

**Revised College Assembly Minutes  
March 14, 2002**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Thursday, March 14, 2002 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Father Leo Nicoll led the invocation.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Dean Scully announced that Catherine Wessinger had the application and payroll deduction forms for AAUP. Georgia Gresham announced the invitations for A&S Night would be arriving shortly for the production on April 18. Dean Scully announced that the Deans had put together a budget proposal to present to Father Knoth for an increase in next year's operating budget and faculty positions. Marcus Smith inquired about the Memorandum of Understanding between the Law School and the University. Dean Scully stated that he had not seen it, but it had been in place for about three years. Mary Blue stated that the memorandum would be renegotiated this year. Dean Scully announced NEH proposals for exemplary education projects. The deadline is October 15 and he would like to spend a significant amount of time putting the proposal together.

3. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – Dean Scully asked for a motion to put the following motion on the table: "The College of Arts and Sciences accept the following protocol for the establishment of the College Planning Team as a standing committee to be incorporated into the College of Arts and Sciences Handbook." It was moved and seconded that the motion be brought to the floor and tabled until the other two motions had been voted on. It was unanimously approved.

Dean Scully asked for continued discussion on the motion introduced at the February meeting: "Motion to Create an Ad Hoc Salary Distribution Task Force." Georgia Gresham asked if this motion was initiated at the college level how this would help us at the university level. Dean Scully stated that we needed to decide what was best for our faculty. Other colleges are doing absolute dollars. Lynn Koplitz questioned the Klemm recommendation and stated that it was not clear how their recommendation would be implemented. Mark Fernandez stated that it was his understanding that the President has used the Ad Hoc Salary Committee's report instead of the Klemm report. He put forth a motion to amend the main motion by adding the clause, "Examine different models for awarding merit raises including percent of salary and absolute dollar raises and bring a recommendation to the Assembly." The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The question was called and all were in favor. None were opposed. All were in favor of the amendment to the motion. The motion to amend was passed unanimously. Henry Folsie stated that it was the intent of the committee that processed the input from Klemm to get away from awarding salary raises on a percentile basis. If we do our calculations in secret and then come forward with the result of the computed percentages in absolute dollars then we are just going through a loophole. Eileen Doll asked why the two motions were not together. Dean Scully responded that they had had a committee which had been working on performance standards and they had not brought them to the College Assembly. It seemed appropriate in light of what had been done in the past year to go farther than that committee did. The Ad Hoc Salary Committee was mentioned because they had been involved in the past. SORC could be a good committee to do that also. Mary Troy Johnston stated that by the time the committee was constituted, the Klemm recommendations would have been implemented for two years. What was done at that time created other inequities and each year it adds up. It was motioned to call the question and seconded. All were in favor of calling the question to this motion and it passed unanimously. All were in favor of the motion. None were opposed.

Dean Scully asked for continued discussion on the second motion: "Motion to Empower the Ad Hoc Strategic Faculty Salary Committee to propose expectations of faculty performance

applicable across departmental lines.” Georgia Gresham asked if the departments would determine criteria. Dean Scully answered that the departments would propose criteria to the committee. If a faculty member has been outstanding, and is compared to faculty in other departments who have fewer accomplishments, then we need something to level the playing field for all departments. Lynn Koplitz stated that the motion did not say anything about departmental protocol and the handbook states that faculty are evaluated on their departmental protocols. Gary Herbert stated that the handbook has always given them the criteria that every department has to apply in its protocol. The Strategic Ad Hoc Salary Committee was arriving at criteria that would be applied university-wide, not college-wide. They needed criteria by which all members of all colleges could be measured. Laurie Joyner stated that the difficulty came in when they tried to look across departments for comparability. She did not think there was anything wrong with the current protocols, they only needed to be standardized. David Estes stated that perhaps the Chairs needed to be trained to do evaluations. Mary Blue stated that the protocols should be standardized. Lynn Koplitz stated that her department highly valued departmental service. Junior faculty believe that when they come here, but then, when their evaluations get out of the departmental-level, all of a sudden departmental service does not count. No one knows how much departmental service they do. Mark Fernandez stated that this motion was asking departments to define that and say where this is going to fit into the five-year system. Earl Richard asked if there were provisions for an election of new members and Dean Scully replied there is none – this is an Ad Hoc Committee. Gary Herbert stated that the motion proposed that procedures be set up that makes it impossible for any department to exempt itself from responsibilities or criteria in research, teaching or service that other departments hold themselves to. Mary Troy Johnston stated that it seemed like they were getting a far distance from self-government. If faculty are not productive, standardization is not going to take care of it. It would be healthier to have thriving departments that are self-governing and accountable to the Dean as well as the committees that the Dean establishes. Dean Scully stated that when you do an evaluation, it is a whole lot easier to say that everyone is meritorious and some people are outstanding, but nobody simply meets expectations because it is difficult for Chairs to say that. That is what he experiences when looking at Chairs’ recommendations. If he only used Chairs’ recommendations, some departments would get a lot of money and others would get a whole lot less. David Estes stated that he thought it was the job of the Dean to help the Chairs annually to make a fair evaluation across the department. Dean Scully stated that he did discuss evaluations with Chairs. Mary McCay stated last fall at the Chairs’ Retreat they had received a document about the point system. She stated they started using the document and then it disappeared. Dean Scully stated that Gary Herbert had explained why it did not suit our needs at this point. Because it was developed specifically to evaluate faculty here relative to other colleges, not something across department lines. It is very vague when you get above “meets minimum expectations” as you make distinctions. Maurice Brungardt stated that it is very useful to have the Chairs articulate what they view as “meets expectations,” “exceeds expectations,” “meritorious,” and “outstanding.” There is a tendency for members on SORC and for the Dean to look at what individual departments have to say in that regard. There is also the tendency for that to carry over to other departments. It would be useful to the departments and the college as a whole in terms of what we expect at those different levels. Mark Fernandez stated that there is nothing in the protocol that prohibits the Dean from stating the categories by which he wanted faculty to be evaluated on and charge Chairs with turning in recommendations that speak and defend those positions. Dean Scully stated that he did not sense there was a consensus yet. He added that it might be worthwhile having a meeting in the second Thursday in April. Georgia Gresham stated that the structure should be defined better. The committee should take this dialogue into account to determine whether this motion should go forward, or a different approach to the same issue. Mary Troy Johnston stated that she would like to see the document and suggested that the document that was considered at the Chairs’ Retreat should be circulated and considered. The question was called and seconded. Conrad Raabe suggested the motion be tabled until the next meeting and also suggested that the assembly get the working document. The question was

