

December 2007 Meeting of Faculty Council

Alanah Fitch, secretary

Present: Gerry Mc Donald, Walter Jay, Peter Schraeder, Linda Heath, Tony Cardoza, Rich Bowen, Alanah Fitch, Janis Fine, Linda Paskiewicz, Gordon Ramsey, Tony Castro, Heather Cannon, Hank Rose, Nick Lash, Allen Shoenberger, David Schweickart, Marc Hayford, Terry Williams, Harvey Boller, Bill Schmidt, William Cuthbertson, Jaweed Fareed, William Cuthbertson, Pamela Caughie, Gloria Jacobson, David Posner

1. Invocation – Linda Paskiewicz

2. Approval of the November Minutes

20/0/1 abstention

3. Chair's Report (Gerry Mc Donald (GM))

Bernie Ward is scheduled to talk about security issues with respect to Virginia Tech in January. Bill Cuthbertson and GM to initiate a revision of the faculty council (FC) web page. New Dean for Arts and Sciences upcoming. GM asked for a suggested length of time to have human resources (HR) talk to FC about the satisfaction survey. The resolution made last month on the Information Security Policies was sent to Faculty Affairs University Policy Committee (FAUPC). The draft policy is likely DOA. Provost Chris Wiseman (CW) indicated (at the Executive Committee (EC) meeting of FC)) meeting shared our concerns.

CW also suggested combining the FC deans evaluation with the Provost's deans evaluation and the idea was sent to Nick Lash's (NL)committee to consider.

Nick Lash reported that the FC questionnaire has 50 basic questions that have evolved over time. The Provost's questionnaire has 15 questions and does not seem to have good overlap with the one of FC. There was some discussion of who fills out the dean's evaluation sent out by the Provost. It was unclear whether or not faculty have been consistently included as participants in the past. It was also unclear which of the two questionnaires are referred to in the faculty handbook (FH). Gordon Ramsey and Walter Jay both indicated that the purpose of the Provost's questionnaire may be very different (middle manager) as compared to that of the faculty (meeting faculty needs) and said that they could see that the Provost's questionnaire would have a different purpose. It was suggested that if the FC deans evaluations are used in the overall evaluation of the Dean that it would be desirable to maintain the separate FC evaluation. The discussion concluded with a consensus to retain the separate FC dean evaluation. Nick Lash thanked all the volunteers who will be working on dean evaluations this semester. G

4. New Business –AAUP Spring Forum – Pamela Caughie (PC)

PC requested that FC co-sponsor the Spring forum of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The forum this year is on academic freedom and will feature Norman Finklestein. The date is on or near April 24th. Previous cost of such forum is about \$175. A motion was made and seconded.

Motion passed - 25/0/0

5. Committee Reports

a. Awards Committee – Rich Bowen

The awards committee report by the bionic committee chair. Rich Bowen reminded all that the faculty member of the year (Tony Cardoza) will be honored at the Simpson learning living center this next Thursday between 3:30-5:30 pm. A call for nominations will go out in February for next year's recipient.

b. Faculty Status Committee – Allen Shoenberger – Faculty Salaries

Motion:

It is in the interests of Loyola University in the long term to maintain a competitive position in the national market place for faculty and to encourage retirement at the traditional time. With that in mind, Faculty Council suggests:

- 1. Progress towards the 60% comparable salary target with respect to a group of “comparable institutions” ought to be made more transparent to faculty, since it appears the university has fallen short of that target by 2006-2007 academic year, particularly in full professor rank as well as the assistant professor rank.**
- 2. Steps should be taken to ensure that the 60 percent target is actually met. From our estimation between an additional \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 would be necessary to approach that target.**
- 3. The university contribution towards faculty retirement remains at the low end of comparable institutions by at least a factor of 2 percent. This should be addressed, perhaps with a matching program of a base of 8%, plus university match of 2% for faculty contributions towards a retirement plan of 2%.**
- 4. The university should reconsider its salary target for faculty with an eye towards moving Loyola towards an 80% target within comparable institutions. A first step would be analysis to determine how much additional money would be necessary to produce such a result, and then consider a phased program to generate such additional salary increases over x number of years.**

Unanimous vote.

In support of the motion Allen Shoenberger (AS) said that Father Piderit once invited the provost of Boston College to explain how they had changed the profile of their institution. The provost of BC said that beginning in the 1970s they had set a goal to be at 90% of salaries.

The data presented was discussed in terms of skew with respect to a) long period of time for associate faculty in rank (skewing associate professor salaries up), b) lack of hires in the assistant professor level, c) tenure track vs. non tenure track, d) area of discipline, and e) the meaning of compensation in the various data sources. AS said that Loyola's

internal data tends to over-inflate the amount of non-salary compensation (tuition benefits).

AS said that then acting Provost John Fren dreis had offered to share internal data with the committee in order to rule out differences between data sources, but that no such sharing actually occurred. However, he then went on to say that with respect to the “shortfall” of money required to bring salaries to the 60% level the data of the acting provost and FC was remarkably similar.

c. Other

David Schweikart gave an update on the ad hoc committee on faculty leave. The committee has been enlarged a bit, picking up on a suggestion from Provost Wiseman to put together a white paper – will give some history of our concern about sabbatical, a rather complete description of the policy at inspirational institutions, and some Jesuit schools, and then rational for such a policy, and a proposed motion to be brought forward to FC, and then to University Coordinating Committee (UCC) if it passes. It is being sent around now and will then go department chairs and deans, and then to the faculty at large with some mechanism for feedback.

6. Question and Answer Period with the Provost Chris Wiseman and President Father Garanzini

Provost Chris Wiseman talked about the faculty convocation she is planning for spring semester. She would like to initiate a conversation within the university on the role of faculty in teaching first year courses, core courses, etc. at a research institution. She has also asked the Dean of Libraries to prepare a policy paper on the promotability of library faculty. She had a discussion with the executive committee (EC) of FC on sharing the deans’ evaluation function. The faculty handbook has been looked at and commented on by various branches of the upper administration and they are now preparing a unified document to return to the faculty handbook committee.

The bulk of the remaining conversation with the Provost and President centered on security issues related to individuals of the university community who may or may not present a risk to the community. Father Salmi is working on preparing a policy for emergency response and how to deal with students in difficulty. The report should be available in March. It is not clear how this report will integrate with separate initiatives at the medical center. The committee is considering how to separate mental health issues from disciplinary issues, how such issues can be referred to a committee, and how to allow or not allow anonymous reporting. The committee is investigating a common source of communication to be in place in the event of a lock down. Bernie Ward of security has suggested that at the beginning of the semester to have four students in each class program phone to receive emergency text messages. Father G said that this is the package the university is leaning toward purchasing since other institutions have shown a 60-80% buy-in by students and staff. The major issues is how to limit the use of the text messages to true emergencies to avoid “crying wolf”. Father G said that the previous procedure was to call the Wellness Center and to try and bring a student in crisis in, which is respectful of the individual student, but may not serve the safety issues of the

rest of the community. Stephanie Lighter from legal council is also working on this, along with people from student affairs, - liability issues related to identifying students. Each year we have more students on medications, and many stop taking medication because of side effects. We have more bipolar students

7. Reception – Guests Provost Chris Wiseman and President Fr. Michael Garanzini
4:29