

**Special College Assembly
December 14, 2001**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Special College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, December 14, 2002 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Father David Boileau led the invocation.

2. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Dean Scully stated that everyone had been given copies of the recommendation of the ad hoc committee on faculty salaries. He stated that he had called the meeting to discuss the faculty's reaction to it. The recommendation had been accepted by the University Planning Team. He stated that he knew that there were strong feelings on both sides of the issue. Mary Blue stated that the recommendations were also approved by the President. Mark Fernandez stated that he was not so sure that he agreed with anything that came from UPT or approved by the President is necessarily binding on this assembly. He was against section 2.2. He passed out a white paper that he had circulated in his department. He created a hypothetical year with a 7% merit raise with 10% being the highest. He then projected how that would work over 10 years on a chart. He concluded if an absolute dollar model were adopted, the first year of the raise would be the best and every year thereafter would be less. Absolute dollar raises greatly favor management, because the University provides an 8% contribution to your retirement fund, and, if you go to absolute dollars that contribution becomes significantly less. When the cost of living goes up, it is measured by percentages. We need our salaries to be increased by percentages so we can continue to advance with the American economy. James Wee stated that cost of living is distributed through the government through percentages. Mary Blue gave a point of information that there are no more cost of living raises. James Wee stated that we are wrong by masking the concept of merit and equity within a cost of living increase. We are losing our purchasing capacity. If there are equity issues in the College, those should be made in terms of an absolute dollar. Merit needs to be separated from cost of living and needs to be separated from equity. Dean Scully asked if someone had a perspective that was different from Mark Fernandez's perspective. Edward McCaughan stated that his perspective was different in the sense that he thought the problem was not the way that merit was being determined, but the elimination of cost of living. If this proposal was still open to change, the more relevant issue was to put back a cost of living category separate from merit. He thought they should be addressing the cost of living issue. Laurie Joyner stated that she did not think that what Mark Fernandez has presented was even an option for them right now unless they discuss State's rights versus Federal rights. The percentage issue is not even on the table for discussion. Getting to cost of living, she agreed with Edward McCaughan completely. But, the web-based survey that Klemm completed that everyone filled out, revealed that in the College of Arts and Sciences seven out of 10 of them felt their annual increases should include cost of living. Nine out of 10 of them felt their annual increases should reflect cost of living and individual merit. She agreed and thought that this was a real issue where they did have some consensus. She thought that might be the more important issue. John Biguenet asked if the other colleges were different. Laurie Joyner stated "no", and reported the following total figures: A&S = 67% of faculty thought cost of living should be included, across all colleges = 67% of faculty thought cost of living should be included. She added that if you looked at cost of living and individual merit, 90% within A&S thought it should be based on those two things, and if you

look across colleges, 78%, still the overwhelming majority. Gary Herbert stated that Father Knoth gave faculty equity increases to eliminate the compression problem here at Loyola. If absolute dollar raises are awarded, it will create more salary compression which would throw us increasingly out of alignment with our peer group institutions. Mary McCay stated that the two should be mixed. You can't always give percentage increases. That creates too wide a disparity between the top and the bottom. At no time can you always give absolute dollar amounts. You can't just do one thing or the other; you have to do a mixture of both and you have to create a pattern so that you don't create the problem that each one of these kinds of things causes. She stated that they needed to create a mixture of absolute dollars some years and percentage raises in other years. Mark Fernandez seconded Mary McCay's proposal. He stated that the report that he had given out dealt with how merit should be awarded. He added that they had used a mixture in the last few years that had worked very well. They had used absolute dollars for equity adjustments and percentages for raises. He thought that was a good approach. Dean Scully stated that it troubled him that the University changed to a completely different system from what it had been using in the past. He had had a long talk with Father Knoth and expressed his concern about it. Out of that discussion came a compromise in which they could implement this type of approach: the idea of absolute dollars, but graded differently for Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and Instructors. Lynn Koplitz objected to that idea. She stated that a model could be created that combined both dollars and percentages that got distributed amongst teaching, scholarship, and service. Julian Wasserman stated that they were talking about salaries and equal merit, but they really hadn't talked about how merit was determined. This gets back to the ranks. He asked Dean Scully if Chairs expected more from a full Professor than an Assistant Professor and added that he had felt certain expectations because of his rank. Eileen Doll stated that perhaps they had some flexibility within A&S of setting up a cost of living increase and on top of that an absolute dollar merit increase. Mary Blue agreed that it was possible that, as a College, they could say that there was a certain amount that we agreed was for a cost of living raise. Although the Trustees voted to not add a cost of living component to the salaries budget. If we don't get cost of living, it causes compression down the line. Gary Herbert stated that the recommendations referred to using departmental-level reference school comparisons. There was nothing in the report about acquiring the data. When he talked to Laurie Joyner, he found out that the Klemm group said that when we were compared to our peer groups, our ratios of salary distribution were fine – that was totally wrong. The Klemm group never did anything to collect the data to find out what our real situation was with regard to our peer group institutions. Seems like we were comparing ourselves to “phantom” data. Dean Scully stated that the Klemm report was on reserve in the library. Steve Scariano stated that he was on that committee. What he had heard yesterday at the University Senate meeting was that this was basically a done deal. He had the distinct impression that the Klemm recommendations were going to the various colleges and responses would come back, and then action would be taken as a University on those things. He never got the impression that, when the committee had finished its work, that it was a done deal. He stated that it upset him greatly because no information was coming back up the line and any work he had done on the committee was of no use. Laurie Joyner stated that she had asked the question in their last meeting “how much wiggle room were Dean's going to get in their position” and she never did get an answer. Kurt Birdwhistell had gotten the impression that the \$5,000 merit raise in A&S was different from a merit raise for the College of Business and not worth \$5,000, but maybe \$7,000 in the College of Business and maybe \$10,000 or \$12,000 in the School of Law. So the idea that this

system was supposed to be “fairer” might not be if the same amount of merit at the Assistant and the full Professor level apparently did not apply across colleges. Dean Scully stated that it wasn’t clear to him either. However, he said it would give the Provost the opportunity to make equity adjustments across college lines. Kurt Birdwhistell stated that they could do that now if they wanted to. Dean Scully stated they could not because of the way the salary dollars were distributed. Dean Scully added that in previous years he had been given total salary dollars and worked up what he had been given to distribute. Steve Scariano told Dean Scully that he could have gotten more from the Provost because it was the Provost’s decision to give what is needed. Dean Scully agreed. David Moore went to 5.1 in the recommendations and addressed setting salary amounts. He added that whatever schools were brought into their calculations, we should have brought into ours. But he did not think that the issue would be reopened again. Earl Richard also addressed 5.1 in the recommendations regarding the fact that A&S spent time on using CUPA data and the other Colleges used the special accrediting associations to their benefit and A&S had nothing. Klemm suggested a cost of living as a fund which we voted on and lost. He stated that those were not their committee’s recommendations and he thought they should be challenged. Henry Folsie asked Earl Richard if he thought he was voting on something which would ultimately be presented to the College. Earl Richard answered “yes” because they were recommendations. Dean Scully stated that the recommendations were presented to the University Planning Team. Laurie Joyner stated that she felt the entire report and appendices should be put on reserve and they should have invited input. It was not clear that we would be able to change this. Laurie Joyner stated that she had had a phone call from Father Knoth. It was not at all clear how much room they would have to alter anything at this stage. Dean Scully stated that he would like to think that the faculty would give feedback to Father Knoth and that discussion would take place across campus. He hoped that a discussion would result in some recommendation back to the University Planning Team to reconsider it or to recommend more specific models or some other guidance. Laurie Joyner addressed the point of the recommendation of the combination of absolute dollars and percentages. “If you had read through all of the recommendations, there was a suggestion of a combo. We lost completely on cost of living.” But using absolute dollars for merit and then making adjustments of those appears to beat any inequities over time. That was in the recommendations. Maurice Brungardt stated that he thought it was very dangerous to move away from the percentage model since it was the only way to maintain control and have a basis for comparison. “If you are in it for the long haul, the percentage model is what’s going to do the best for you.” Lynn Koplitz stated that she thought a motion was needed from the assembly to tell them to stop. Mary McCay stated that the Law School is in the lowest quartile regarding prestige. The College of Business has a requirement of one article over a period of two or three years. The College of Arts and Sciences demands more from its faculty and A&S faculty gives more in terms of research, service and teaching. When it comes time for raises, other colleges always get more in terms of absolute dollars because their salaries are higher to start with. We ought to set something like the Law School and say these are our requirements and this is the money that we need to pay the people because we are the most important College in the University. We do all of the service courses, we do a good deal more teaching than anyone else and we produce a great deal more in terms of getting prestige for the University. Dean Scully stated that he didn’t know if that was fair. Guidelines that were developed by the ad hoc Strategic Faculty Salary Committee that were passed out in November were based on the other colleges and they weren’t very different. Francis Coolidge pointed to 2.2 “salary adjustment process should be based on absolute dollar basis.” He asked what

