



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

Minutes – Faculty Council
Wednesday, March 31, 2021; 3 – 5 pm

Members in Attendance: Baber; Borys; Brown; Caughie; Cornelius; Dahari; davis; Dentato; Dong; Elsky; Graham; Holschen; Johnson; Jones; Jules; Lash; Martin; Moore; Moran; Nicholas; O’Rourke; Ohsowksi; Pope; Rosenblatt; Silva; Steven; Tangarife; Thiruvathukal; Uprichard (ex-officio)

Guests: Provost Norberto Gryzwacz; Director of Center for Math and Science Education Timothy Stoelinga; Director of Core Dana Garbarski; Acting Assistant Provost for Academic Diversity Robyn Mallett.

1. **Call to Order and Approval of January Minutes.** The January minutes are moved, seconded, and passed by acclamation.

2. **Discussion Item: Chair's report**

Jules opens with the subject of the Council’s work over the summer. Given that the university plans to resume classes 100% in person, it may be particularly important to be working over the summer. The Executive Committee (EC) is trying to figure out ways of onboarding new members coming onto the Council for smooth integration. He suggests seating new members in May, and that we employ a more logical approach to voting for the members of the Executive Committee.

A Council member agrees, indicating that it seems odd to them to come in on last meeting, then nothing happens. They wonder if new members should instead be seated at the first meeting of the new academic year. Jules says that the current Council members’ term wouldn’t be up until the end of August, so current members would be working through the summer. Another member suggests a May 12th meeting, before end of the 9-month contractual commitment of most faculty. They agree that we need better onboarding, and an advance slate of members of the EC before the meeting in which they are elected. A different member asks if the expectation would be a monthly meeting over the summer, or on an as-needed basis; they point to the field season for research, which they will probably spend standing in a wetland. Jules indicates that his plan is to hold June and July dates, but only to use if needed.

Jules then changes topics to the faculty evaluation of deans. He indicates that there has been a different schedule for these evaluations, which would mean that the committee administering them would be very active over the summer. Moreover, Chris Martin, the chair of the Service and Communications Committee, is stepping down; he has run elections and the service committee, whose duties include administering evaluations of Deans.

One member asks about mention of meetings or schedules in the current constitution. Jules says that the current constitution does not stipulate a particular schedule, other than mandating that new members should be seated in the last meeting of an academic year. Jules mentions resolution passed at the last meeting about a tenure system for Arrupe College. We have all seen the Provost's response declining to proceed on this matter. The resolution is being referred to Academic Affairs, and will be discussed with Arrupe Faculty. The other question is that as we think about the issue a tenure standard at Arrupe, the provost has asked to think about that in the context of what kind of university we are, and what is Arrupe's position in that. One member says that they are unsure of Arrupe faculty opinion. The faculty has approached the administration about this issue and has been met with disregard. There is concern about how to proceed precisely because of their lack of tenure and the fact that they could be dismissed at any time. They do need Council's help. They have requested that the Provost come to one of their faculty meetings.

One member indicates that they don't think the question of what kind of university they want to be is relevant to this, since it has already been defined by initiatives from the Provost's office. Another member indicates that they were dismayed by the response, which displayed a basic ignorance of one of the main points of tenure, which is to enable the exercise of academic freedom and shared governance. To have an entire academic unit without the possibility of tenure is to vitiate shared governance from the beginning. They also observe that although it has been terrific to have the provost attend the Council's meetings, there are issues that faculty should discuss without the provost being present. This may well be one such issue, particularly for Council members who are not tenured. They suggest taking up this question in an executive session with only faculty.

Another member indicates agreement with previous comments. The response from the provost tied tenure closely to research activity, but the AAUP would argue that tenure is a baseline condition of doing not only research, but teaching and service that come with a faculty appointment. We should be fighting to extend that to all who do that work. Another member indicates that they understood where the provost was coming from in his response. We have many faculty members who are not tenure track, so this is a broad question that many universities are grappling with. Their question is not about the type of university, but whether our motion was interpreted as wanting tenure track for all faculty at Arrupe, or was it understood that it was intended only for some? They doubt the broad interpretation of tenure some of their colleagues are advocating.

A different member observes that the law school has a distinctive position in this discussion. It is accredited by the American Bar Association, which has produced discussions about clinical professors in the law school. Although they are not eligible for tenure, they can qualify for multi-year contracts, for which they undergo a process of review. Teaching is their primary role and the basis on which they are evaluated. That system works well and has been accepted by the American Association of Law Schools as a kind of compromise that seems to satisfy most clinical professors. So that is an alternative scenario.

Another member raises the question of the tensions between our anti-racist stance and our pursuit of R1 status. There is a volume of data at community colleges that indicate that faculty with tenured status have more impact on minoritized students; at the same time, the Carnegie standards for R1 status emphasizes research by ladder faculty. So having tenured faculty who are not engaged in research could dilute our pursuit of R1 status. We may be trying to do two things at once that aren't really compatible. We should be open about that.

