

**College Assembly  
January 16, 2003**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, January 16, 2003 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 November 12, 2002 were accepted. Minutes of November 21, 2002 had one change. Minutes will reflect such change.

3. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – Dean Scully announced that all three sections of the recommendation had passed -- the point system, variable weighting and the mixed model for the allocation of the salary raises. He added that SORC would review the success of the system and make recommendations in the spring. Dean Scully then asked Lynn Koplitz to give a report on the recommendations from the Ad Hoc Salary Committee regarding equity, which she did. (See attached recommendations from the Ad Hoc Salary Committee.) A request was made to receive CUPA data and Dean Scully stated that he would send it out that same day. Mary Blue stated that her understanding of how promotion bonuses were built into the budget was that they based it on the number of people they expect to be promoted in a given year. If it would be possible to get promotion bonuses they never got, that would have to be advocated in the academic area and built into the budget. Dean Scully answered that what he and SORC tried to do with equity adjustments was put full Professors at the salary they should get. Mary Blue replied that, theoretically, they were given merit increases for merit in that given year. And, if they would be given merit increases, it would have to be advocated for by the Dean. Dean Scully stated that in the past few years he had been focusing his attention on getting the faculty an equity pool that was based on number of years in rank. He stated that he would be happy to advocate a mechanism that satisfies the faculty that everything has been done to demonstrate appreciation of the University for all the contributions they have made. Dean Scully stated that on number six of the recommendations he used 20 and suggested that they stay with 20.

Dean Scully introduced the Motion to Allow Assistant/Associate Deans to Continue to Serve Terms as Elected Members of College and University Committees. He announced that he had invited Laurie Joyner to be an Associate Dean in his office. She was on a few committees and raised the issue about her remaining terms. Georgia Gresham suggested separating the motion into College and University. It was voted on and 61 were in favor to split the motion, and 3 were against splitting the motion. It was moved to table the motion until the next College Assembly. All were in favor, none were opposed.

Craig Hood introduced the Motion to Revise the College Handbook to include pretenure review (see attached). He read, "Following three full years of service at Loyola University untenured will undergo a comprehensive review at the beginning of their fourth year. The purpose of this review is give untenured faculty a clear indication of their progress toward tenure and to offer constructive suggestions for improving their case for tenure. The materials to be considered should include all those materials that would be a part of a tenure application package with the exception of external letters. The evaluation process follows that of annual evaluations except that all tenured faculty of the department should be involved in the review. The College Rank and Tenure Committee will not review the material." Dean Scully commented that the fourth year that an untenured faculty member gets a renewal for their tenure year. What occasionally happens is that a department does not send a clear message of what is expected of a faculty member for tenure. Mark Fernandez asked if a positive pretenure review implied or ensured a positive tenure. Dean Scully answered that it never ensures anything. Mark Fernandez stated that he thought that the motion needed some language to that effect. Georgia Gresham stated that

that needed to be clarified. Steve Scariano stated that different departments could read the document differently. Dean Scully stated that in his experience departments don't like to make tough decisions before the tenure decision and tend to be more lenient rather than stricter. Nancy Dupont suggested that it be included in the document that the faculty member will receive the guidelines prior to the review. Craig Hood stated that the departments were reviewing protocols to ensure clear explanations. Simeon Hunter stated that he supported the motion as an untenured faculty member.

Dean Scully introduced the Extraordinary Faculty Policy which was a change in the faculty handbook. The Extraordinary Faculty Policy came out of the Provost's Council. Dean Scully asked the assembly to look at the policy and compare it to the faculty handbook. One thing that was missing from the handbook was responsibilities or policies regarding extraordinary faculty. It still had to go before the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee, but this was the time for input.

The Intellectual Property Policy was introduced by Dean Scully for development for SACS reaccreditation. He proceeded to explain the Works For Hire process. He asked the faculty to review it in detail. He described it as faculty friendly. Lane Savadove commented that he was not sure that his directors' union would approve it. He was asked to look into that issue.

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

**Recommendation to the College Assembly for a Salary Distribution System  
January 16, 2003**

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

(Part I concerning annual raises was passed in December 2002.)

**Part II. Equity Adjustments**

Since the fall of 2001, the Dean of Arts and Sciences has used CUPA data for our Reference Group, divided into quartiles by rank and discipline, to determine appropriate salary comparisons for ordinary faculty. The Task Force recommends that this practice be continued, with changes as described below, as a method to judge whether or not individual faculty salaries should be considered for equity adjustments.

Proposed changes:

- (1) As with the Annual Raise process described previously in Part I. of this System, SORC will review and revise this Equity Adjustment process annually.
- (2) Data for Loyola departments will be removed from all lists of CUPA data such that it is not included in determining quartile comparisons.
- (3) Outliers that are significantly low or high will be removed from the CUPA data set (see example on a following page). Note that exclusion of outliers must be done before quartile ranges are determined because it will reduce the total number of faculty represented by the data set.
- (4) The Assistant Professor rank will be treated as a special case since it is clear that the expected range for years in rank is six, and since this number is not conveniently divided by four in order to compare it with CUPA quartiles. By either (a) dividing the data into sextiles or (b) using a linear interpolation from lowest to highest value divided into six parts, there will be a range corresponding to each year in rank for assistant professors in every discipline.
- (5) The expected range for years in rank for Professor will continue to be 20. So, for example, an average faculty member who has been a professor for 8 years should be at the middle of the second quartile (1<sup>st</sup> quartile of salaries corresponds to years 1-5, 2<sup>nd</sup> to 6-10, 3<sup>rd</sup> to 11-15, and 4<sup>th</sup> to 16-20) for his or her salary amount. If s/he is below that level, s/he should be considered for an equity adjustment.
- (6) The expected range for years in rank for Associate Professor should be decreased from 16 to 12. The Faculty Handbook includes as one of the qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor, "...ordinarily a minimum experience of five years in the rank of Associate Professor..." (p. 4-4).
- (7) Since the most current CUPA data available is for the previous academic year, the values need to be adjusted for comparison with current academic year salaries. For now, the Task Force recommends that the values be adjusted upward by the appropriate Consumer Price Index percentage (this approach has been used by the Dean in the past). However, a detailed comparison needs to be made between these projected values and the actual ones when they become available. If this method of adjustment turns out to be biased, a new method will be devised.
- (8) Whenever special funds are to be distributed for equity adjustments at a time other than during the regular annual evaluation and salary negotiation process, the Dean will consult all departmental

chairpersons and SORC before determining how to distribute these funds. In order to allow enough time for discussions between the Dean, chairpersons, SORC and the faculty, there will be no less than one month between these initial consultations and the ultimate distribution of the special funds.

(9) This year, \$100k has been budgeted specifically for equity adjustments for the whole University (excluding the Law School). Some part of this amount will be awarded to A&S. Those funds will be distributed by SORC based on quartile comparisons of salaries with CUPA data and Committee discussions of individual faculty records over the past 10 years. If SORC determines that inequities still exist after this round of special adjustments in the spring of 2003, the Dean will be asked to seek further special funds for additional adjustments based on the needs specified by SORC.

(10) Most years, a separate pool of money will not be awarded to specifically address equity concerns. If the annual raise pool is sufficiently large (e.g. a salary pool increase that is substantially more than the CPI increase), a small piece of it could be held back to address equity concerns.

(11) CUPA data for our Reference Group should be made available routinely to all department chairs and to all members of SORC as soon as it becomes available each year (usually in July). It is the Dean's responsibility to make sure this information is shared as described. Note that our College Handbook states ([http://cas.loyno.edu/handbook/salary\\_oversight-review.html](http://cas.loyno.edu/handbook/salary_oversight-review.html)):

### 3. PROCEDURE:

- a) Each fall semester, after the Salary Scales and New Position Subcommittee of the University Budget Committee has acquired information about reference group salaries and compensation, that information, by rank and by discipline, will be provided to SORC and to the departmental chairs;

### **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 this year). For this coming year the proposed university budget includes \$50,000 for the faculty promotion pool.

The Task Force requests that these bonuses become codified as part of the Faculty Handbook. Also, they should be amended such that the size of the bonuses grows at the rate of inflation as represented by the Consumer Price Index.

