

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, November 14, 2012
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 209, WTC

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Boller, H.; Bowen, R.; Cardoza, A.; Dominiak, M.; Fine, J.; Fitch, A.; Jellish, S.; Kelly, B.; Kilbane, T.; Lash, N.; Macksey, S.; Miller, H.; Mirza, D.; McNulty, J.; Penckofer, S.; Ramsey, G.; Ruppman, T.; Ryan, J.; Schoenberger, A.; Udo, M.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:05pm by Gordon Ramsey. Introduction of new member: Jean Ryan (SCPS).
2. Invocation – Janice Fine.
3. Approval of October minutes. Minor corrections. Moved: Cardoza; Lash seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
4. Chair’s Report
 - Thanks to Walter Jay for chairing last Council meeting.
 - FC committees: We have the four committees in place, as of our last meeting. We now need to decide their charges, and the membership of the committees. See also the “Table of Approvals.” We will aim to finalize the committee structure for our December meeting. We should form an *ad hoc* committee between now and then to draft new bylaws for the Faculty Council incorporating these changes. The aim will be to vote on the new bylaws at our January meeting.
 - I would like to invite people for some short briefings (15:00-30:00); one for online courses; one for AAUP; one for international programs; etc.
 - Comment: an online course task force (University wide) has been tasked with finalizing the strategic plan for online learning by January; perhaps we want to get input during our December meeting. GR: I will try to get someone in for the December meeting. Please think about issues between now and then.
5. Discussion: FC Proposed Committee Structure
 - For policy issues of faculty concern in the “rainbow chart,” common members of FC and US can bring us US information and, in turn, communicate FC concerns to US.
 - Comment: Timing is an issue--what if the US deliberates and decides without giving FC time for input? GR: we hope the administration will act in good faith on faculty concerns.
 - Comment: what if FC and US *have* no common members? GR: the US should have an item in its bylaws calling for representation from FC.

- Membership of the three other (non-Executive Committee) committees
 - Each should be composed of five or seven members, with the chair a FC member; 3 or 4 FC members; non-members can be brought in for expertise. The Academic Affairs Committee should have at least one US member and could include BUS and BGS committee members.
 - Comment: We should have it as a goal to have wide representation (e.g., not just from CAS).
 - Comment: Seven member committees are unlikely to meet. Suggest seven for Academic Affairs; five each for Faculty Affairs and Service.
 - Comment: Service Committee deals with FC business solely; all members of it should be FC members.

Volunteers for the ad hoc committee: Schoenberger, Lash, Cardoza to draft new bylaws.

6. Meeting with Provost John Pelissero

- The US will address the task force report “Positioning Loyola for the Future” (link available on Strategic Planning page on the web). The task force was struck last spring; it reviewed the Deloitte and Touche consultants’ report. It has recommended changes to the current strategic plan in the following areas: (1) environmental studies; (2) international programs; (3) how we competitively position ourselves.
 - Under (3) the task force considered the following: (a) distinctive undergraduate programs; (b) making Loyola a regional destination school for urban environmental issues; (c) international studies programs; and (d) Catholic healthcare leadership preparation.
- The task force also considered growing the Loyola enrollment to 18,500, by way of (a) online studies; (b) more BA/BS programs; and (c) graduate degree programs.
- It also recommended growing the endowment for more scholarships and academic support
- Under talent and resource management, it recommended program review processes, performance/productivity measures, and performance evaluations. (It was especially concerned with expectations of student success beyond classroom contact.)
 - Question: Course evaluations: are course evaluations going to be University-wide uniform? JP: we are talking to IDEA Corporation to design instruments to measure faculty and course evaluations not only within the University but by comparison with similar courses at similar universities.
 - JP: Faculty annual evaluations: about nine years ago, the uniform form was abandoned. Most evaluation systems haven’t changed,

apart from this, in about 30 years. A small group of deans is working on a redesign of performance evaluations to more closely track teaching, research, service, also service to mission, student engagement, etc.

- Question: How do faculty evaluations relate to tenure/promotion? JP: annual reviews are done for merit raise purposes. They are not used specifically for tenure/promotion, although they are sometimes mentioned in tenure/promotion packages. (The Faculty Handbook does not reference these evaluations in the tenure/promotion process.)
- Question: What about online teaching evaluations? JP: results have been poor: so far there has been low turnout, with bimodal results.
- Question: What about making evaluation results public? At other schools they are made public (as they are here in the School of Business). JP: the University has no overall specific plan for this; schools and departments should determine this for themselves.
- Question: In the Psychology department, evaluations show that two questions are the most important: overall evaluation of course, and overall evaluation of teacher. What about requiring faculty to review and evaluate other courses—a peer-to-peer process? JP: in some departments this is done already, especially senior faculty evaluating junior faculty.
- Question: What do evaluations measure? JP: current tools versus IDEA tools—IDEA gets closer to what really got done in the course, even compared to what faculty members claim they are aiming for or are achieving. (Comment: we find IDEA works in the School of Education.)
- Question: the School of Business rolled out an early/phased retirement program last week. Will it go University-wide? JP: This was unique to the School of Business. Due to the current “moment” at the school (renaming/rebranding, need to hire new faculty, thus need to incent older faculty to retire). Offer was made to about 20 faculty, above the age of 60, with a certain minimum number of years of service. There was a special allocation of funds for this program. The regular phased-retirement program is still in place for the rest of the University.
- Question: on the “Positioning” task force report: the “distinctive” criterion: what does this mean? JP: Marketing to high school and junior colleges for freshman and transfer enrollments. This year more than 50% of transfers are from community colleges. (Greater diversity as well.) SCPS has about 300, down from 3000 10 years ago. Depaul has 1500, Roosevelt 3000; we’re way behind.

- Question: the “veterans’ market”? JP: several initiatives. Matching “Yellow Ribbon” (new G.I. bill, post-Persian Gulf War) funds. Down the road a veteran-friendly office or center may need to be organized. We recently hosted a veterans’ jobs fair. We had 1500 sign up, and 900 attend. 100 jobs were offered on the spot. It was one of the best organized career fairs recently held on campus.
- Question: what about marketing to retirees? JP: good point—we’re not doing this now.
- Question: can you tell us about the Advisory Committee on Online Education? JP: We need more faculty on this. I asked Jobeth D’Agostino and Carol Scheidenhelm to strike a committee (15-18 people) on online education. Each of the deans is charged with developing his or her own online programs and procedures. We are not planning to offer an online CAS BA or BS degree. We hope the committee will make recommendations on where we want to go. (E.g. is a course offered online with the same credit as one that is hybrid or off-line? NB Fairfield University *requires* at least one course a year be online.)

7. Motion to adjourn: Moved (Lash); second (Mirza). Meeting adjourned 5:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary