

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Minutes**  
**Wednesday, April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019**  
**3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC; IC 332, LSC; SSOM 429, HSD**

**Members Present:** Battaglia, G.; Bowen, R.; Brown, J.; Classen, T.; Conley, J.; Dahari, H.; Elsky, J.; Gillespie, L.; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Johnson, B.; Jones, P.; Jules, T.; Kang, H.; Langman, L.; Lash, N.; Martin, C.; Miller, H.; Oosterhouse, K.; Pope, L.; Shoenberger, A.  
**Guest:** President Jo Ann Rooney

Meeting was called to order at 3:04pm by Chair (Classen). Jo Ann Rooney, LUC President, introduced and greeted.

1. Visit from President Jo Ann Rooney

- Thanks for inviting me in to spend time with all of you today.
- Speaker Policy: We have had it in place since 2016, and it makes clear that there is no attempt to control what goes on in classrooms. What happened was that a mistake was made: an email was circulated with the subject line, “Speaker policy,” when it should’ve been, “Commencement speaker contract.” The only time this gets used is for commencement speeches. And the only part which has changed since 2008 deals with recordings, which brings our policy into line with the Illinois law.
  - Question: In 2 cases in my department, speakers invited to give academic talks on campus were sent contracts to sign with restrictive clauses included, and were assured that they were binding upon them. In both cases, there was extensive back-and-forth between the prospective speaker and the business manager assigned to deal with them. (I know of 2 other instances in other departments.) JR: These were clearly errors, and the letters should not of been sent out. The manager was misinformed, and our Office of General Counsel was clear that there had been an error. I have asked the OGC to work with the business managers to make sure that this doesn’t happen again.
- Regular sabbatical policy: We are attempting to set up a single office which will coordinate research and leave funding for all campuses across the University. Under the Vice Provost for Research this office will support research and leaves across the University, and will begin its work over the summer. I absolutely support about research funding, and I want to see it organized under this centralized office.
  - Question: While the desire to organize research funding under single office is administratively laudable, if it helps to address unfairnesses between and among schools and their faculties, it also means years of bureaucratic delay. Some faculty have labored 20 or 30 years at this university and never received one of the “competitive” research leaves. This whole bureaucratic process will slow down the organization of a regular

sabbatical system by several years; many of these colleagues will simply retire, never having had a single sabbatical leave their entire time at Loyola. (When I mention this to colleagues at other universities, they are aghast. My own department had an external evaluation this year, and the external reviewers expressed shock that our department was as productive as it is in research without the University having a regular sabbatical system, such as they had at their own schools—one of which was Boston College, another Jesuit university.) JR: you're posing a somewhat broader question—not just about research funding but about sabbaticals, specifically. I think this is a problem which should be handled by the new incoming Provost. Q: Then we are still looking at several years before any change in policy is made. The new Provost will not arrive until the fall of 2020 at the earliest; it will take a year for the new Provost to learn the ropes, and another year for committees to work up a proposal such as was generated, passed by Faculty Council, approved by the Provost, and turned down by the President and the Council of Deans in 2008. We are looking at 3 years, possibly 5, before any substantial change to our lack-of-)sabbatical policy happens.

- Question: When we in the humanities hear about “unified offices,” we get a little worried. Our research needs and methods are quite different from those in, say, the natural sciences, or even the social sciences. How will this new unified Provost’s office take these very significant differences into account? JR: This is precisely what the new office will be working on. Indeed, people will be working on it over the summer.
- Rationale for change to the single Provost structure: When we divested ourselves of ownership of the medical center, then would’ve been the appropriate time to bring the two Deans of the Medical School under the direction of a single university wide chief academic officer, long recognized as the Lakeside Campus Provost. It was not done at this time, but we are doing it now. I have consulted extensively about this with the faculty in the Nursing and Medical schools. This unification of the two offices will bring us into line with other peer university administrations and best practices, and especially with accreditation requirements for the AAMC. I strongly encourage your active engagement and involvement, as faculty, in the process of selecting the new Provost. In the last round of interviews— which did not conclude in a candidate being selected— there was a disappointingly small turnout for on-campus interviews and a low level of feedback from faculty (on average only about 30 people attended the interview fora).
  - Question: I seem to be getting mixed messages from you about the Provost search. You are aware that the AAUP has sent you a letter, cosigned by over 80 faculty, expressing their concern about the way the decision to move to a single Provost model was arrived at. You claim that the committee was doing its work independently, and was charged with coming up with suitable candidates, which it did. On the other hand, you did not select one of the candidates, which implies that the committee either

made a mistake or had been mis-charged. On the one hand, you encourage more participation in the Provost selection process; on the other, you will make the decision on the new Provost entirely by yourself. Could you please elaborate on these concerns? JR: The decision to move to a single Provost model is an organizational one, as I mentioned above. I think the committee did its job extremely well. But what became evident in the review of the surveys and discussion with the committee was that there was not widespread, broad-based support for any single candidate. Therefore, I decided that the search had been inconclusive and should commence again. Indeed, I thought that the committee's job was done so well that I asked its members to stay on, since they had set up and executed a good search, given the candidates they were provided by the search firm. We subsequently decided to change search firms, in the hopes that we will obtain better and more suitable candidates, who have the kind of breadth of experience and vision that we need for an all-campus Provost. I'm confident that we will be able to find our next chief academic officer soon.