## DETERMINING OUTLIERS

Outliers (data points that really don't belong with the rest of the numbers) can be identified (with 95% confidence for a normally distributed data set) by the following procedure:

- (1) Calculate the mean and the standard deviation of the whole data set (including any suspected outliers).
- (2) Add 2 x standard deviation to the mean to find the reasonable upper end of the distribution; subtract 2 x standard deviation from the mean to find the reasonable lower end of the distribution.
- (3) If the datum is outside this range, it is an outlier and can be dropped from the data set.

So, applying this procedure to actual CUPA data for 01/02 (not adjusted for inflation):

The lowest salary listed for one Chemistry Professor is \$49,950 with the next lowest value at \$61,231; the departmental mean is \$76,250 with a standard deviation of \$11,685, giving a reasonable lower limit (95% CL) of \$52,880. Clearly, this one value for one person is an outlier and should be excluded from the data set.

The highest salary for Professors in Communications is listed as \$125,350 for one person. This number is more than \$30,000 higher than the next department listed. The departmental mean for this category is \$75,511 with a standard deviation of \$15,702. The reasonable upper limit (95% CL) is therefore \$106,916. Clearly, this one value for one person is an outlier and should be excluded from the data set.

This procedure seems reasonable where the departmental data is for one person, and possibly also for cases where it is an average for 2 people. In cases where exceptionally high or low numbers represent 3 or more faculty members, it may be possible to judge them to be outliers if they exceed the 99% confidence limit. This range is calculated as above except that the standard deviation is multiplied by 2.5.

For example, the Assistant Professor category in Sociology lists the highest salary as \$65,183 and is an average for 3 people. The next highest value is \$55,229; the category average is \$45,604 with a standard deviation of \$6,102. The reasonable upper limit at the 95% confidence limit is \$57,809. However, the value in question already represents an average of 3 salaries, so maybe excluding this average is not appropriate. At the 99% confidence level, the reasonable upper limit is \$60,860. We might choose to accept this more rigorous test and exclude the \$65,183 value as an outlier. It is almost 2 standard deviations away from the next closest value as well.

# Handbook of the College of Arts and Sciences

## Faculty Evaluations

Salary negotiations include evaluations and rankings along at least three dimensions--teaching, professional activities (research, publication, etc.), and community service. All faculty members must be evaluated and ranked because of the Board of Trustees's stipulation that salaries be based on merit. These evaluations should be based on the criteria arrived at by consensus by each department on what constitutes a good professional and/or academic in that department. The protocol is the only official statement by the department on what level of performance is expected by each member of whatever rank or situation he/she holds. Evaluations must be in writing and signed by the faculty member being evaluated who may, if he or she desires, append a statement of exception.

The protocol is the only legitimate document, in accordance with the University Faculty Handbook, on which annual review of nontenured faculty should be conducted. Decisions on retention, promotion and tenure are based on this protocol. Therefore, clear statements of departmental expectations in general, but also by rank (assistant, associate, professor) should be stipulated. The annual review must be done prior to the Dean's recommendation on contract renewal for nontenured faculty. However the department decides to do its review (by chairperson, committee, etc.), that review should be communicated to the person reviewed orally and in writing and the written version should be signed by that person. The faculty member may file an exception at that time, noting points of disagreement, etc. These documents are then forwarded to the Dean who reviews them, interviews the faculty member, adds elements of his/her own knowledge, experience etc., writes his/her own evaluation, presents him/her with the evaluation and has that individual sign it. An exception may be filed at this time also. The total package then goes on to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who makes the final decision.

Following three full years of service at Loyola University, untenured faculty will undergo a comprehensive third year review at the beginning of their fourth year. The purpose of this review is to give untenured faculty a clear indication of their progress toward tenure and to offer constructive suggestions for improving their case for tenure. The materials to be considered should include all those materials that would be a part of a tenure application package, with the exception of external letters. The evaluation process follows that of annual evaluations except that all tenured faculty of the department should be involved in the review.

The chairperson should request from all faculty members in the department a list of their activities during the past twelve months in the areas of teaching, professional activities and community service. The chairperson should review this information, evaluate it according to the department protocol, and make recommendations to the dean for merit raises.