

Retreat Evaluation  
**Faculty Council Retreat**  
**20-21 August 2001**

**1. The part of the retreat that I liked best:**

- Small group discussions
- Learning about various organization structures
- Meeting Fr. Garanzini, listening to his ideas & views
- Engaging in meaningful discussion during meeting & lunch
- Having an opportunity to work with others from different disciplines, campuses [both faculty & administration]
- Excellent facilitation of discussion and active participation by all
- Fr. Garanzini's address
- Discussion w/administrators
- Faculty conversations
- Second City
- Frank & focussed discussion
- Meeting w/Fr. Garanzini
- Discussion of action plans
- Facilitators
- Discussion w/Fr. Garanzini & opportunity to think together about what appears to be the new directions of the university
- Opportunity to get to know other FC members better
- Incorporation of the Senior VPs
- Discussion w/Fr. Garanzini
- Follow-up analysis of discussion on Tuesday am
- Meeting w/Fr. Garanzini
- First day went very well
- Attempts to make this an action-oriented conference w/ideas & action plans
- Topics chosen were very good
- Interaction w/fellow faculty & administrators
- Fr. Garanzini's time w/the group
- Interview w/Fr. Garanzini
- The whole 2-day process worked very well. Info-sharing w/MG was good & also good to include administrators. I came skeptical of spending 2 days on this but tried to have an open mind & think this panned out well
- I only came on Tuesday but the "wrap up" session was candid & poised some good points
- Talking w/colleagues
- Meeting w/Fr. Garanzini
- Facilitated discussion w/Fr. Garanzini
- Small group working sessions
- Roundtable discussions

**2. The parts of the retreat that seemed least effective were:**

- Making of "action plans" - although it was a useful, thought-provoking exercise, it was not "effective" in that actionable items were not generated
- None
- Including the administrators in the discussion
- The administrators didn't seem very involved
- Needed fewer group exercises and more general discussion w/administrators
- As always - the end. The end of such events always trail off as attention shifts to dismissal and the "morrow"
- Developing action plans for concepts such as "trust" and "culture clash"
- Second day dragged a little and was also somewhat repetitive. Given everyone's shortage of time, perhaps we should have collapsed retreat into one day
- Down time on the first day - we could have arrived at 10am
- It's hard to say that any one session was least effective since the 3 sessions had such clear foci
- Structured exercises on Monday afternoon ran a little long
- I though just about all the time was used effectively
- In some cases the "action plans" seemed forced & premature

**3. In order to improve retreats like this in the future I would suggest:**

- More administrators
- To continue in order to re-build the Loyola community
- Greater participation by Faculty Council & administrators

- To include more administrators [maybe have the President encourage them]
- More time w/senior administrators - better attendance by senior administrators
- Incorporate senior VPs to get over the "them/us" confrontational block
- One day, not two. It's hard to maintain energy
- Basically was very good retreat
- Keep in mind the importance of time. Consider boiling retreats into as short a period as possible, e.g., 1 day, not 2
- Not holding it at such a busy time
- This was timely because of the transition. I'd think carefully about another one since we don't want to wear out the possible time commitment
- Honor the break times; if discussion runs longer, let the break time stand
- Nothing
- Structure some feedback/response from administrators. It was good that they sat and listened but we should also be able to hear from them to be sure that they understood what they were hearing

#### 4. The points that we discussed at the retreat on which we definitely need to follow up are:

- Clarity, coordination & transparency of governance processes across campuses & bodies
- Programs, processes that focus us on our shared goals, missions, & work [e.g., "One Loyola" Conference on Jesuit mission]
- Strategies to promote progress in participatory governance
- Clarity about LUC top administrative structures - their accountability, responsibility, and guidelines for feedback
- Clarification about "niches"
- Jesuit mission conference - Loyola identity
- Continuing work on shared governance
- Constitution
- Functional structure
- Mission discussion
- Faculty salary
- Structure of governance
- Moving forward w/Constitution
- Pursuit of program on Jesuit identity
- Constitution
- Jesuit Mission Conference
- "One Loyola"
- Jesuit Mission Conference
- "Collaborative" government rather confrontational, adversarial governance
- Continue building bridges between faculty & administration
- Priority settings for FC
- Meeting w/Fr. Garanzini regarding organizational structure
- Conference on Jesuit Mission
- What are the specific objections that administrators have to the Faculty Senate Constitution?
- How will we identify niche graduate programs to be supported and how will these programs determine/effect faculty hiring?
- How will we establish mechanisms for increasing communication and information sharing between faculty & administration?
- Faculty/administration shared governance
- Continued communication across campuses
- Continued communication among representative faculty groups
- Jesuit Conference
- Action plans
- Jesuit conference
- Shared governance
- Development of trust
- Sustaining academic quality in the face of cuts, hiring freeze
- Jesuit Mission Conference
- Moving forward on setting up collaborative governance structures

Revised October 2001 by Patricia Xia ([pxia@luc.edu](mailto:pxia@luc.edu)), University Libraries  
<http://www.luc.edu/resources/faccouncil/reports/retreateval01.htm>