- LUMA: The decision was that we would no longer operate LUMA as an "accredited museum." Accreditation would require a certain number of hours of opening and a certain quantity of staff. We will still maintain LUMA and the D'Arcy collection; we will still do special openings (including the Creche); LUMA will still be open for use by faculty and staff (especially by Arrupe College faculty and students); and we will still have staff to maintain the collections. Moving away from accreditation status will save a considerable amount of money for the University budget.
  - Question: Was any consideration given to making this a fundraising opportunity for well-heeled donors? JR: In order just to maintain current accreditation status and funding would require income from an endowment of about \$30 million. Right now we don't have that endowment to put up.
- New Dean of the Graduate School: That search has begun. The job description/profile has been worked up, and interviews will hopefully begin soon.
- Advancement: When I first came to Loyola, in short order we hired a new VP for Advancement. He came to us with a lot of great experience, but turned out not to be a good fit for us. We weren't able to move some projects forward. I thought this was an occasion to take a step back and evaluate what we need in that position. So we decided to bring in a firm, Marts & Lundy, that I've worked with before to help carry out the evaluation. (Cf. file, "Advancement Presentation to Faculty Council April 24 2019.pdf". NB: President Rooney has requested that this document be designated "For Internal Use Only.")

In the interim, we brought in Jeanne Colleran, PhD, former acting Provost and President of John Carroll University, to help stabilize the department. She did this. We also brought in Dan Macaluso, formerly at Harvey Mudd, who helped with the department as well; he will stay with M&L to assist in the transition to the new VP

for Advancement.

The presentation shows that we are not in a position to run a large public capital campaign, on virtually every metric (even trustee giving), and have not been for at least the last 10 years. As far as fundraising goes, we actually resemble more a less-mature public university than a prominent Catholic one. Our endowment is currently just under \$700M; it needs to be at least double that, but we are not in a position to raise those kinds of funds now. The starting point has to be boosting alumni giving very substantially. M&L has laid out almost 200 actionable steps to begin to make headway here.

- Question: Was any analysis done about the university's failure to capitalize on the Final Four appearance of the basketball team? JR: Yes, some. And that was the real wake-up call for us: that we had failed capitalize upon that meant that we had to do some serious questioning of development as a whole.
- Question: What is the rationale behind the claim that we must invest substantial University funds in the development department, when the schools and faculties of the University, who do the actual work of education here, are continually being told that we must do more with less? JR: We are simply trying to be more rational about how we expend our capital, and be more mindful of the relationship between enrollment and staffing, in particular. But this is a transitional issue— unless we can grow our endowment, we will always be at the mercy of the market of enrollments, and relying too much on tuition dollars. (Last year's first-year class, for example, was, frankly, larger than we can reasonably support in the long run.) This is a volatile market, and the university's long-term financing has to be built on a much more stable foundation.
- Question: What do you think is the timeline for hiring a new Vice President for Development? JR: Our search firm tells us 6 months to year; I am hoping for 6 months.
- Question: You mentioned that, in hiring, we need to carefully consider whether a position needs to be filled, or needs to be adjusted to fit enrollment needs. Do you have a rationale or plan for diversifying Loyola's faculty in this process, or will you simply wait for retirements to begin this diversification process? JR: Faculty diversification has been and remains an important goal in ongoing faculty (and staff) hiring across the University. Retirement is not the only mechanism for bringing about diversification. (BTW: *In re* Wheeling Jesuit [now just Wheeling]: there is no way that Loyola will step away from its traditional humanities, social science, and natural science undergraduate core. This is not negotiable. This is what happened in the case of Wheeling, and as a result the "Jesuit" denomination was withdrawn by the province.)
- Graduate student unionization: In our discussions with the graduate student representatives last year, several concerns emerged: (1) increase stipends; (2) improve

healthcare insurance coverage; (3) increase travel and professional funding. And we did that, across the board in all the graduate programs. We will continue to support our graduate students in this regard. While not getting into the details of the dispute over whether graduate students are primarily students or laborers, let me point out that students are commonly receiving packages in the \$40-\$50K p.a. range. As students, scholarships are not taxable. I know that Dean Regan SJ has continued to meet with a group of students who have organized, in an attempt to understand how we might better serve their needs. We intend to continue those meetings and to try to improve our service to our graduate students. But our position on the unionization question is the same as that of other Jesuit universities, with the exception of Georgetown, and that is that graduate students are primarily students and not laborers.