The Provost responds that he thinks this is an important topic. Jules quoted him out of context. The larger question of what kind of university we want to be was a part a wider conversation, but only one part. The system described for the law school is "a really good alternative" and the administration is open to that. He reiterates his response – the vision is that Loyola is a research university, its leadership has developed a strategic plan accordingly, and hired faculty accordingly with big emphasis on research excellence. He describes the thorough process of hiring for tenure track positions and the amount of evaluation that goes into those searches. [Several comments from members in the Zoom chat box indicate that hiring for Arrupe is similarly thorough, and point to tenure track systems at other community colleges]. Gryzwacz reaffirms commitment to diversity, indicates that his office is rejecting searches that do not emphasize diversity.

3. Center for Science and Math Education and University Reorganization

Jules introduces the subject of the Center for Math and Science Education (CMSE) and its move in the organizational chart. He emphasizes that this is part of a larger reorganization. At one point the possibility of its moving to the Institute for Racial Justice was broached. He thought it best for us to hear directly from the Center. Timothy Stoelinga is introduced and the floor turned over to him. Stoelinga introduces the history and work of the Center. Established in the early 2000s to support changes taking place in the teaching of Math and Science in the Chicago public schools, it works with teachers on STEM content and teaching practices. Because of the insight that STEM education can reinforce or disrupt all kinds of social inequities, the work of the Center has moved beyond just improving instruction and toward supporting minoritized students in STEM. Given the mission of the Center, several possibilities for where CMSE best fits arose – the School of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Institute for Racial Justice, or new transdisciplinary unit focusing on research and outreach ("On the Cusp.") Currently the Center would like to move to On the Cusp for two main reasons. First, this would allow for partnerships and cooperation with other units that deal with similar questions or questions with similar dynamics, like gender bias and discrimination. The second is a change of name being contemplated (to "The Center for Equity in Science and Math Education") that communicates the evolution of CSME, makes clear better fit with On the Cusp. Stoelinga goes into detail about some ongoing projects related to social equity. One member praises the report, saying that it helps them understand why CSME would look for a connection to the Institute for Racial Justice, and more generally the scope of the Center's operations. Another member echoes the praise. They invoke the work of the Gannon Center for Women and Leadership and say that they don't quite understand the logic of "On the Cusp" since so many other parts of the university (the English Department, for example) examine questions of equity and inclusion. The Provost responds with a description of On the Cusp,

which centers on working across disciplines in order to address social inequities. The Gannon Center clearly is a part of that.

Another member asks for examples of recent projects, hoping for optimistic stories. Stoelinga describes a seven year program, which some Council members are involved in, that provided first year undergraduates with authentic research experiences in STEM majors, prioritizing students from underrepresented groups.

4. The Core Curriculum

The floor is turned over to Dana Garbarski, Director of Core Curriculum. She describes two phases for revising the core –the first is revising the structure, the second is populating with content. She refers to document sent to the Council, slightly revised version of which was sent to all faculty at the university. Now she is at the stage where wants feedback on findings and recommendations. Garbarski wants to assemble “core development working groups” to populate new courses to see how it would fit together. She wants a transparent and open process and sees that this is the start of a conversation.

One member asks about current developments in society and their impacts, referring particularly to computers and the extensive use of Zoom and similar technologies. What are the general structural things being considered. Especially as a professor in a STEM discipline, he wants to see a different audience in his general intro class. How can we make core more relevant and interesting to our students? This member hears lots of complaints about the core. Garbarski thanks the questioner. She points to the idea of moving away from distinct disciplines and moving toward an idea of scaffolding across disciplines, which she hopes will allow for interdisciplinary inquiry at the end, but also the development of new courses at earlier stages.

A different member says that it is not clear to them how requirements are allocated to foundations and explorations segments of the core. Why are some in one category and why others not? Garbarski indicates that she really wants to move away from Tier 1 and Tier 2 designations, which she fears cuts off integration between disciplines. Foundational is a designation meant to encompass what is in core curricula at Jesuit universities, like theology. More advanced explorations in a particular discipline, like “explorations in social justice,” would be in the “explorations” category. What these courses are is what she wants core groups to work on, a process that she says will begin this summer.

A different members notes that in some ways the document she circulated reads as a public-facing document, invoking the importance of such questions as racial justice. What strikes them as missing are measurable outcomes – how can we assess hearts and minds, but we can assess skills. The second point of concern is the integrative seminar at the end. How can this be taught by a single faculty member? That is not really interdisciplinarity, which is not so easy or quickly learned. One problem has been an issue of numbers -- the university has not wanted more than one faculty member in a class, we ought to be able to have team-teaching. The third point of concern is that what is proposed seems to give writing short shrift, although it is a crucial skill.

Another member also thanks Garbarski and reiterates some of the previous member’s points about skills. They were wondering about language proficiency and writing skills.

