

**College Assembly
September 13, 2001 Minutes**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Thursday, September 13, 2001 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Father Leo Nicoll led the invocation.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Minutes of April 19, 2001 were approved.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Lauren Campisi from SGA addressed the assembly in regard to the September 11th terrorism, announced collecting for Red Cross, and Soup and Substance on Tuesday. She asked that faculty address the events of September 11 in their classes because students felt strange that it seemed to be ignored and they felt they needed to talk about it.

Dean Scully announced that the Provost had implemented a process for developing a strategic plan for Academic Affairs, a strategic plan for the college, and that the plan would be presented next month. He stated that this was a very positive development. He also announced that the College Strategic Plan was almost ready. Dean Scully asked David Estes to talk briefly about the plans of the Strategic Planning committee. David Estes stated that the proposal would be sent to faculty the first week in October and discussed at the October meeting.

Dean Scully stated that college elections needed to occur in a timelier manner, and suggested possibly voting via e-mail. Georgia Gresham stated that there had to be an alternative plan for those who did not use e-mail. Mark Fernandez warned that returned votes would not be anonymous.

4. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** - Mary Blue made a motion to switch the agenda around and vote on her motion. Discussion was held on the motion to change the agenda. The question was called. 74 people were in favor of changing the agenda. Three people were opposed to the motion. Four people abstained from voting. The motion was passed to change the agenda. Mary Blue moved to change the quorum number to 35 at a College Assembly. Julian Wasserman offered a friendly amendment to provide for proxies if someone was away on University business. Georgia Gresham asked if University business would be a legitimate professional conference. Julian Wasserman answered in the affirmative. Bill Hammel suggested that proxies were acceptable. Conrad Raabe spoke against the motion because the legitimacy of the College's decision making would be impaired with 35 people making decisions for everyone in the college. Marcus Mahmood asked if any vote would have to go out to a general ballot before it was accepted. The assembly answered "No." Georgia Gresham stated that she agreed with Conrad Raabe's comments. Bill Hammel disagreed with Conrad Raabe and stated that if there were better attendance at the College Assembly, Loyola would have a more responsible faculty. Gary Herbert also disagreed with Conrad Raabe. Mark Fernandez stated that both Gary Herbert and Conrad Raabe raised good points and he would like to see them reach a middle ground. Henry Folse stated that for those who were afraid of the tyranny of the minority, the solution was to simply come to the meetings. David Myers

agreed with Conrad Raabe and stated that the motion took away rights of the people. Francis Coolidge suggested stipulating voting by ballot for controversial issues and letting less sensitive be handled by the assembly. Conrad Raabe stated that not showing up or “voting with your feet” was another way of showing your dissatisfaction of a situation. He reiterated the problem of a very small minority of people legitimating the decisions of the whole College of Arts and Sciences. The people who don’t show up may be proactively opposed to what is happening. Their rights are being deprived by reducing the quorum. Mary McCay stated that voting in a Democracy is a responsibility. Julian Wasserman stated that if you want to make a statement, you have to come to the assembly to make a statement. Lynn Koplitz stated that if someone did not like what was going on, they could still vote against it by sending in a proxy. The question was called. All were in favor of the question except one person. The motion stated that “The presence of 35 faculty at a College Assembly will constitute a quorum. Proxies for those on University business shall be accepted.” Mary Blue stated that the Senate by-laws state that proxies do not count toward a quorum. David Moore stated that he had a suspicion that our College Assembly by-laws already define what a proxy is. Phil Dynia read “proxies are allowed only for members teaching a regularly scheduled class that conflicts with the meeting time of the Assembly. The proxy must be submitted one working day in advance of the meeting.” Conrad Raabe asked if “proxy” meant general proxies and if he could assign his proxy to anybody for any purpose. A unanimous affirmative reply was given by the assembly. 45 people were in favor of the motion of the presence of 35 faculty at a College Assembly will constitute a quorum, 38 people were opposed. The motion failed to reach a 2/3 majority to change the by-laws of the college. Julian Wasserman introduced a motion that the College should reinstate minus grades. It was moved that the motion be tabled until the next meeting. All were in favor of tabling the motion except one person.

Dean Scully opened the discussion of merit in the College of Arts and Sciences. He stated that they were his reflections on how he looked at an evaluation. In his past experience, evaluations by chairs can be anecdotal or poorly substantiated rankings of faculty. The faculty wanted guidelines as to what they should be spending their time on and what the college thought was important, based on objective criteria and perceived as fair. Those that were being evaluated or rewarded for their merit knew why they were rewarded for their merit and proportionately for the amount of effort they put in. The guidelines need to be pilot tested and need faculty validation. The overall consideration in the proposal says that the weighting should be 35% teaching, 35% scholarly/creative activity, and 30% service advising. The reason is that when we go into a tenure/promotion meeting, we don’t reward people with tenure because they have done outstanding service and little or no scholarship or adequate teaching. We weight them unequally, whether we do it consciously or unconsciously. Some of what was proposed overlooked some parts of faculty activity such as attendance at graduation, and availability to students. Dean Scully stated he proposed that special consideration be made for faculty contributions which were not adequately addressed in the document, such as when a faculty member does something unusually good and needs an unusual reward, over and above what may be in the formula. That could be done by petition. It would be considered by Dean Scully and when he discussed these issues with SORC, it is something that SORC would consider. In the area of teaching, Dean Scully proposed looking at student evaluations. The student evaluations suggested that the vast majority of faculty were doing an excellent job. He

used graphs to support that idea. He also suggested putting 20 of the 35 points on the student evaluations and what they might say about the quality of a faculty member's teaching. He also put in five points for a chair or peer evaluation to acknowledge people for being outstanding. He put 10 points out of the 35 on curriculum development. Student evaluations aim to help evaluate the teaching skills of colleagues. A single annual evaluation should not be normative, but should be part of the data which might indicate a continuing weakness. Less weight should be given to the extreme outliers, both affirmative and negative, especially in small classes. The proposal was laid out to award faculty to receive greater than 30th percentile in all student evaluations in questions 9, 13, 14, and 19, and every course with positive student comments would receive + 20. Less than 30th percentile in even one course equals + 10. There are some courses that students might rank a particular faculty member significantly lower than others. Strong peer evaluation from at least two peers should offset that and a comment from the chair should offset this. Dean Scully stated that he had put a great deal of thought into this, but as any human document is concerned, there are flaws. He stated that he still had concerns about the things he was proposing such as how to identify serious deficiencies. Would evaluations with an additional five points based on anecdotal data be acceptable. Is curriculum of + 10 points of the 35 weighted too heavily?

In scholarly/creative activity credit is given for major activities over several years. The range of activities receiving credit was intended to be all-inclusive. They needed more discussion. Everyone is expected to do service/advising. The advising component varied by number of advisees. Dean Scully stated that he had met with several groups and appreciated the work of the ad hoc Strategic Faculty Salary Committee. Dean Scully mentioned that the chairs had suggested to him that perhaps the numbers that he had were not appropriate and don't really reward people for the work they do. The chairs proposed that there should be more flexibility and evaluations should be based on quality of service. David Estes asked Dean Scully how he planned to move from points that are totaled in the evaluation process to a dollar amount that one would receive. He asked if total points in the College be added up and divided by the dollars available for merit and then applied to each person. David Estes stated that last time Dean Scully had worked with a percentage system. Dean Scully stated that he would continue to work with a percentage system and an average evaluation got an average raise. Those with higher got an above average % raise, and less got a lower than average % raise. Dean Scully stated that he was waiting on the Klemm report to see what their suggestions are across the college. Georgia Gresham thanked Dean Scully for getting the information to the faculty so early in the semester. One of her main concerns was the qualitative versus the quantitative which she knew would be an issue. She told Dean Scully that he seemed to be moving in that direction. She wanted to see things more open. The numbers in the point system are rigid and based on beancounting. The system needs more input from the departments as set up by their protocol. She was pleased to have student evaluations, but she had trouble with the questions other than the four that counted towards the evaluation and the weighting of that section. Dean Scully responded that in order to evaluate one department relative to another, he had to have something to measure. Dean Scully stated that all chairs came to him as advocates for their faculty. There were differences across departmental lines that don't need to be there. Catherine Wessinger protested the amount of weight that Dean Scully had assigned to editing a book because she did not think that it was adequate. Patricia Dorn was in agreement with