- Question: President Rooney, I want to be sure that you understand the enormous toll that the University's stance on the unionization question for its graduate students is taking upon those students and upon the faculty generally. Today I heard my Congressional representative and the pastor of St. Gertrude's Church condemn this University for this policy. Six of the last 8 tenure-track hires in my own department have come from graduate programs whose graduate students were unionized; that they have produced such stellar graduates that we have rushed to hire them is evidence that unionization does not have deleterious effects upon their studies. And there is really no debate about graduate students' status and use as a labor force in undergraduate teaching and teaching assistantship. Your stance is exacting a moral toll on this University that you may not be in a position to understand. JR: I respect your views in this matter, and those of your fellow faculty and graduate students. We will continue to work with you all to address your concerns. But we will maintain our position. We have reached a good agreement with our unionized non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty. We will continue to work with them and bargain collectively with them, as we do with other union locals on this campus. But our position on the graduate students will, respectfully, remain what it has been.

2. Approval of March 22, 2019 minutes. Amended to add names of 2 members to list of those present. Moved (Langman); second (Lash). Motion passed (18-0-0).
3. Chair's Report/HSD updates:
  - (Classen): There will be a task force on shared governance working over the summer to discuss, among other things, faculty participation in University shared governance. Zelda Harris and I will be chairing that task force, and we will be reaching out to you to help with representation on it.
  - HSD (Battaglia): Our department (Pharmacology) recently met with the Dean, and were asked to consider changing our departmental name and focus to include neuropharmacology. There is strong support for that in the department, but we are still working out the details on it. (Classen): Many thanks to George Battaglia for his years of service on Council, as this will be his last meeting.

#### 4. Updates on University Senate (Classen)

- The Senate will be meeting for the last time this semester this coming Friday, from 3-5pm at LSC.

#### 5. Updates on Previous Issues

- Provost search: One of the things which became apparent to our committee was that, given the open fora and discussions held on our campus with finalist candidates, we were not going to get (and did not in fact get) currently sitting provosts to apply for our position (since their public appearance at our school might weaken their position at their home institution). We need to discuss this, and already have in committee, but we may need to go to a less public form of campus engagement with candidates if we hope to attract sitting provosts as finalists.
  - Question: The President complained about the lack of faculty attendance at the fora for the Provost candidates, and the paucity of faculty input in the selection process. But the Faculty Council is the titular voice of the faculty. When was Faculty Council consulted on the decision to unify the Provost position? And why was consultation primarily with faculty at the Medical and Nursing schools? (Classen): I was struck by this as well. Of course, the Medical and Nursing schools are the ones “losing” their Provost, so we would make sense to consult with them more extensively. Q: did Faculty Council push back at this decision all? (Classen): It was presented to the search committee as a *fait accompli*; pushback would not have been met with any response. I’m disappointed, but at this point the decision has been made.
- Faculty Appeals Committee: We had a motion coming out of the last Faculty Council meeting to change the way in which the Faculty Appeals Committee is constituted. In response, acting Provost Callahan set out to solicit names from the humanities faculty for membership on that committee. Five sitting members and 3 alternates were appointed in the fall. I’m encouraged by the number of nominees that were advanced for the committee.
- Motion pending from March meeting on humanities representation on the search committee: tabled until September.
- Teaching Evaluation: IDEA is gone, and there will be a new teaching evaluation system in place for the fall. Perhaps we can have Dean Slavsky come and talk to us about it in the fall.
- Sabbatical Policy: I have requested data from the Provost on approved (without funding), subvented, and denied leaves under the current system. David Slavsky and Joanna Pappas are looking into data on our peer institutions.

#### 6. Committee Work

- Service

- Dean reviews: Regan (CAS), Ryan (Libraries) taking place now. (Conley): the review process has been very substantially overhauled. Thanks to our colleagues in IT for their help in sending out the evaluations.
  - Elections: We have had robust results on the election, and have only 3 open seats. The new Parkinson SHSPH has one seat initially. (Conley): I deeply appreciate the efforts of everyone involved in the election, and those who stood for it as candidates.
7. Seating of New Members
- (Classen) Many thanks to those whose terms end today for their service with Council, and to the new members now seated for their work to come!
  - (Miller) And especially to you, Tim, for your years of service as Chair.
8. Election of Officers for 2019-'20
- Chair: Tavis Jules  
Vice-chair: James Conley  
Secretary: Hugh Miller
  - At-large XC Members:  
Jolie Holschen  
Haysun Kang  
Chris Martin  
Lavar Pope
9. Motion to adjourn (5:11pm) (Lash); second (Miller).

Respectfully submitted by  
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary