

**College Assembly
February 15, 2001 Minutes**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Thursday, February 15, 2001 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Fr. Leo Nicoll led the invocation.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Minutes of November 16 and January 18 were approved.
3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Dean Scully announced that Skelly McCay was chosen as one of the top 20 students in the country by USA Today. Dean Scully announced the great honor Loyola had received recently because Skelly McCay had been selected to the USA Today All-American Academic First Team. He asked the assembly to honor Skelly with their applause which they did.
4. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – Dean stated that he wanted to address how he determined salary raises across the college. He stated that he looked at the vitas, and the Chairs look at the vitas and made recommendations on salary adjustments. He has been trying to put the College in line with the University Planning Team suggested for a Strategic Salary System for the University. What that system suggested was that faculty who met expectations would get a raise equivalent to the Consumer Price Index and that adjustments be made above from there or below from there. The Consumer Price Index was 3.4%, so Dean Scully set a base of 3.6%. He looked over every updated Curriculum Vitae in the College, looked at differences from one CV to the next, and made comparisons. As he went through, he had to come up with guidelines to use in his decision-making. Dean Scully referred to the guidelines. Assuming a 3.6% base, there would be an adjustment of as much as 1.6% for truly exceptional scholarly activity. 1.4% for an average of one refereed publication per year over the past three years, and other strong scholarly activity, an adjustment of 1% if there were two refereed publications this year and other regular scholarly activity each year over the past three years, and so on. If there were no refereed publications over the past three years, he took a percentage off up to 1.6%. He did the same thing for teaching. The adjustment there was also 1.6% for clearly excellent quality, exceptional comments on student evaluations, average or greater numbers of students taught, high standing among colleagues, and excellence in creation in new courses. Dean Scully stated to the faculty that if they felt that there was material that they were evaluated on that they were not able to submit in the past for scholarly activities, teaching or service, he was going to give all faculty members the opportunity to add to whatever they had submitted. Dean Scully stated that he wanted to make the process more concrete. Earl Richard asked what the time frame was. Dean Scully replied that he planned to get the letter out that afternoon and a week should be sufficient time to submit additional information. Jane Chauvin stated that SORC had one week to process everything so the Dean would need to get everything by Wednesday evening. Leslie Parr asked Dean Scully if he was just considering referred publications or would he take into consideration presentations or created productions? Dean Scully stated that he was getting the recommendations of the Department Chairs. Bill Hammel stated that Dean Scully did not mention "books" under "research". Dean Scully stated

that a book published in 2000 earned 1.4%. Bill Hammel asked if one refereed publication was better than a book. Dean Scully answered that one refereed publication this year is 0.6%. Glenn Hymel asked about the -0.8% for presentations. Kurt Birdwhistell stated that "Grants" did not show up at all and they are refereed and asked if "Grants" did count. Dean Scully stated that they are one form of refereed publication. Mary Blue stated that she had directed Honors theses every year; there was no credit for that being shown and she would like to see that on the form. Bill Hammel asked Dean Scully where he was putting grants. Dean Scully stated that, if it was funded this year, he was counting them as refereed publications. Kurt Birdwhistell asked, if a person had a grant within the last three years, would that be adequate. Dean Scully stated that he would address each one on an individual basis. Mark Fernandez stated that Departments had written standard guidelines and asked why those guidelines weren't being used. Mark Fernandez also asked about "Teaching" and using student evaluations as evidence, adding that faculty had not been required to turn in these student evaluations. Dean Scully stated he had asked Chairs to request student evaluations from faculty and use them in their assessment of teaching. He had given Chairs the guidelines that they were going to use with regard to the percentages they had to bracket. Dean Scully said that initially he had decided only to evaluate research and service until a uniform evaluation instrument had been in effect. However, at his initial meeting with Chairs in January, they had argued strongly that they could evaluate teaching. Consequently, Dean Scully incorporated "teaching" into the guidelines.

In reference to Mark Fernandez's statement about departmental guidelines for raises, Patrick Bourgeois stated that it was confusing because some departments drew up minimum guidelines. So, on the college level departments' guidelines can't be used because some guidelines are more rigorous than others are. Dean Scully stated that the guidelines that Department Chairs used did not come up during his discussions with them. Mark Fernandez asked about the negative numbers. Henry Folsie stated that the system is based on the assumption that research and productivity comes out like toothpaste from a tube. Your ability to get rewarded is largely based on luck. If your productivity accrued at a time that the University had money, you would get rewarded. If your productivity was during low-budget years, you would not get rewarded. The whole cannot be measured as a unit of time. Dean Scully stated that was why he asked for all refereed activity over the past three years. When he saw no activity, he went back before that in the complete vitas looking for demonstration of activity. It is not unreasonable to expect some activity during this amount of time. John Biguenet stated that he wanted to support Dean Scully's approach since this was the first time there had been a retroactive examination of scholarly activity. Mark Fernandez asked Dean Scully if he was giving people credit for presenting on a regular basis. Dean Scully answered that if he saw no refereed activity in the past 3-5 years, then he at least gave people something because they were making presentations. He took the -1.6% (which was subtracted from 3.6%) and added back something to it. Gary Herbert stated that they had guidelines for distribution of salaries but they needed guidelines for implementation of those guidelines. Dean Scully stated that he was trying to give the people who did the most work credit for all they did. Earl Richard stated that once the guidelines are on the books, faculty could aim for those. Mark Fernandez stated that this is progress and he wanted to know how this is being implemented. He stated that in the past they had always evaluated teaching based on Chairs' reviews, so the instrument should be used starting next year. Dean Scully stated that he is relying on the Chairs to give feedback to him about the teaching in their departments. Georgia Gresham stated that things are done differently in different departments. John Biguenet stated that he thought it was a

good idea to have multiple indicators on effectiveness in classrooms. Laurie Joyner stated that there were a lot of things they agreed upon in the Strategic Faculty Salary Committee appeared here and the document that Dean Scully was showing was supposed to be used to compete for an additional pool of money from UPT. It was never her understanding from their committee deliberation that they would do this internally. It was always her understanding that they needed to go back and take into consideration all the difficulties of trying to quantify this across departments. Dean Scully stated that he did not use the committee's work. He stated that the Strategic Faculty Salary Committee did not address specific guidelines like those or percentages. Laurie Joyner asked if we had received any extra money. Dean Scully stated we wouldn't this year because we don't have a system in place. Kurt Birdwhistell asked if the other colleges would be getting extra money this year. Dean Scully answered that he did not know, but he had heard that there might be additional money for compression. Laurie Joyner stated that extra money for compression has nothing to do with the UPT recommendation. Gary Herbert stated that the guidelines the Dean had presented have nothing to do with what the Strategic Faculty Salary Committee was trying to accomplish. Dean Scully stated that we have to establish something across college lines in order to be able to get that pot. All he had was the pool that he had been given. Laurie Joyner wanted the faculty to understand that their committee did not set up a system for internal evaluation. Marcus Mahmood asked if Dean Scully intended to provide a breakdown to the faculty members. Dean Scully answered in the affirmative and stated that it was going back to each of the Chairs. Bill Hammel questioned "average or greater number of students taught". Dean Scully stated that he wanted to be sensitive to those departments that have large courses and are teaching large numbers of students. Laurie Joyner asked if they would get a copy so that they would know what to submit if they disagreed with the recommendation. David White asked if the base was 3.6% would they get "docked" if they were not average in research and had not presented on a regular basis. Dean Scully answered in the affirmative and added that demonstrable good teaching and service would enable someone to offset that. Mark Fernandez suggested the College pass a resolution to have this on the agenda early in the fall. Dean Scully stated that it was a good suggestion. Earl Richard suggested it be brought up again in the spring.

Skelly McCay made a Motion to bypass DSAC Recommendation #4 and change agenda to move Recommendation #5 up in place of Recommendation #4. The question was called. All were in favor of the question. All were in favor of moving DSAC Recommendation #5. Skelly stated that this would introduce some flexibility into the Common Curriculum. Nine hours of Philosophy and nine hours of Religious Studies are now required. After taking the Introduction to Philosophy and the Introduction to Religious Studies, students could then take three more hours than are currently required in either discipline and three hours less in the other discipline.

Dean Scully read DSAC Recommendation #5: "Students be given the option of exchanging one of their Philosophy/Religious Studies requirements for an additional course in Religious Studies." Catherine Wessinger stated that the Motion implies that Religious Studies and Philosophy are interchangeable and they are not. Georgia Gresham stated that this gives students the opportunity to have a preference as to what they want to delve more into at the advanced level. Janet Matthews suggested to add "Philosophy/Religious Studies Common Curriculum Courses" as a friendly amendment. Pat Bourgeois stated that he did not think that was necessary. Mary Blue asked what would be the benefit of the change. Skelly McCay stated that the students would be able

to concentrate on one or the other and it would be a continuation of one into the other. Gary Herbert stated that it could end up meaning that the students would have less choices. Mary Blue asked if students could use their Common Curriculum Elective to take an extra class in Religious Studies. Skelly McCay answered that it is possible, but they wanted to make it more available. Debate was suspended for lack of time.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.