

## **Revised College Assembly Minutes November 21, 2002**

### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, November 21, 2002 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Father Leo Nicoll led the invocation.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Minutes of October 17, 2002 were accepted unanimously. Georgia Gresham announced that A&S Theatre Night was tonight and the performance would be “Women and Water”.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – Plus/minus grading policy was introduced and Julian Wasserman moved that discussion be closed. The motion was seconded. Dean Scully asked if the assembly would allow Mary Grace Stewart be given an opportunity to give a report from students which she did. She reported that students did not have enough information and were confused. The question was called and the majority was in favor. 48 were in favor of the motion to implement plus/minus grading system, 9 were opposed, and there were 6 abstentions. The motion would be voted on by ballot.

Dean Scully introduced a motion to accept the Ad Hoc Salary Distribution Recommendation from the Committee. Dean Scully stated that there were three major components and suggested the motion should be broken into those three major items. Dean Scully asked the assembly to consider the motion in three parts. the point system, the distribution of workload, and how dollars are distributed. A motion was made to accept the three parts. No discussion. The question was called. All were in favor of the question. All were in favor of the motion to break the recommendation into three parts. Mary Blue stated that the charge of the committee was to examine different models for awarding merit raises including percent of salary and absolute dollar raises and bring a recommendation to the Assembly on how to implement the KLEMM recommendation. Dean Scully stated that if these issues were not passed, he would do what he did last year. There would be a four-point system without weighting of teaching, research and service and he was inclined to use the mixed model for allocation of raises. Mary Blue stated that they were asking the assembly only to try the recommendations. Christian Brugger mentioned that in part “C” one rating was “meets expectations” and that another was considered “exceed expectations”. If we aspire to be a nationally ranked university, that would mean our contract would hold us to minimal expectations which is very high relative to the standards around the country. He added he would be in favor of a four-point system. Simeon Hunter suggested changing the phrases for ratings of 0, 1, and 2 by adding the word “minimum.” Mary Blue stated that average at Loyola is really above average. Lynn Koplitz explained total ratings for teaching, scholarship and service. Georgia Gresham also suggested changing the wording. The question was called and seconded. All were in favor, none were opposed. All were in favor of the five-point scale with the new wording.

The next issue was variable weighting. Steve Scariano stated that the faculty handbook mentioned teaching, research, and service – in that order. The history of this university had been that they value teaching at a higher level than the others so we should recognize teaching at a higher level. Dean Scully stated that this was the only section of the recommendation that he was anxious about. He learned recently at a CCAS meeting that Kansas State University had implemented a policy like this. He added that he thought there were a lot of subtleties that were not apparent and he was concerned that the college needed more conversations about the issue before voting. Julian Wasserman stated that their first duty is to the student in teaching. Teri Henley stated that this was an opportunity for faculty to maximize the weighting of teaching. John Biguenet stated that to increase teaching might diminish service. It was moved to accept the

variable weighting motion. The question was called on variable weighting and seconded. The motion passed.

The next issue was absolute dollars versus percentages. There was some discussion with Julian Wasserman adding that a little compression for the highest paid faculty is fine. The question was called and seconded. The motion to accept mixed dollars and percentages was passed.

A motion was made to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

**Recommendation to the College Assembly for a Salary Distribution System  
November 1, 2002**

Ad Hoc Salary Distribution Task Force  
Mary Blue, Maurice Brungardt, Jane Chauvin  
Mark Fernandez, Frank Jordan, Lynn Koplitz

**Part I. Annual Raises**

- A. SORC will review and revise this process annually in order to ensure the most equitable distribution of merit raises.
- B. Departments evaluate in three areas: **teaching, scholarship, service**. These evaluations will be based on detailed, explicit criteria stated in Departmental Protocols.
- C. Determine a **rating** in each area: The college will adopt a rating point system for evaluation of each faculty member in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service that includes:

Rating Points

- 4 Outstanding
- 3 Meritorious
- 2 Exceeds minimum expectations
- 1 Meets minimum expectations
- 0 Does not meet minimum expectations

Scores in increments of 0.5 are possible from 1.0 up to 4.0 (0.5 will not be used).

In its Protocol, each department will describe detailed, explicit criteria for faculty to receive these rating levels in each of the three areas.

- D. Use **equal weightings** of the three areas (sum = 100%):  
teaching = 34%, scholarship = 33%, service = 33%

**OR**

Use **variable weightings** of the three areas (sum = 100%):

- Ranges: teaching 30-50%
- Scholarship 30-50%
- service 20-35%

Weighting Factors

For the variable weightings option, each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be weighted appropriately for each faculty member over the ranges given above. All three weightings must add up to 100%. The default weightings for the college will be 34%: 33%: 33% (equal 1:1:1). Each department may determine a set of departmental default weightings that differs from the college values. Individual faculty members may choose a customized set of weightings (e.g. 50:30:20 or 40:40:20) within the ranges specified previously. Chairpersons will submit a set of weightings along with ratings for each faculty member to the Dean. Weightings will be negotiated at the departmental level by April 15 (by December 1 for this year). Weighting factors for a given calendar year may not be adjusted after they have been agreed upon at the departmental level.

E. Find **overall score** = sum of three (weighting x rating) for each faculty member:

e.g. variable weightings option

	<u>weighting</u>	<u>rating</u>	<u>product</u>
teaching	0.50	3.5	1.75
scholarship	0.30	3.0	0.90
service	0.20	2.0	0.40
<b>SCORE</b>			<b>3.05</b>

equal weightings option

	<u>weighting</u>	<u>rating</u>	<u>product</u>
teaching	0.34	3.5	1.19
scholarship	0.33	3.0	0.99
service	0.33	2.0	0.67
<b>SCORE</b>			<b>2.85</b>

F. Dean meets with each Chairperson to discuss/negotiate individual scores. Chairpersons present evaluations and report the results of these negotiations back to their faculty.

G. SORC/Dean review faculty evaluations and all scores, renegotiate individual cases where Dean's score and Departmental score differ; determine **final scores**.

H. Calculate annual raise based on final scores using absolute dollar approach for half the total raise pool amount, percentage for the other half of the total raise pool.

Absolute Dollars

Half the total available raise pool will be divided by the sum of all the faculty scores to determine dollars per point. This value multiplied by the individual's score gives the absolute dollars part of his or her raise.

Percentage Part

Half the total available raise pool will be divided by the sum of all the individual faculty scores multiplied by the associated base salary to determine dollars per base-weighted-point. This value multiplied by the individual's base-weighted score gives the percentage part of his or her raise.

I. Report all final scores and raise amounts to individuals (SORC/Dean to Chairpersons to faculty).

*Additional information and plans:*

**Part II. Equity Adjustments** (still under discussion)

In November of 2001, equity adjustments were awarded to selected faculty to retroactively adjust their 2001/2002 base salaries. In late May of 2002, a second round of equity adjustments were awarded to selected faculty to adjust their 2002/2003 base salaries. This money has not been part of the merit raise pool. For this coming year the proposed university budget includes \$100,000 for one more round of equity adjustments. The Ad Hoc Salary Distribution Task Force will continue to hold meetings in order to develop a recommendation for a process to distribute equity adjustments.

**Part III. Promotion Bonuses**

Over the last two years it has become standard practice for an additional promotion bonus to be awarded to individuals who advance in rank (\$2500 for assistant to associate professor, \$3500 for associate to professor). For this coming year the proposed university budget includes \$50,000 for the faculty promotion pool.