November 2007
Faculty Council
Alanah Fitch recorder
Present: Pamela Caughie, Allen Schoenberger, Linda Heath, Nicholas Lash, Linda Paskiewicz, Paul Jay, Janis Fine, David Schweikart, Anthony Castro, David Posner, Marc Hayford, Harvey Boller, Heather Cannon, Marta Lundy, Bill Cutherbertson, Anthony Cardoza, Bill Schmidt

Start: 3:10 p.m.

## I. Invocation (Gerry Mc Donald (GM))

Announced the arrival of a big comet and recommended Handel's Opera "Julius Caesar in Egypt" as the best in years showcasing two counter tenors who can sing, dance, and back flip while singing.

## II. Approval of minutes

Paul Jay's mother is not dead.
Approved 14/0/2

## III. Chair's Report (GM)

Rich Bowen broke his neck last Jan. In June he had an operation and has been in a body cast this fall.

Motion on education materials (as proprietary to the faculty see Minutes of Oct.) was sent to the UCC (University Coordinating Committee) and from there was sent to FAUPC (Faculty Affairs University Policy Committee). Father Garanzini is coming 4 to 5 at Dec. meeting of Faculty Council (FC). Tom Kelley will be at the Jan FC meeting to talk about benefit. The School of Communications seems to be lumbering or lurching forward. GM presented a list of individuals he thinks are on various committees, if not please let him know. There are committees without chairs. Pam Caughie asked about the Gender Equity Committee.

Nick Lash reported that not many people are rushing to serve on the Administrative Policies/Resources FC committee. He indicated that there will be 5 deans to evaluate this year and so pleaded for volunteers. Marc Hayford and Linda Paskiewicz volunteered themselves. Janis Fine suggested Jerry Williams. Tony Castro, GM, Bill Schmidt, Allen Schoenberger suggested Hank Rose.

GM indicated that the UCC passed a motion to have all motions should be sent to the UCC, distributed to the UPCs and returned to the UCC.

GM briefed FC on an "Information Security Policy" (ISP) which contains a number of problematic features. Two people are to be designated as data stewards (trained by IT) who will examine every computer in every department to look for sensitive data and report violations to the university.

A wide and free-ranging discussion ensued covering two pages of unedited minutes.

Highlighted in the discussion were the following issues:

1. Who will volunteer for that new workload (which IT can not afford)? Especially if there are provisions for the steward to be disciplined for inappropriate use of their position to search computers?
2. Why should all faculty computers be searcher when we have, relative to chair's and some staff, little access to sensitive material?
3. The complexity of the law on this issue is enormous and can hardly be "trained" in 1 day a semester.
4. Will this include searches of thumb drives, personal lap tops, home computers that are used to access the university via VPN?

A motion was proposed and passed 19/0/0
The current ISP policies cast too wide a net and need to be focused on areas where actual security risks exist.

Alanah Fitch raised the issue that of greater concern to the members of the university community is that we have no policy which allows us to suggest and then move through the process of identification of individuals who may pose a physical threat and should be banned from campus, particularly in light of events at Virginia Tech last summer. It was concluded that FC will bring in Bernie Ward from Security and other individuals to discuss this matter in subsequent FC meetings.

## IV FAUPC report (Peter Schraeder) - not present

## V. New Business - Contingent Faculty - Pat-Graham-Skoul and Pat Simpson, AAUP

PS presented information on the status of contingent faculty both nationally and at LUC to demonstrate an accelerating trend away from tenure faculty toward contingent faculty, driven by structural changes in Higher Ed.

1987 793,0000 total faculty 34\% part-time
2005 1,290,000 total faculty 58\% part-time
2006 Campus Equity Week publication organized by AAUP, NEA, and AFTA and National Writers Union

1969 3.3\% fulltime faculty appointments off tenure track
2006 65\% of all full-time faculty points off tenure track
1998-2001 - full-time non tenure track appointments grew by 35.5\%
The goal of the presentation to FC was to open a discussion about the issues of contingent faculty within FC, including representation on FC. These issues are part of a series of proposals that a sub committee of the local chapter AAUP (American Association of University

Professors) will be presenting in the spring. PS emphasized that tenure-track faculty have many issues in common that are affected by the presence of such large numbers of contingent faculty including, for example, assaults on academic freedom. She suggested visiting the AAUP national web site Recommended Institutional Regulations (www.Aaup.org ) which says that we need to offer due process to faculty and representation and try to come up with some job security guarantees in an incremental service that they move into tenure or tenure like conditions. She also suggested visiting the AFT's web site on academic freedom: (www.aft.org/higher_ed/index.htm)

Patricia Graham-Skoul (PG-S) who has been a member of the Classics department, part-time since 1979, next presented a power point on the role of contingent faculty and issues of representation at LUC

## Loyola's 2006 data from the National AAUP

National AAUP figures based on Department of Education.

| 420 | full time tenure track faculty (80.3\% of FT) | (3.97\% of total instructors) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 103 | non-tenure track (19.7\% of FT) | (9.3\% of total instructors) |
| 583 | part-time faculty | (52.7\% of total instructors) |

The fraction of non-tenure track instructors is largest in the Chicago area, greater than that of DePaul.

There was a discussion of the issues raised in defining and tracking the years of service of part time and full time non-tenure track faculty, the validity of the data presented, and how that data might impact the relative extent of representation that should be given to "contingent" faculty. On paper representation is open to all full-time, but it is difficult to have full representation when the employment status is unknown on a yearly basis.

One suggestion from the sub-committee of the AAUP is a requirement of departments to track their PT contingent faculty. Tony Cardosa felt that chairs would necessarily already have that information, Allen Shoenberger said that that would not be true in the Law School.

Pamela Caughie brought up the fact that many of the new program proposed and approved this past year are based entirely on contingent faculty, therefore we (faculty council) should get control of this issue now.

David Posner shade that in his department 10 years ago the PT faculty were relatively stable pool for individuals but over the last 10 years the amount of "real" dollars has shrunk and it is difficult to get contingent faculty to teach for the amount offered therefore the pool is much less stable. "We have had to scramble from semester to semester persuade people to accept the chick feed.". He said that the Dean has indicated that the university's goal is to work toward
$60 \%$ tenured or tenure track
20\% full time non tenure track
20\% part time non tenure track.

Posner further said that these numbers are the exact opposite of his departmental numbers
Allen Shoenberger said that he thought that the majority of class time was still handled by tenure track and that students are pleased with their education. He further said that he felt that there were issues relevant to PT that could only be addressed by PT (benefits and health insurance). He felt that a committee to address these issues should be created immediately.

Pamela Caughie ended the discussion be reminding FC that there are two different issues, 1 is the increasing numbers of contingent faculty and the second is bringing contingent faculty into the "fold" of the faculty.

## VI Old Business - Elections Policy, Sabbatical Policy (David Schweikart)

DS indicated that a white paper is almost complete including draft of a motion. The next step is to get back comments from faculty at large, then it should move to the UCC.
VII. Adjournment

5:00 by loss of faculty

