

**College Assembly
February 20, 2003**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, February 20, 2003 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Father Leo Nicoll led the invocation.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Georgia Gresham announced A&S Theatre Night would be March 14, Dean’s Reception at 7:00 p.m. and curtain at 8:00 p.m. Marcus Smith announced that copies of the “Memorandum of Understanding” were available. Catherine Wessinger announced that Loyola University would be hosting the AAUP Louisiana State Conference, March 14 & 15.

3. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – Dean Scully introduced the Recommendation from the Ad Hoc Salary Committee regarding equity. Lynn Koplitz reminded the assembly about the issues. Craig Hood stated that CUPA data had been valuable, and even though there is undoubtedly a general relationship of years in rank and salary, he did not know how other institutions fared. He added that it is wrong to try to position everyone on the assumption that there is this relationship and thought that numbers 4, 5, and 6 of the recommendations should be eliminated. Dean Scully commented that there is no information on specific salaries at peer institutions and the numbers of years in rank for the faculty with those salaries or the productivity of those faculty. The only way he could imagine he could estimate what an “average” faculty member should earn is to adopt some benchmark. He felt that years-in-rank was the best estimate. Lynn Koplitz stated that the committee had suggested that top and bottom outliers be taken off and Loyola should be taken out. She added that what they really needed was the data that matched individual salaries with the actual years of service. Conrad Raabe asked if the model had taken into consideration those faculty who had never received bonuses when they moved from Assistant to Associate, etc. Dean Scully stated that the model takes that into consideration. Dean Scully added he was not in agreement with changing the expected range of years in rank for Associate Professor from 16 to 12 and proceeded to explain, using an overhead, why the range should not change. Using CUPA quartiles for biology faculty, Dean Scully attempted to demonstrate that using 12 years to determine quartiles would mean that an associate professor with 12 years in rank would earn the equivalent of a full professor with 11 years in rank. Steve Scariano recommended taking out #10. The committee accepted it as a friendly amendment. Conrad Raabe spoke for #10, requested that it would remain, and Steve Scariano withdrew his amendment. Lane Savadove asked if there was a time limit on how long to use the CUPA data as the dataset. Dean Scully answered that there was no expectation on how long to use it. Dean Scully yielded the chair to Tom Smith and asked the assembly to amend the main motion and reject item #6 because he thought that it was appropriate to use 16 as the expected range for years in rank for Associate Professor. The motion was seconded. Steve Scariano moved to split the question, by removing item #6 for consideration at a later time, and vote on the remaining parts of the document. The motion was seconded. A motion was made to table removing #6 until the next meeting. The vote on the recommendation as amended was passed unanimously.

Mark Fernandez introduced a motion for promotion bonuses. “The Assembly of the College of Arts and Sciences recommends that the Faculty Handbook Revision Committee incorporate the practice of awarding promotion bonuses to individuals who advance in rank into the Faculty Handbook. We further request that the codified practice will require the size of the bonuses to grow at the rate of inflation as represented by the Consumer Price Index.” The motion was tabled until the next College Assembly.

Dean Scully introduced the motion to allow Assistant/Associate deans to continue to serve terms as elected members of College and University committees. Marcus Smith stated that he was

against it and added that he had no problems with Deans attending the meetings, but voting in many situations had been a conflict of interest. Davina McClain suggested letting Laurie Joyner serve out this term because there was time to elect for next year. A motion was made to allow Assistant/Associate Deans to complete the current year of their term. The question was called and all were in favor. The amendment was voted on and passed. A motion was made to allow the Assistant/Associate Deans to complete the current year of their terms as elected members of the College and University committees with the exception of CRTC and URTC. The question was called and passed. The motion was voted on and 19 people were in favor of the motion as amended, 17 people were opposed. A quorum was not present so the motion will go out for a mail ballot.

A motion was made to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 1:45 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 (1st quartile of salaries corresponds to years 1-5, 2nd to 6-10, 3rd to 11-15, and 4th 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):

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.