adjustment meant. He added that it could be construed to be about equity and everyone could merit a cost of living raise if they are meeting expectations. He asked what it meant in 3.2 “in the future additional studies should consider the relevant number and compensation of university administrators among reference schools...teaching, research, and service expectations among reference schools.” He asked if that meant there was data available for them to look at what comparable schools expect in the way of research, teaching and scholarship for a different level of rank. If so, that would be important to get. Dean Scully stated that he and Department Chairs had tried to get that data, but it’s hard to get. It’s not tough in Business or Law, but it is tough in Arts and Sciences. Francis Coolidge stated that they needed to do more work to clarify that. Mary Blue stated that Laurie Joyner had asked Father Knoth if the statement meant that an Assistant Professor in A&S and an Assistant Professor in Law who were equally meritorious would receive identical dollar amount increases and he said “No, because their targets are different and our goal is to get to the 50th percentile.” Mary Blue stated that that is one of the indicators in the U. S. News & World Report that will make our ranking go up. Mary Blue also pointed out that 1.4 is absolutely in opposition to the Faculty Handbook because it changes the relationship between UPT and SCAP to UBC and UPT. It changes the emphasis in salary deliberations from a faculty committee, SCAP, to UPT. She stated that if they let 1.4 go, they are letting the Handbook be violated. Gary Herbert asked who collected CUPA data. Dean Scully stated that he had until about the 21st of January when he needs to begin allocating salaries. Dean Scully stated that he would like to use a combination of absolute dollars and an acknowledgement that Associate Professors in general make more than Assistant Professors and that full Professors are expected to do more than Associate Professors. There can be some combination at this stage of absolute dollars and percentage adjustments in acknowledging that there are different ranges for Assistant, Associate and full Professors and that is what he wanted to use this year. He also wanted the faculty to come back with a recommendation when the Klemm report comes out and make a recommendation that the UPT reexamine this. Maurice Brungardt suggested they recommend that 2.2 be based on an absolute dollar basis. Henry Folsie asked if they needed to address that motion to someone. Dean Scully stated that it probably had to go to UPT. Georgia Gresham agreed that there should be a motion, but if it were presented point-by-point right now, it wouldn’t have the impact that it should. She stated that she would like to see a group of people get together to format the motion in strong language, so that it comes across as a strong document and not as if they were nit-picking. Earl Richard stated that something should be done about the salaries. He added that UPT would not meet for several months. He thought the whole document should be looked at in its entirety. Paulette Swartzfager stated that what has happened is the A&S has been “committeezed” and she wanted to urge the assembly to take a stand that A&S is the heart of the University. Lynn Koplitz agreed that the College of Arts and Sciences needed to stand up for themselves and take a leadership role. Henry Folsie stated that he took the recommendations to be recommendations and not policies. Dean Scully stated that they were recommendations of the ad hoc committee; they were presented to the UPT and the UPT accepted them. Henry Folsie added that as Mary Blue was reporting from the Finance Committee of the Board, Father Knoth interjected “It has been approved, it is policy.” Henry Folsie suggested that if the assembly wanted to change the implementation of this recommendation on this year’s merit raises, they had to send Father Knoth a letter today. Julian Wasserman asked Dean Scully what would keep him from going to Father Knoth and telling him that there are quite a few people in A&S that are unhappy about this. The question was called for the motion. Dean Scully stated that he did not think that he had time to get

something done by January 21 although he thought it was important that the College makes a statement that the recommendations out of the ad hoc salary group be reviewed and discussed in each of the colleges before any recommendations be accepted. That is the sense of what they needed to do. Mark Fernandez added "The College of Arts and Sciences disagrees with significant elements of the ad hoc salary committee's report and demands its reconsideration through the College Assemblies in the spring 2002 semester." Friendly amendment from Laurie Joyner to add "...disagrees with "significant elements" of the ad hoc..." Julian Wasserman asked Dean Scully to be their messenger to Father Knoth. Dean Scully stated that he did not think there would be any rejection, he just wanted to get something in place this year. The question was called. All were in favor of the question. None were opposed. All were in favor of the motion "The College of Arts and Sciences disagrees with significant elements of the ad hoc salary committee's report and demands its reconsideration through the College Assemblies in the spring 2002 semester. Laurie Joyner read from page 34 of the Klemm report, "changes to the salary adjustment process should be voted on by the academic faculty and should be implemented one year later to allow faculty sufficient time to adjust to the new procedure." Motion was made to attach the aforementioned sentence and seconded. All were in favor of the motion. It was moved and seconded to attach the sentence to the motion that had just been approved.

A motion was made to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.