

**College Assembly  
October 19, 2000 Minutes (Revised)**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, October 19, 2000 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Fr. Nicoll led the invocation.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Mary McCay suggested that the College Assembly meeting start

at exactly 12:30 p.m. Peter Bernardi announced the Fall Yamauchi Lecture on Sunday at 7:00 p.m. given by Professor Earl Richard. Georgia Gresham announced A&S Theatre Night would be a 2:00 matinee on November 6. Craig Hood announced that Dr. Paul Erlich would be speaking on November 2 at Rousell Hall.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Held over until next College Assembly.

**4. OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

Skelly McCay read DSAC Recommendation #3. "We, the members of DSAC, recommend the following alterations to Loyola e-mail accounts: 1) The storage time for unread e-mail(s) be reduced from thirteen months to three months. 2) Student accounts be terminated three months post graduation. Accounts may be kept open or reinstated by contacting the Alumni Office. To offset additional costs, we recommend a one-time fee or monthly charge for alumni e-mail accounts." Patricia Dorn suggested that we should find out what the cost would be and maybe try to hang on to these e-mail accounts. Georgia Gresham stated that we would probably lose the marginal people. Earl Richard stated that since we don't know the cost, it is too early to vote and made a Motion to Table the Recommendation which was seconded. David Moore stated that the burden should be on the Alumni Office to collect a fee. Pat Bourgeois questioned if this was the right body to bring this recommendation before? Mary McCay suggested the recommendation be split in half. Mark Fernandez questioned if we had ever received notice that these e-mails were a problem? Connie Rodriguez concurred with Mary McCay to split the recommendation in half and stated that campus e-mail had increased exponentially. Connie Rodriguez also stated that in the past when Alex Eagle was the speaker for DSAC, he had taken this issue to Bill Cahill. Dean Scully stated that students had brought a perceived problem. We could accept the recommendation and endorse the recommendations of students. The question was called. The Motion for splitting the amendment was made and seconded. Debate? None. A friendly amendment was made to change the wording of the amendment. The question was called. All were in favor of the motion to recommend storage time of unread email(s) be reduced from 13 months to four months. None were opposed. The second part of the amendment recommended that "student accounts be terminated after three months post-graduation. Accounts may be kept open or reinstated by contacting the Alumni Office. To offset additional cost, we recommend a one-time fee or monthly charge for alumni e-mail accounts". A Motion To Table was made and seconded. All were in favor. None were opposed.

Vernon Gregson discussed the proposal for policy for joint majors and stated that it does not force anything. The Motion was to facilitate those that want to do it. Dean Scully asked if there was discussion. Craig Hood questioned #13 of the policy. David Moore stated we have not gotten this institution to recognize a second major. Dean Scully stated that during the time he has been here we have not made decisions on resources

based on the numbers of majors in a department. The strength of a program is how many courses are filled/offered. Mary McCay questioned if you have a second major, who is going to get the information generated on the student? Evan Zucker questioned the situation with departments that require comprehensive examinations. Vernon Gregson stated that that is up to the department. Evan Zucker asked if students needed to do both? Vernon Gregson replied that the two departments should decide what is acceptable. Georgia Gresham stated that in a joint program things should be taken that work together. A joint program is different from a double major where there are two advisors. One department needs to act as a home department and they both should come to an agreement on which department that will be. Mark Fernandez asked Vernon Gregson if he had discussed this with the Provost **to see if the proposal would meet SACS criteria?** Vernon Gregson said that the Provost did not express any disagreement. Connie Rodriguez stated that Dr. Danahar may not have said anything at SCAP but he will say something at UCC. She also mentioned that there is a page in the University bulletin about students earning second degrees and students who read this will not want a joint or double major, but they will want to get two degrees from Loyola. Dean Scully added that some of our students collect majors and minors. Paulette Schwarzfager stated that there are precedents and differences. Nancy Anderson stated that she doesn't see how this really helps. Julian Wasserman stated that what students get intellectually is beneficial. Vernon Gregson stated that students who will benefit are students who may not be sure what they want to do and structure is required for students' learning. The question was called and seconded. None were opposed. A motion was to endorse Draft Proposal to SCAP and to the Colleges to Authorize Joint Majors. All were in favor of the Motion. The Motion was passed.

Dean Scully introduced a letter from Father Knoth in response to the Motion from the College Assembly. Julian Wasserman stated that he didn't find this response adequate. He did not think that the letter responded to our concerns about administrators' salaries and evaluations. He suspected that a lot of people who had very strong opinions were not consulted. He doesn't think that kind of evaluation was really what the assembly had in mind. Another issue that came up in the AAUP meeting was that he said the committee that had been established by Father Knoth was perhaps an attempt at smoke and mirrors as a response to dull the force of our Motion. He had been told that plans to develop that committee had been set in motion before the College Assembly Motion was made, which may mean that that committee really wasn't a response to what we had asked for. Maurice Brungardt stated that we were looking for specific statistical information that allows us to compare various components in the university to some of our peer groups which is not what was in the letter. Vernon Gregson referred to two sentences in the letter: (1) "I will ask the same consultant to review administrative salaries and validate them in light of the general reference group we use for our faculty salaries." And, (2) "As we discussed last week, I would appreciate any materials or protocols you can collect regarding the evaluation of administrators and would be pleased to bring them to the Cabinet for review." Dean Scully stated that in his discussion with Father Knoth he said he was not familiar with forms to evaluate administrators. Dean Scully told him that he had been involved in this type of evaluation process at his previous university. Dean Scully has received faxed copies of evaluation forms for the Provost and Deans. Dean Scully asked if anyone has or knows of forms to evaluate Presidents, please let him know. In reference to sentence (1) referred to by Vernon Gregson, Julian Wasserman stated that the terms "review" and "validate" in the letter seems to beg the question. Craig Hood stated that we would feel different about this if the letter said "and publish the findings". He also questioned whether or not the

original Motion was sent to the various bodies other than Father Knoth? Dr. Scully answered that he had sent them specifically to Bernard Lee, Father Knoth and the Provost. Gary Herbert stated that he gave Dean Scully salary averages for peer universities by college, academic area and by rank and that we ought to be able to have something comparable to that for administrators. Mark Fernandez stated that our 1995 self-study contained a "should" statement that said that this university should have a discussion about the disclosure of salaries across the board. Maurice Brungardt questioned how much of the salary packet goes to various components of the university as a group? That information was available here in the '70s, but those categories have been obscured in recent decades. Vernon Gregson added that we can use these things to move things in the direction that we want. He did the comparison of administrators about five years ago at UPT. He took data from the Chronicle and presented it to the UPT. Earl Richard stated that the question was asked at UPT about administrative salaries and the answer was "yes" these salaries would be looked at. Dean Scully stated that that question was asked in the open forum when Father Knoth was giving an update on a number of issues. Mark Fernandez stated to Dean Scully that it was in his best interest to promote this issue. Julian Wasserman thanked Dean Scully for creating the committee for the model evaluation instrument. Pat Bourgeois asked about a Motion Of Order? Dean Scully stated that if a motion comes out of this it has to go before the faculty in general. Dr. Bourgeois stated that he would recommend reasserting the Motion. Maurice Brungardt requested information with some specificity regarding statistical and salary components. Georgia Gresham discussed the staff salary chart that she did not find useful. Dean Scully brought this up to Father Knoth who suggested that Lois Goldstein be invited to the Chairs meeting to explain it. Gary Herbert stated the recommendation should be that the faculty would not be satisfied without comparative data. Tony Ladd suggested a review of the total compensation package, not just salary. There are rumors about the perks that are part of the compensation of the administration. Pat Bourgeois mentioned that the procedure of choosing the consultants should be done using a committee. Laurie Joyner stated Father Knoth wrote a recommendation for a consultant that they rejected in the first meeting. He readily pulled the person and asked their committee for a recommendation and the representative for the Law School had the name of an expert who had served in several cases against universities across the country dealing with race and gender inequities. Their committee has had only one meeting, but in that meeting she and Earl Richard expressed the sentiments of the College Assembly in terms of not just addressing gender and race inequities, but addressing the compression issue, and the ratio issue of A&S salaries as compared to Law, Business, etc. Father Knoth said that's the purpose of these committees. Dean Scully stated that we want to make sure that whoever is chosen as the outside consultant is competent to do this type of analysis. Earl Richard stated that we want someone who has dealt with universities before. Laurie Joyner stated that we want a consultant to educate us about the "hot" issues because she and Earl Richard need to understand what the key issues are since they are going to report back to the College Assembly about progress being made. The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.