



*Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives*

## **Faculty Council Meeting Minutes Wednesday, April 21, 2021 3 - 5 pm**

(via zoom)

Members in Attendance: Artemchik; Baber; Blackmond-Larnell; Brown; Caughie; Cornelius; Dahari; davis; Dentato; Dong; Elsky; Graham; Holschen; Johnson; Jules; Lash; Martin; Moore; Moran; O'Rourke; Ohsowksi; Patel; Pope; Rosenblatt; Rushin; Silva; Steven; Tangarife; Thiruvathukal; Uprichard (ex-officio)

Guests: Provost Norberto Gryzwacz; Vice Provost for Research Sonny Singh; Vice President for Advancement Karen Paciero; Director of Center for Faculty Excellence Christine Li-Grining

### **1. Call to Order and Approval of March Minutes**

The March minutes are approved as amended, with 1 abstention.

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

Jules discusses need for new Executive Committee (EC). The Council's committees have worked well this year, but we're losing Chris Martin (Service and Communications Committee) and Steven Rushin (Academic Affairs). Service and Communications especially important because it works over the summer.

Jules raises the question of whether the Executive Committee should stay the same size, or should be enlarged. The key question is the right balance between nimbleness and breadth of representation. He asks the Council to think about that. He also wonders about 2 year terms for the Executive Committee. One member notes that since the composition of the Council changes every year, the EC really has to be elected each academic year. Discussion of this point ensues and the consensus is in agreement with it. Jules mentions that for the first time, an orientation process will be conducted for newly elected members.

### **3. Vice Provost for Research Sonny Singh**

Jules yields floor to Singh. Singh refers to pre-circulated information. He will speak to three major questions put to him.

How is his office trying to enhance research productivity? By increasing awareness, not only of policies and procedures, but also discipline specific funding opportunities, awareness of who to contact with questions. He mentions pressbook, a one page entry anybody doing research invited to send to his office. Describes process of that; it is intended to help not only his office, but also faculty, to put them in touch with one another.

This effort also involves investment and infrastructure. Most of the Sponsored Program Accounting (SPA) has been moved to his office, with the audit function being the main exception. He points to small size of the pool for seed grants, esp. for Lakeside Campus faculty. This amount is being doubled to \$350,000, and he will be mindful of how his office rolls that out. Singh wants this program to translate into growth of research portfolio. New “transformative grants” would be larger amounts, bringing together people from different fields to work together. Other measures are underway, including more summer salary support to devote time to scholarship. He discusses different software platforms. He is in the process of adding contract analysts and outsourcing some grant writing assistance to help faculty as well.

One member asks how close to R1 status we are. Singh responds that this is a complicated measurement of 8 indices relative to other schools, rather than crossing a pre-set threshold. In some metrics we are close, and even above the lower of R1 universities, but in others lag further behind. He and the Provost are discussing the question of where growth and investment would be the most helpful. The member asks about the number of doctoral degrees granted, suggesting that they are a key factor. They and Singh agree that increasing the number of programs and their size would be helpful. But even this is complicated to parse in terms of its impact on reaching R1 status.

Another member asks about the parallel move to support a more diverse faculty and asks about funding specifically tailored to this end. Singh appreciates the question and welcomes our thoughts on the pros and cons of special funding for minoritized faculty. He emphasizes that the grant writing training program his office will be rolling out will be focused on minoritized faculty. The goal here is not only to provide funding, but also to provide training and mentoring to facilitate success. He has seen this work well at other universities.

Another member asks about the benefits of reaching R1 status. Does something magic happen when we cross that threshold? Does that mean that we are doing the things we want to do better? What is the value of being an R1? Singh responds in two ways. This is more about aspirations and pushing ourselves to be even more successful. There is some data and literature to support the idea that schools with R1 status have a “reputational return on investment.” There is a lot of reputational advantage to be gained when faculty published in good journals, secure grants, and the like. It is not just about grant dollars. So much, for example, of the *US News and World Report* ranking is based on reputational factors. Research is an investment, not a profit-generating endeavor. This journey is “not about finding efficiencies in our quest for R1.” It is how do we better invest in faculty research.

#### **4. Vice President for Advancement Karen Paciero**

She introduces herself, has been here a year and half, started 5 months before the pandemic forced working from home. Her background at the University of Chicago Medical School, Feeding America, and St. Jude’s (which is a fundraising behemoth, lots of small

donations). She is happy to be in organization that stresses social justice and individuals and students.

Paciero then discusses current fundraising goals, sharing data with us. She observes that the racial justice movement has inspired big philanthropic bush; mentions specific gift from McCaib for rule of law institute, focused on student scholarships especially international students. They are reaching for a \$48 million goal, we are at \$27 million today. They are seeing improvement in the million dollar gift ranges. In other historical crises, like after Hurricane Katrina, there has been a large decline in gift-giving not associated with the specific event. But in cooperation with President Rooney, they decided to be ambitious.

Paciero acknowledges the decline in alumni gifts, which she is working hard to reverse. In the past, there has been no comprehensive fundraising program beyond naming buildings and big gifts, but not much with alumni engagement and gift giving. This is not uncommon with schools with commuter populations, but given our alums she hopes for improvement. Engagement is a precursor to giving, so they hope also for greater engagement.

One member asks how much participation and giving comes from athletics and successes such as the NCAA appearance. Paciero says it is an important piece, year to date giving is about \$490,000, but compared to nearly \$4 million for the law school. But athletics is also helpful in terms of engagement, which is where March Madness has been helpful. Their general requests are better received under these circumstances. The member identifies themselves as a Loyola graduate. They wonder if there is a way for individual units to help and participate. Paciero says that right before the pandemic, they were hiring to staff particular units with advancement personnel, but this was slowed down during the pandemic, is now resuming. They want more penetration into all of the schools. The member applauds the good job done by the student who called them asking for an annual donation. Paciero expresses appreciation for the gift and for the supportive comment about the student and their training.