withdrawn and the motion was to table the motion. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Georgia Gresham presented the following motion to the assembly. The motion was to accept the following protocol (see below) to establish the College Planning Team as a standing committee that is incorporated into the College of Arts & Sciences handbook. Dean Scully thanked the committee for the work it had done. The motion was seconded. Davina McClain requested that the wording in the motion be changed to “will be elected by faculty”

A motion was made to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

## **College of Arts and Sciences Planning Team Protocol**

### **MISSION STATEMENT**

The College Planning Team works closely with Arts and Sciences faculty and university planning and budget committees to develop, implement, and evaluate the efficacy of initiatives to lead Loyola towards its goal of becoming a nationally recognized leading Catholic comprehensive university. The committee proposes initiatives that reflect Loyola’s commitment to the Jesuit tradition of educating the whole person with respect to faith, scholarship, learning, service, and justice as defined by the college mission statement.

### **THE COMMITTEE**

#### **Membership**

- 1) One representative from Social Sciences, one from Natural Sciences, and two representatives from Arts/Humanities are elected by the faculty. Elections are held in the Spring and completed by April. The runner-up in each of these categories serves as the automatic alternate, who meets with the College Planning Team when the elected representative is unavailable.
- 2) The Council of Chairpersons chose a representative and an alternate, both of whom are members of the Council.
- 3) The terms for these five representatives are three years (staggered following the first election so that there will be continuity) and renewable.
- 4) The Dean will appoint one representative each from SCAP and UPT. The Dean will also appoint an alternate from each of these committees. The terms for these ~~three~~ two representatives are one year, renewable. These appointed members serve until their replacement is appointed.
- 5) The Dean is a voting member of the committee.

### **STANDING RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### *Goals and Charges for the Committee*

- 1) Develop objectives and outcomes relevant to the College
- 2) Suggest college priorities to the Dean
- 3) Work with the Dean to:
  - a. Strengthen the College’s influence on the University’s planning processes
  - b. Strengthen the College’s influence on the University’s policy-making processes
  - c. Consult with members of select College of Arts and Sciences committees
  - d. Consult with members of select University committees

- 4) Work with the Dean to monitor implementation of action plans
- 5) Review outcome assessments completed by various programs and conduct outcome assessments of the committee's activities

## **OPERATING PROCEDURES**

- 1) The Committee holds a meeting in the spring following elections and selects a chair to serve a one-year, renewable term.
- 2) The Committee meets at least monthly during the academic year and at the call of the chairperson.
- 3) The Chairperson is responsible for setting the agenda of meetings, ensuring that minutes are taken and approved, following ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure during meetings, and communicating activities of the committee to the College Assembly.
- 4) Meetings are open to all faculty, staff, and students of the College. The Committee may invite other members of the university community and non-Loyola persons for consultation on business of the committee.
- 5) The Committee continuously reviews progress the College makes in leading Loyola towards its goal of becoming a leading Catholic comprehensive university as defined by College of Arts and Sciences Strategic Plan and other official planning documents.
- 6) The Committee continuously reviews, updates, and initiates goals and objectives of the College of Arts and Sciences Strategic Plan by working closely with: a) A&S faculty b) students c) members of other college and university planning and budgeting committees.
- 7) Since planning is an ongoing process, the standing College Planning Team calls for the formation of an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Committee every five years composed of representatives from throughout the College.
- 8) The Committee makes reports and presents recommendations to the College Assembly, ~~and~~ Council of Chairpersons and Provost at least once each a semester.
- 9) The Committee may propose changes in this protocol at any time in accordance with the College Handbook.

Approved by the Ad Hoc College Planning Team 3/8/02

Approved with friendly amendments by the Ad Hoc College Planning Team 4/8/02

Approved by the A&S College Assembly 4/18/02

MOTION: The College of Arts and Sciences accept the following (above) protocol for the establishment of a College Planning Team as a standing committee to be incorporated into the College of Arts and Sciences Handbook.