Catherine Wessinger. Mark Fernandez asked for an explanation about maximum points. Dean Scully stated that for two technical reports, + 10 each would equate to + 20. Mark Fernandez stated that almost everyone had some measure of disagreement with weighting of individual sections. His suggestion was that the report be sent to the departments for responses which would allow for natural flexibility. He also thanked Dean Scully for producing the document. One of the reasons they had such a focused quantitative report was the movement to quantify was frustration in SORC and about the way raises were always assessed. The other was a suggestion was that if a better job were done in quantifying activities we would be allowed to compete against the other colleges next year for additional monies that were supposed to become available. Because of that they expedited the move to accept student evaluations of teaching and focused a lot of effort on categories of scholarship. Mark Fernandez stated that, to his knowledge, those extra monies did not pan out. And, if they did, they did not pan out in a competitive fashion between A&S and the other colleges. Mark Fernandez asked Dean Scully what happened with that because he felt misled. Dean Scully responded that his reply was the document being discussed and that is what the document was about. The document was not about the Strategic Faculty Salary System. Mark Fernandez stated that the Student Evaluation's of Teaching exist partially because they were promised a chance to compete against other colleges. Dean Scully replied that right now that is still at the Strategic Faculty Salary Committee. A proposal had been sent up to the Provost's Council and back. Discussion has been held and they needed to respond to that before it goes back to the College Assembly. He also stated that it was his hope that they would be competing for those funds. Mary McCay stated that all raises are merit raises and stated that last year Dean Scully had money set aside to deal with difficulties. It would seem that somewhere in the document it should be stated that, if a person does not merit a raise, the person does not get an equity adjustment because that, too, is a merit raise. She then asked what constitutes merit? She stated that she was speaking especially in terms of scholarship. The problem is that some of the best scholarship in the world takes years to produce. There was no place in the document where it could be stated that a person was working on something important. Dean Scully wanted to hear how other departments felt about that. Stephen Scariano stated that salary discussions were going on at the highest and at some point they would be involved with those discussions. They should take what was being proposed here very seriously. It should be brought into the departments, discussed, refined, and the document should then be taken forward. Stephen Scariano stated that Dean Scully's graphs showed that they were an excellent faculty and now he had quantitative information on it. If you took the inadequacies of the numerics that the Dean had in his quantitative approach and look at it, by and large each faculty member is still going to come out looking very good compared to other colleges. The Klemm Group has vindicated the statistics: that this College is one of the best as far as teaching and we have been slighted in certain ways. Davina McClain stated that under service "chairing one of the committees" had been left out as well as "referees for books". Dean Scully stated that that should be taken up with the departments. Julian Wasserman stated that sometimes one good article is better than two that are not as good and he would rather contribute significantly to his field. There was no qualitative component in the document. Kurt Birdwhistell stated that the document seemed to be setting the different percentages that would be evaluated for tenure. Patricia Dorn stated that the document reminded her of the I.Q. test which was not designed to divide people into segments, but to identify the people that needed the most help and provide help for them.

What they did not like in the old evaluations was that they got a comparative score: compared to your department, and compared to other people across the college. Teaching a large difficult freshmen class was going to score very differently and four of those questions were taken out and raised to the level of 20 out of 35 points. She suggested that, minimally, that they should go back to the departmental level. Francis Coolidge echoed Patricia Dorn's concerns about quality. And, republication is one place your peers can see when you have written something outstanding that merited being in print. He suggested that it carry more weight. Lynn Koplitz wanted to know what other schools experienced using this model, did it work or not, and how did they fix it, if it did not work. She stated that she thought we were primarily a teaching institution and she did not like 35/35/30. She thought that it should be 50% teaching. Kate Adams mentioned that the faculty handbook stated that 75% of our time has been defined as teaching which is 35% of the evaluation and that the document needed to be changed to show what being a professor at Loyola is.

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