College Assembly
March 20, 2003

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, March 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** – Minutes of February 20, 2003 were accepted. Results of mail ballot regarding asst./assoc. deans being allowed to complete current terms was passed by a 4:1 margin. Alexis Franks announced that DSAC was trying to create a culture of academic integrity on campus and would like to work with faculty and administration regarding problems with plagiarism. Craig Hood announced the Biology Symposium on March 28, 2003. Peter Bernardi announced prayer and fasting for world peace would be starting soon in the Peace Quad.

3. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS**
Dean Scully opened discussion on Item No. 6 of the recommendations from the Ad Hoc Salary Committee. Lynn Koplitz proceeded to explain that the average time full professors have been in rank is 12 years and used an overhead. Dean Scully stated that if someone is promoted in five or six years, an adjustment would have to be made that would be larger than $3,500 and an equity adjustment would be justified. However, Dean Scully suggested that some associate professors are never promoted to professor. He believed that, if 12 years were used to develop quartiles for associate professors, associate professor salaries would reach the second quartile for professors by the time the average person was promoted. What we are doing is arguing for when it is appropriate to give an equity raise. Lynn Koplitz offered a friendly amendment to the recommendation to have SORC look at both possibilities and see for how many people it would make a difference. That way they would be able to see what the model would look like for the years that go along with that salary range for Associate Professor using 16 and 12 years. SORC could then make a recommendation and the assembly would vote. SORC would be asked to report back to the Assembly in April. The assembly accepted the amendment as part of Part II.

Part III was considered by the assembly. Mary McCay asked if the promotional increase was applied before or after the percentage. Dean Scully stated that it was applied afterwards. The promotion bonus motion was read and voted on. The question was called. All were in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

The Handbook of the College of Arts and Sciences motion was introduced. Nancy Dupont asked about release time being given and what the decision was based on. Dean Scully responded that the idea was based on a part of the College Strategic Plan and it had been discussed in the Council of Chairs Meetings. Dean Scully stated that this year he would invite all faculty who will be going through their 4th year pre-tenure review and faculty who will be going through mandatory tenure review to a meeting to explain the process. Larry Lorenz stated that faculty coming in should be told what the requirements are going to be. They could start to keep files so that when the time comes they would only need to package their information. Catherine Wessinger stated that untenured faculty needed to be informed about release time. The question was called and seconded. All were in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dean Scully withdrew the extraordinary faculty policy because he had discussed it with the Chairs and it needed revising. The policy was tabled until the next meeting.

Dean Scully introduced the Intellectual Property Policy and reminded the assembly about its contents. Mary Blue suggested that the policy be forwarded to the AAUP legal committee for review and the committee's findings be discussed at the next assembly. A motion was made to remand the policy to the AAUP legal committee for review. The motion was seconded. The question was called and all were in favor.

A motion was made to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Recommendation to the College Assembly for a Salary Distribution System
January 16, 2003
(Passed as Amended below on March 20, 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.

(Needed equity adjustments for Associate Professors will be evaluated using both 12 years and 16 years-in-rank and compared. Using these data, SORC will make a recommendation to the College Assembly.)

(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 <u>substantially</u> 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.