Another member observes in the comment box that they are “surprised that once again we did not capitalize on the NCAA tournament. These numbers are no different that the year prior for athletics.”

Paciero shifts to the question of a capital campaign. It was made clear to her upon arrival that she needed to move into capital campaign. The Board has approved entry into “readiness phase.” There is a total 8 to 10 year runway. Her office will be going to the Board in June with a working goal.

Another member asks about her slide showing the timeline for the public phase for the capital campaign. She agrees that it is a longer process than most people understand. About 60% of your fundraising is accomplished before you go into a public phase. The participation rate is an important aspect of that, and she hopes to increase it.

Another member asks about the apparent drop in engagement rate of alums. KP clarifies that hasn’t been traditionally measured, so the data is not so good. Her sense is that there has been more in recent years. On donation side, she points to past focus before Rooney to de-emphasize donors not at the top.

Another member thanks her for the presentation, observing that it is more heartening than the presentation from the President several years ago. They discuss a past gift made to the Gannon Center, which was acknowledged by the School of Education! Paciero apologizes and underscores the importance of the first gift experience.

Another member asks about fundraising allocated to particular schools and whether that money stays in those schools. Paciero indicates that it mostly does, since most of the gifts, especially smaller ones, the deans have discretion over. Larger gifts such as the one mentioned earlier are generally allocated for programs in those schools.

Another member asks about the racial justice examen and the results in Advancement. Lorenzo and his question about the racial justice examen and the results in the Advancement division. Paciero says that it has not been completed, but will be engaging in it. She thanks faculty for work on this subject and says that it has resulted in very diverse candidate pools for hiring going on in her office.

## **5. Director of Center for Faculty Excellence Christine Li-Grining**

Li-Grining glosses the formation of her office, which was begun in August. In the fall term they hosted seminars on moving from associate to full professor and on how to prepare research leave applications. and the speakers they have hosted. Inaugural faculty writing groups were also launched. A speaker this term discussed writers' block, and plans are in the works for a workshop on preparing tenure dossiers. She is looking forward to the launch of peer mentoring circles.

Another initiative underway is the Magis Faculty Fellowship, which has a call for applications out right now. This is intended for those interested in exploring campus administration and leadership opportunities. A faculty writing program is also under development, which aims to mix faculty from different departments and units. Li-Grining also describes special events about supporting Black and other faculty of color, including a retreat at the Ecology campus. A workshop for how to be an ally for underrepresented faculty is also planned. She reminds us that we have an institutional membership in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD), which gives all faculty access to their own individual memberships. They provide numerous resources, which she highly recommends. Lastly, she describes some other future programs, including "meet the editor" events.

One member asks about the NCFDD program and how to access it. Several members express their regret that this kind of programming had been available years ago. Another members expresses appreciation for the focus on BIPOC faculty. They also describe a program at Emory that helps people who have been in rank for a long time prepare to go up for promotion. Jules encourages his colleagues to look up the mentoring handbook put together by the Provost's Office.

## **6. Committee Reports**

Communication and Service Committee. Elections for next year have been held. One was a tie, which is a new experience for this committee chair, and the two faculty up for consideration have been consulted. Discussion of possible Russian interference with the elections is considered. Summary results of dean evaluations not being sent out to faculty members. It is up to the dean under review to send out brief summary of results with action items for areas of improvement. Jules thanks him, was glad to see competitive elections. There is just one unfilled seat.

Benefits Advisory Committee Members. The two Council members on the University's Benefits Advisory Committee. There was a long discussion of Aetna in recent meeting. The results of the recent Faculty Council survey will be considered. The committee has met three times. One Council member serving says they have found the meetings to be open and that they have relayed concerns available to them. The topic of adding income grades to the health insurance has been discussed and seems to have support. The committee is talking about one additional survey, to understand not just problems but how people would parse the question of costs versus coverage.

Jules asks about when decision will be made about service providers and how long enrollment will be open. It appears Aetna will be the provider for next cycle, and that the enrollment period will be for two weeks. Jules observes that if he puts together this information, it appears that the decision to renew with Aetna has already been made. Discussion of what role the committee has ensues.

Another member asks how long the contract are expected to be. This member also discusses their own legal action against Aetna for their failure to pay claims. One of the central conclusions of the survey is that Aetna fails to pay its claims in a timely fashion, and that there is evidence this is a national level business strategy by Aetna to make and hold money. This member hopes that the close attention to denial of claims will be addressed. Many complaints from survey is their poor coverage of mental health, which derives from the fact that Aetna is reluctant to deal with people with individual practices. If the school does another survey, they might ask about these matters.

Faculty Affairs. Nothing major has been done or developed recently. They have collected feedback on strengths and weaknesses tied to the move to R1 status. This feedback will be compiled and sent to Singh next week. Jules says he has received many questions about the timeline to R1 status. He confirms with the provost that this is a 7 to 10 year process. Gryzwacz confirms this. It is a longer term goal. Jules says that this fact has not been incorporated into faculty discussions but it should be.

Academic Affairs. They have responded to the EC's request for discussion of changed compensation for MA students. They have also submitted a letter on the question of speaker contracts, which they think raise serious questions. They will be sending something to the the Council. The committee has also been discussing the core curriculum and will be forwarding something.

Meetings with IPS and SOSW faculty and staff have been held about incorporating IPS into the School, ranging from the degrees to business side of things, but also the name of the college. They are doing so based not only on IPS and SOSW faculty, but on the possibility that other units might end up joining them in the future.

With no new business, the meeting is adjourned by consensus.