# FACULTY COUNCIL Minutes <br> Wednesday, December 16, 2011 <br> 3:00-5:00 PM - TSC 303-4, WTC 

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Boller, H.; Bowen, R.; Currie, J.; Derhammer, N.; Embrick, D.; Hermansen, M.; Jay, W.; Jurgensmeier, SJ, C.; Kilbane, T.; Lash, N.; Lococo, M.; McNulty, J.; Miller, H.; Ortega Murphy, B.; Penckofer, S.; Ramsey, G.; Rose, H.; Ruppman, T.; Schoenberger, A.; Udo, M.; Wojcik, E.

1. Meeting was called to order at $3: 06 \mathrm{pm}$ by Gordon Ramsay.
2. Invocation - Charles Jurgensmeier, SJ.
3. Approval of November minutes. Correction: room number was CLC 306. Motion: McNulty; Lash seconded. Motion passed unanimously.
4. Chair's Report
o Faculty/Staff Lounge ad hoc committee has begun meeting.
0 According to the Academic Affairs website (http://www.luc.edu/academicaffairs/policies.shtml) document on the Faculty Phased-Retirement Program, "Normally the length of the period during which a faculty member may participate in the Phased-Retirement Program shall be from one semester to three-and-a-half academic years. However, in exceptional cases a longer term may be agreed upon." Q: What about lengthening the standard period, say to 5 years (as at DePaul)? A: This can be addressed later. Q: What about a phase-out with e.g. 2 courses in the fall, none in the spring? A: This has already done in cases.
o Faculty Senate (FS) Task Force

- Four committees are now in the working model:
- Executive Committee (including Strategic Planning, since XC will have administrative members);
- Academic Affairs (academic programs, research; recommendations to Office of the Provost, BUS);
- Faculty Affairs (FAUPC functions, plus those of current Faculty Status, Awards, and Elections committees);
- Student Development \& Affairs (suggested by MG and Provost)
- FS/faculty caucus schedule: FS to meet September, November, January, March; caucus October, December, February, April. (August "retreat" will also include caucus meeting.)
- FS \& University committees: Administrators have agreed that University committees can be elected/selected by the FS. This is a significant concession.
- Questions:
- Will FS votes be binding on the administration? A: not "in principle"; but the presence of the senior administrators when those votes are taken should given them more moral force. We will have to see.
- To what committee will dean evaluation be assigned? A: Not yet discussed.
- Will decisions in the new committee structure take more time than in the current UPC one? Will FS and University committees feel pressure from "pre-loaded" proposals, as some UPC's (like AAUPC) have attested? A: The current UPC structure is very slow and has occasionally been bypassed. The new one cannot be slower, and, again, the presence of administrators on the committees, one hopes, will help with the timeliness issue.
- The "Student Development and Affairs" committee: isn't this title too vague, its charge potentially too vast, given all the different student constituencies? A (Walter Jay): The impression we received was that the committee would only be involved in major policy decisions.
o The Board of Undergraduate Studies has approved the new Core Curriculum structure. I will get a copy so we can evaluate it and give our input.

5. FS "Dry run" Meeting: feedback from Council members

0 It was remarkably informative, but had little give-and-take feel to it (a "one-way street with questions").
o Perhaps in regular FS meetings we can stipulate that there be at most one presentation, with a strict time limit.

0 I felt that the presentation from the Office of the Provost was particularly "orchestrated" to provide support for the new faculty teaching load guidelines/policy. I find the numbers supplied by the Office of Institutional Research questionable. (Similar concerns about the figures involving the School of Nursing and the Med Center/Basic Sciences.)
o FS meetings exist for informed deliberation and decision-making. Administrators need to know that their presentations should serve these ends. Perhaps the information from the presentations could be communicated to the FS members in advance of the FS meeting, so that we could come prepared to make informed decisions.
o How will the issues we are to deliberate be selected? There is a danger that issues of value to the faculty might not get time on the agenda if the selection is administrator-driven. The Executive Committee's faculty members will have to be vigilant to make sure the FS doesn't become wholly admin-istration-driven.
o Can faculty non-FS members be on committees? Will they be elected or appointed? G (Ramsey): They can. The method of selection has not yet been settled. Elections would be otiose; we have trouble filling our own committees now as it stands.
o Will there be a constitution and by-laws? A: Yes, presented to us (FC), voted on, and, if passed, they go to the Board of Trustees.
o To return to an issue raised during the President's report (vide supra): Could an FS or University committee table or otherwise delay a motion if its members thought they needed more time and/or information to decide? (For example, the new Core was presented to the AAUPC in a great hurry, under a pressing deadline to get an approval for the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting. Some members felt under undue pressure to approve the package.) A: In principle, yes. In practice, again, we will have to see.
o Gordon Ramsey: One sticking point in the FS Task Force negotiations has been the issue of term limits for faculty representatives. The administration strongly supports them (2 consecutive terms). They have given, in our view, no good reasons for this; we have compelling reasons not to have such limits. The issue has been tabled in the FSTF for now.

## Motion: The Faculty Council strongly opposes the imposition of term limits for faculty membership in the new Faculty Senate.

## Moved (Penckofer); seconded (McNulty). Passed 21-0-1.

6. Motion to adjourn (Lash), seconded (Jurgensmeier). Meeting was adjourned at 4:40pm.

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary

