

**College Assembly
April 19, 2001 Minutes**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Thursday, April 19, 2001 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Bob Gnuse led the invocation.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Minutes of March 15, 2001 were approved.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – The A&S drawing was made for dinner for two at Commander's Palace. The winners were Steve Rucker and Maurice Brungardt.

Dean Scully/Evan Zucker introduced Lori Schultz who was conducting senior research about faculty attitudes toward grades/grading. She asked for participation from the faculty.

Questionnaires were available at the end of the assembly.

Dean Scully asked David Estes to give the assembly a brief update on the development of the A&S Strategic Plan which he did.

4. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** - Dean Scully moved on Mary Blue's Motion. Phil Dynia read his conclusions regarding parliamentary issues of last meeting. Dean Scully concluded that the Motion needed to be sent out for a ballot vote. The question was called. All were in favor. 57 were in favor of sending out the Motion to the College Assembly for a 2/3 majority vote to make the quorum for the College of Arts and Sciences Assembly 35 voting members. Seven members were opposed to sending out the Motion. Two members abstained.

Dean Scully asked Vernon Gregson to present the motion to reject some of the Dean's salary policies which are contrary to the faculty handbook. Vernon Gregson stated that one of the purposes of the motion is to alert the assembly to what was going on and that he was not speaking for the Handbook Committee or SORC. Vernon Gregson stated that the Motion was not meant to be a vote of "no confidence" in the Dean. He read from the second paragraph "calls upon the Dean to do all future evaluations." He stated that point had to do with the assumption that the current Dean would remain Dean and that the Motion would address how things would operate in the future. He stated that he also gave handouts that stated what the faculty obligations are in regards to teaching, scholarship, and community service. With regard to teaching, the Dean was interested in student evaluations. Most "teaching" evaluations deals only with what peers know, and that is new courses/content of courses, which was not the focus of the Dean's criteria. He stated that he was taken aback when SORC met to find out that they weren't the criteria that the Dean had set up. They immediately asked the Dean to send them out to the entire faculty and the Dean said that he would do that and did not. Vernon Gregson stated he copied Dr. Danahar about the situation and Dr. Danahar asked Dean Scully and Vernon Gregson to meet with him.

Dr. Danahar told the Dean that he had told all the Deans that he would prefer things to be done well rather than quickly, saw the point that these criteria were not being used and delayed the contracts a month so that they could deal with these criteria. Vernon Gregson stated that in his view the Dean simply kept to his criteria and the contracts

were just given out a month later. With regard to "scholarship", the Dean was only interested in published articles, not works in progress. Even works in progress in which the actual copy was presented were not accepted. He gave Bernie Cook who was working on an encyclopedia as an example. Vernon Gregson stated that he pointed out to the Dean that if he insisted that only "published works" be counted, he would effectively stop any books being written if no credit was given for the process. The only thing that would count would be articles. In community service the Dean wanted to deal primarily with work done for the University at the University. Vernon Gregson gave a personal example that he, as a representative of Loyola, was on the Medical Ethics Committee of Touro Infirmary which is a site for LSU Medical School's Research. He also taught Ethics as it dealt with the Gulf War Syndrome, and the use of fetal tissue transplants. The research included women, children and minorities. Over the last eight years he has dealt with practically any issue that there has been medical research on. He stated that not only did this make visible to the medical community that Loyola was interested, in a number of instances he was asked to write the committee's policy on issues. He added that when he taught Ethics it brought richness and concreteness that he did not know how he could have gotten any other way. Yet, this was considered "service" outside the university, having nothing to do with "teaching". There are things in each of these three categories the Dean is not using. The criteria that the Dean had were not known even by members of SORC until after all of this was done. Vernon Gregson stated that the whole point was to alert the assembly and to ask the Dean to follow the criteria of the handbook.