Garbarski says that there will still be writing intensive courses, which are a university requirement but not part of the core itself. The same is true of a language requirement.

A different Council member asks about the diversity requirements within the core and how they work. Garbarski clarifies that meeting these requirements can come from either core courses that address questions of diversity, or courses that do so but are not part of the core. It is a distributive model, as is done at other universities.

Garbarski is then asked a question by a different Council member about students who are majors in one of the core's knowledge areas. In the current system, the classes for their majors that cover the same material fulfill the core requirement; will this continue? Garbarski affirms that it will.

Another member praises the work done for this proposal, emphasizing how important the core is to a Loyola education. Unlike the previous member who spoke, their experience is that students enjoy much of the core. But they are concerned that faculty do not see it as a strong outlet for their creative energies, and that so few of the classes they would like to teach qualify for the core. They raise the question of whether the capstone is too "social sciency" in the sense of being so much about applied rather than basic knowledge. Some areas, like nationalism and environmental destruction would seem like logical subjects of these seminars, and are studied by multiple disciplines. But if they could be solved by an undergraduate seminar, they would have been solved long ago. Garbarski replies that the expectation is that students in these classes would do research and present on subjects in depth, and that solutions or potential solutions might address a part of a much larger problem or puzzle. Garbarski and the member agree that any student who solves the problem of nationalism should get a medal and a check.

The conversation shifts to the process for approving a new core. A member asks why slating new classes to meet the requirement is being scheduled for the summer, if formal approval would not happen until the fall. Couldn't the categories of classes ended up being changed? Garbarski acknowledges that the timeframe is aggressive, but the assumption is that the basic framework would not be changed so much that classes couldn't be slotted to fulfill certain requirements.

5. Committee Reports

The Communication and Service Committee chair reports that over the last few weeks, he and Jules have met with the Provost and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs about how dean evaluations are being conducted. Deans will be reporting out to faculty directly about the results of evaluations. In terms of Council elections, there are still two slots needing to be filled, one in CAS social sciences, the other in libraries. The library faculty feels stretched very thin right now.

The head of Faculty Affairs indicates that they have moved forward a letter on the manua trainings required by Human Resources, but there is nothing to report yet on that count. The survey on health insurance has been issued. They have also been invited to discuss the move to R1 status with the Vice Provost for research. The floor is turned over to one of the members who did the most work on the health insurance survey. They indicate that the results, which will be released soon, indicate that 46% of respondents had a provider who went out of

network with the change, 44% of which were mental health care providers. Many people lost two or three providers. For some faculty, the consequences have been dire; they describe an inability to focus on their jobs. Far more faculty report an increase in out of pocket costs, and there were multiple complaints about time consuming difficulties with customer service. Some respondents also expressed disappointment and anger that Loyola's decision to use Aetna was inconsistent with the Jesuit Catholic mission. Faculty from the Rome campus describe the health insurance as functionally useless since so few providers there accept it.

One of the Council members who sits on the university's Benefits Advisory Committee reports that the committee has met. The subject of this report was discussed. They convey that Aetna has a way of having providers added, that has perhaps not been publicized sufficiently. Some people have used it. In addition, on a different matter, the University is exploring expanding the tuition exchange program we have with some Jesuit universities – considering joining a much larger group of universities. A member refers to comments made in the Zoom chat about problems with the contraceptive cards, reports of providers leaving Aetna, and a history of lawsuits against the company for failure to pay claims in a timely fashion. One of the members involved in the survey indicates that they have been unable to get data from Human Resources on how many faculty are insured through Aetna.

6. New Business

One member raises the question of a contract apparently being sent to invited speakers who are paid, which has struck many faculty as problematic. The Executive Committee will be referring this to Academic Affairs. Jules says that letters thanking faculty for their service on the Council will be sent to department chairs and deans. The committee to revise the handbook has been working, but is waiting for the Shared Governance Task Force to submit its report. So there will not be a new handbook by next academic year. One member expresses consternation at this, describing the current handbook as very out of date and a "historical document" that describes a university that no longer exists. They say this is another sign of how so many things have come to a halt under Jo Ann Rooney's leadership as President, especially until the current provost was hired. Another member affirms that this is one reason moving forward there should be a process to update the handbook incrementally, rather than sporadically.

Jules indicates that new bylaws and constitution for the Council will not be approved by the President and Provost until this report. As head of the Council, he now sits on the Academic Committee for the Board of Trustees. The identity of Board members has been kept secret, which is another issue. His point now is that even before a formal change in policy, the Council head is now sitting on this committee. Jules then transitions to the question of how long Executive Committee members should serve, and whether their terms should be spelled out in the Council's constitution. Discussion of the logistics of different term lengths for membership on the Council and on the Executive Committee ensues.

Seeing that the time scheduled for the meeting has expired, Jules calls for a motion to recess. The motion is made, seconded, and passed by acclamation. The session ends.