therefore it is important the somebody sensitive to faculty be elected chair of FAUPC and AAUPC. He encourages members of those committees to talk to each other in advance of the first meeting of the committees. The issue of AAUPC committee composition and voting rights was discussed again. There was confusion about the wording in the document. GM indicated that the administrative designees do not vote. Nick Lash asked that wording in the document be clarified. Kim Dell'Angela pointed out that when administrators do not chair the committee the automatic assignment of support staff (secretarial help) cannot be assumed. GM said that he would look into that.

GM indicated that the search for Provost had not yet resulted in any official designation. He stated that his wife had found in a Google search that Christine Wiseman has been interviewing at St. Michael's College in Vermont (1900 students) for the position of president.

IV. Ad Hoc Subcommittee for Family Leave : Marta Lundy.

Two members of the committee who developed the report were not here. Dawn Lynn has resigned from the University. The recommendations are similar to those presented in the December 2006 Faculty Council (FC) meeting. Walter Jay moved to approve the report with Pamela Caughie seconding the motion. Bob Bireley suggested that the report go to the University Coordinating Committee as a good test case of how policy overlapping various University Policy Committees would be handled. Kim Dell'Angela so moved. Motion was approved 22/0.

Allen S. Indicated that he thought that the proposal will be disapproved immediately for cost issue. As a result he felt that FC should request that UCC forward the proposal to Budget and Finance as well as Faculty affairs. GM said that the UCC should keep us informed with the progress

of the proposal. Patti Jung thanked the committee for its work.

V. Shared Governance

The Shared Governance Task Force awaits ratification by Faculty Council. Several issues were addressed of concern prior to ratification.

A. Eligibility and Process of electing Chairs of UPC Committees.

GM reported on the status of the Shared Governance Document. Faculty Council (FC) would like to specify that only a faculty member can be chair of the Faculty Affairs and Academic Affairs University Policy Committees (FAUPC and AAUPC). He reports that Fr. G is adamantly opposed to this. GM then suggested wording that allows non-administrators to select the chair of the committees at which point Acting Provost John Frendreis indicated his unhappiness. GM felt that JF was worried that faculty will make “uninformed” decisions. GM felt this was a non-issue. First faculty don’t get to make decisions anyway (they make policy recommendations) and second lots of uninformed decisions have been made by non-faculty. He concluded that perhaps the worry was that faculty will raise issues that the administration prefers not to have raised. At this point if FC does not ratify the document he can not predict what the outcome would be.

Walter Jay stated that in theory FC can raise any issue it wants. GM responded that with UPCs it is different because work and recommendations issues might require Fr. G. to exercise veto, a position he would like to avoid doing. Bob Bireley, S. J., asked about the proposal made nearly a year ago to give FC veto power. GM stated that proposal died a long time ago. Communication will proceed from the chair of a UPC to the UCC. The idea would be that the chair of FC is a member of the UCC and could therefore inform FC of any decision or recommendation on policy. Bob Bireley then asked what would be the role of FC. GM said the role of FC is to raise issues.

B. Is Governance Really Shared?

Pamela Caughie suggested that since faculty do not, therefore, actually share in governance, that the title “Shared” be struck. Paul Jay felt that faculty do have a significant voice with the proposed process in that faculty are a majority on the two committees of most interest to faculty (FAUPC and AAUPC). Patti Jung stated that Allen Gitelson opened every meeting of the AAUPC with a statement that the committee served a merely advisory function. Paul Jay stated that was not the case with the FAUPC. David Mirza stated that it was better to act as if we really did exercise shared governance. Gordon Ramsey felt that the “shared” is a relative term, but the trajectory was in the correct direction.

C. Charter of the University Coordinating Committee.

Ian Boussy objected to the clause in the charter for the University Coordinating Committee (UCC) item 3 which states that if the UCC can not agree on something that the issue will be sent to Fr. G. Paul Jay stated he agreed, but that would probably be a rare occurrence. Ian responded that it sets the wrong tenor. As an example if you have interdisciplinary problems a joint subcommittee should probably be convened and wording within the UCC charter should explicitly allow it to convene cross committee subcommittees. Kim Dell’Angela felt that the statement that UCC monitors progress covers that issue. Ian disagreed. Bob Bireley suggested the proposed policies from the Ad Hoc Women’s Status Committee could be a test case.

D. Tracking the timing on a Policy Issue

Ayana Karanja pointed out that nothing in the UCC was related to the timing by which a

policy is considered. Sometimes timing is very important. A UCC could possibly leave some issue open ended. Allen Shoenberger, felt that the UCC is small enough that it would be difficult confronting an issue it could not resolve, but that timing might be an issue. Paul Jay did not see a way to word a requirement for timely action. Marta Lundy suggested that a statement be added requiring an annual summary prepared in June. GM stated that it is recognized that a major communication problem exist and that the intention is to resolve the problem. Ayana Karanja pointed out that members of FC are on all the committees and can report to FC on the status of proposal

Paul Jay agreed. GM suggested that we should act as if we trusted the administration.

Ratification

GM stated that we needed to decide on whether or not to ratify the Shared Governance Document. Ian Boussy raised several specific points with respect to wording in the document for the charter of the AAUPC. GM then suggested we defer ratification but proceed to act as if we had ratified it with respect to populating the UPCs. Bob Bireley said that he was convinced by GM's remark about acting as if we trusted the administration. He further worried about micro managing. Paul Jay stated he had been about ready to suggest ratification and proposed that FC take a straw poll on ratification. Ian Boussy stated he wanted a straw poll for ratification with the proviso that the wording with respect to the AAUPC be clarified. The straw poll was unanimous in favor of ratification. Patti Jung suggested we move to ratify. Paul Jay proposed we amend the wording with respect to the AAUPC composition and vote for ratification. A motion was made to ratify the shared governance document if changes are made in the wording on the composition of the AAUPC membership. The motion was passed 20/1/1 abstention.

VI. Report from the Women's Commission Bren Murphy (co-chair), Linda Heath (survey), Nancy Tuchman, Kirsten Espinosa (statistical analysis)

Bren Murphy (BM) opened the report with a brief historical description of the formation of the committee. She indicated that the committee was charged with looking at women on lake side campuses. The President has accepted the report, obtained a response to the report from his cabinet and written his response to the report. BM stated that many of those involved were disappointed when Fr. G. characterized the concerns addressed within the report with respect to women in the higher administration as a "quota". The commission did not suggest promoting women for the sake of women. The commission is very concerned that Loyola has gotten a reputation that will make it difficult to attract women to positions within administration at the university.

The commission was pleased with his concerns about communications within the university with respect to issues relating to women. Fr. G. Has directed HR to include a progress report on the status of women. Linda Heath discussed the survey on perceptions the faculty and staff have about women at Loyola. She indicated that getting salary data with the kind of granularity necessary was difficult. However, data indicated that the proportion of women in upper administration places LU at the bottom of Jesuit schools. She indicated that the issue was not about targets but about placing value on the contribution that diverse candidates might make due to their different backgrounds. Bren Murphy state that the anticipated very low response rate turned out to be 3x anticipated.

Kirsten Espinosa (KE) explained that she used a standard statistical model for evaluating salaries. An aggregate average makes it look like a very large disparity, but if the employment with

the university is factored in, along with the type of school (nursing, CAS, etc.) very little statistical difference between female and male salaries remained. JF had her do some additional analyses to determine what a salary ought to have been and use that to compare to current salaries to find outliers whose salaries were then adjusted. Nancy Tuchman stated that the process described by KE will now be policy and will take place every year. A handout from Human Resources (HR) was provided which detailed actions taken in HR and academic affairs with respect to searching for women and minority candidates. HR now meets with the chairs of search committees to discuss procedures and efforts to increase transparency. Since the women's commission there have been 6 new hires in the upper administration. HR is under taking a survey with 25 peer institutions with respect to retention of female faculty.

Bren Murphy stated that the commission hoped that FC would monitor what is happening to women at Stritch. Nancy Tuchman stated that the issues for women at Stritch are substantively different than for women on the lakeside campuses. Kim Dell'Angela stated that she felt that was a "red herring". Pamela Caughie expressed disappointment in the available time for question and answer. The committee indicated that at least some of its members could return.