Dean Scully asked if there was a second to the Motion. The Motion was seconded. Dean Scully asked if there was debate. Gary Herbert stated to Vernon Gregson that he made a lot of good points regarding tweaking the criteria. He also stated that he did not agree that the Dean's proposal introduced new criteria. He stated that several years ago departments had been asked for guidelines for applying the criteria in the handbook. The question was asked at that time about what percentages the faculty wanted to apply to the areas of "teaching", "research" and "service" and, the Philosophy Department answered "33-1/3, 33-1/3, and 33-1/3." That said that the criteria should be uniform for every department. Back then, when every department was allowed to establish its own percentage, theoretically, that meant that any particular department could exempt itself from one category listed in the handbook. So far the dean is saying let's set the criteria, let's find guidelines for applying the criteria and let's make them uniform across departments. Admittedly, Dean Scully spelled out how he thought criteria should be applied and the faculty might want to make some adjustments. Gary Herbert thought the faculty should make some adjustments. But generally speaking, he supported the guidelines.

Maurice Brungardt said he was against the Motion. He served on SORC and he said that other members of SORC should state their opinions. He stated that Vernon Gregson had done a lot of great service over the years. He thought that the proposal was an injustice to the Dean, and did not represent the best interest of the college. Maurice Brungardt stated that his experience was that the Dean engaged them and discussed the issues in all three areas. All vitas were reviewed and revisited several times, he gave way on a lot of different issues, came back to the table, reconsidered, and made some changes. He took SORC's advice and suggestions in some cases, and in other's he did not.

Mark Fernandez agreed with Gary Herbert. Mark Fernandez stated that the assembly repudiated the Dean's original suggestion in February when it was presented. It was agreed at that meeting the faculty could submit their entire curriculum vita and evidence

regarding teaching. He stated that he wanted to speak against the Motion because at the February meeting the Dean agreed that the scale was only a starting point. There was obvious disagreement, and the Dean promised faculty that they could revisit the issue in the fall semester next year. He stated that he had served on SORC the past three years and this was the first real formula that he had seen. Mark Fernandez stated that a formal reprimand of this sort was not in order and we have already been informed.

Catherine Wessinger asked Dean Scully if he would respond to the Motion.

Dean Scully stated that the Faculty Handbook says that salaries are determined by negotiations between the faculty and the Dean. They are done in the College of Arts & Sciences with an intermediary of the Department Chair. The criteria for evaluation are Teaching, Research, and Service. He followed all of those. His intention was to move allocation of dollars to departments for distribution. He stated that he spent a considerable amount of time looking at every single one of the updated vitas in the college, including the full vitas of many of the faculty. He opened his door to meet with any faculty member who thought there was a problem with his/her particular salary recommendation. He met with about 1/3 of the faculty in the college. In several instances, he acknowledged that he had made a mistake. In one particular case, two pages of "service" were overlooked by him inadvertently because they were stapled behind the last page of the vita update form. He made changes as a result of this. In other cases he made no changes. He looked at faculty within a department and looked at faculty across department lines. He also plotted all faculty salaries in the Associate and full Professor ranges to see if there were any glaring inequities. He told the Chairs and the faculty exactly how he applied the criteria in individual faculty salary adjustments. Dean Scully stated that in his life, in academics, that had never been done. Evaluations were always "touchy, feely".

Jane Chauvin stated that as a member of SORC she supported what Maurice Brungardt had said. Initially she was very concerned that the criteria had not been distributed. SORC then asked to see the percentages in every category of teaching, research, and service for each faculty member. She felt that it was fair and truly a collaboration between the Dean and SORC and she supported any of those actions taken this year.

Vernon Gregson agreed that the Dean showed a degree of flexibility with SORC to get the salaries that were assigned. He stated the one thing he did not hear from the Dean was whether he was going to bring forth his written criteria in the fall so that the faculty could make alterations in light of their contract, because the written criteria of the Dean did not follow, and explicitly excluded, things which are in the Faculty Handbook. The effect of that was a skewing. An example of the skewing is the 1.2% for "service". Administrators get 2, 3, 4 and sometimes 5 times the salary of faculty for "service". He asked why "service" here was 1.2% and the other categories were 1.6%. He added that the Dean did show flexibility. In one instance he allowed one person to get 1.2% for "service". Vernon Gregson stated that he told someone who was chair of the senate for a year, if this policy is followed, the Dean has effectively made sure that no one from A&S will take the position of Chair of the Senate. By using these ratios a lesser raise will be given no matter how much work is done. He stated that he did not think that was where we wanted to go for the future and the Dean did not say that he would bring his criteria for the faculty to discuss in the fall. He added, that if Dean Scully agreed to make open the criteria at the first meeting of the fall which would give us time to discuss these issues before the evaluation of our salaries were determined, Vernon Gregson stated that he

would withdraw this Motion. This Motion was to call attention to issues and to say that, if the Dean was unwilling to do that, then we needed to recall to remind him that these are the criteria to be used.

Dean Scully stated that he was somewhat confused because he thought he had stood before the entire body and stated that he would ask the committee, which was appointed to develop the Strategic Faculty Salary System, to look into the criteria to be used next year.

Catherine Wessinger commended Dean Scully on all his efforts to develop an effective way to evaluate merit and stated she would appreciate him responding to each one of the points in the Motion and asked if the points accurately reflect his position.

Vernon Gregson stated that the points were presented to the Dean two weeks in advance with a request asking that, if they did not accurately present his views, he let Vernon Gregson know.

Dean Scully stated that there was a proposal sent by e-mail about three or four weeks ago, which was a motion to repudiate the Dean and that is not the Motion presented here. Dean Scully added in all cases in which he determined teaching evaluations he worked with departmental Chairs. When he had questions about that department Chair's evaluation of "teaching" or when a faculty member had responses which disagreed with the Chair's recommendation or his final recommendation, he invited that faculty member to meet with him to discuss them. When it was supported in all cases, he increased evaluations for teaching and reported all changes to SORC.

Dean Scully stated that all faculty are required by SACS to do annual evaluations and to report to Chairs how they used them to improve their teaching. He stated that he did not think that anyone could get tenured or be promoted if they are "outstanding" in service. Therefore, he thought it would be foolish to suggest that all categories are treated equally.

With regard to service, Dean Scully stated that he looked at balance in all things; inside the university and outside the university.

In the evaluation of faculty research, Dean Scully stated that in all cases he was looking for evidence of scholarly or creative activity that had been vetted by external peers. If that did not occur, Loyola would become an insular institution.

Denis Janz told Dean Scully that he was the first Dean who had tried to tell the faculty how he applied the handbook. No other Dean had done that. He stated that he was encouraged by the fact that there was a committee who would review how the criteria for evaluation are applied and will advise Dean Scully next year. Denis Janz stated that he was against the Motion.

Mark Fernandez stated that Vernon Gregson stated that he would withdraw the Motion if Dean Scully would agree to present the criteria next year at the first college assembly in the fall. Mark Fernandez stated that it was his understanding that Dean Scully had promised to do even more.

Earl Richard wanted to call the question. Steve Scariano stated that there is inequity in this college. That has to be addressed and he hoped that the President's Ad Hoc Salary Committee would be in a position to provide relief next year. Steve Scariano also stated that most of the issues SORC raised with the Dean were able to be resolved.

Georgia Gresham stated that she remembered that at a Chairs meeting Dean Scully was open to their suggestions and responses. He took them away and came back. The Chairs asked Dean Scully if they could have exactly what the criteria would be for next year by early August. She stated that Dean Scully has already responded that he would

Vernon Gregson stated that there was a difference between the Dean "letting them know" in the fall what is going to be supplied next year, and the Dean is going to "present to us for our discussion/motions" what the criteria ought to be. The Dean didn't want to give someone much in teaching because he stated he had gotten some complaints from students. There is a section in the handbook that stated that, if the Dean's Office has oral complaints, as soon as possible they are to meet with the faculty member. Vernon Gregson stated that he asked Dean Scully if he had met with the faculty member and Dean Scully said "no." Vernon Gregson stated that he asked Dean Scully if he was accustomed to making decisions hearing only side of a situation.

Dean Scully responded that in the case to which Vernon Gregson referred the faculty member had received at least ten e-mails and accompanying reminders from that person's chair that there were problems.

Mary McCay asked Dean Scully if the Strategic Faculty Salary Committee was supposed to set up the criteria and make recommendations. Dean Scully answered in the affirmative. Mary McCay suggested that the Motion be withdrawn until after the Strategic Faculty Salary Committee had finished. Vernon Gregson stated that he would happy to do that and asked Dean Scully if he would keep the assembly informed as to what was going on with the committee. Dean Scully answered in the affirmative and asked Vernon Gregson if that was a formal withdrawal. Vernon Gregson answered in the affirmative.

The motion was made to adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.