FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, October 24, 2012
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 209, WTC

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Boller, H.; Bowen, R.; Derhammer, N.; Dominiak, M.; Embrick, D.; Fine, J.; Fitch, A.; Jay, W.; Kilbane, T.; Lash, N.; Miller, H.; Mirza, D.; Murphy, B.; Penckofer, S.; Schneck, M.; Schoenberger, A.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:15pm by Walter Jay (for Gordon Ramsey, who is attending a conference).
2. Invocation – Janice Fine.
3. Approval of April minutes. Moved: Derhammer; Lash seconded. Motion passed 11-0-5.
4. Chair's Report (Walter Jay)
    - The new "University Senate"
      How will be old UPC structure be incorporated into the Faculty Council and the new University Senate?
      Some historical background on the University Policy Committees (UPC's): they were introduced by former Provost Facione on the model of Santa Clara University with the intention of speeding up decision-making in a shared governance structure. But when the UPC's began balking and failing to make the kinds of decisions, and within the time frames, that the administration had been expecting, the administration began doing an end run around them by way of other channels, like BUS, BGS, etc. Membership on these committees was not by election, but by administrative appointment.
        - Comment (from FC member also on the new Senate): the new University Senate met yesterday. The Senate does not yet know what its charge is. All we were asked was what committees we wished to be on; the charges of the committees, and their relations to old UPC's was not clear. There was also some discussion of student course evaluations. It was also announced that the tuition increase for next year will be held to 5% for entering first-year students, and at cost of living levels for the remaining three classes, on the grounds that the first-year students will have full use and benefit from all the new facilities being built.
        - Comment: the University Senate is there basically for North Central accreditation reasons. The Faculty Council probably still has the greatest influence upon administrative decision-making when it comes to faculty issues. We also have a large number of faculty members on the new University Senate. Let's try to see the glass as half full.

- Comment: the "Positioning Loyola for the Future" Task Force report has a lot on online instruction, and on reducing the university's present heavy reliance on Pell grants. There has been some divergence of opinion between Fr. Garanzini and Bill Laird on the issue of Loyola's reliance on those grants and on our high discount rate (about 35%). According to Laird, Loyola could reduce its tuition from $34K to $19K if we didn't give out so much financial aid. The University administration is worried that so much financial aid comes from "mission"—i.e., aid for poor students. We may have to reduce that. The administration wants to be in a position where it can increase tuition for all four classes only on the basis of cost-of-living adjustments. There has been no discussion of reducing funding for gifted students versus reducing funding for "mission" students.

5. Further Discussion: Replacement of UPC's with FC/US committees
    - (WJ): Are we going to miss areas of faculty concern with the lapse of the UPC's? Should they be brought into the Faculty Council? When the Faculty Senate proposal was on the table, it had been planned that the Senate was going to have fewer committees. Do we keep that structure in the Faculty Council under the new dispensation? Teresa Kilbane does a great job on elections; Nick Lash on dean evaluations. Do they and their work need to be absorbed into committees? What responsibilities belong to the Faculty Council, and what to the University Senate? Discussion.
        - **Motion:** that the Faculty Council adopt the four-committee structure proposed in the document, "Loyola University Chicago Faculty Council Proposed Committee Structure," changing the name of the "Council Affairs" committee to the "Service" committee. Moved (Dominiak); second (Miller). Passed: unanimously.
6. SSOM issue

    M. Schneck: Faculty and staff at the SSOM are considered "outside" the University on IT issues. SSOM faculty have no "luc.edu" address. LUMC ID cards do not have LUC access privileges. SSOM faculty cannot access the "cloud" (e.g., the new luc.box.com online storage accessible to all other faculty.)
    - **Motion:** that LUMC faculty get the same University-wide IT access and resources as all other LUC faculty. Moved (Schneck); second (Dominiak). Passed: unanimously. (GR will write to IT; invite a representative to meet with us and discuss how to implement this.)
7. Motion to adjourn (Schneck); second (Dominiak). Meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary