

COLLEGE ASSEMBLY

JANUARY 29, 2004

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 29, 2004 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly and secretary was present. Rev. Leo Nicoll, S.J. led the invocation. This assembly was a rescheduled date of the cancelled meeting on January 15, 2004.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The motion to approve the minutes were accepted and agreed unanimously.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A) Intro of DSAC Officers

Associate Dean Thomas Smith announced the DSAC officers:

Speaker – Coby Nathanson

Speaker Pro-Tem – Salome Mallgren

Coby Nathanson announced that they are currently working on an honor code for the College of Arts and Sciences. Presently they have a rough draft that is being reviewed by their sub-committee. They should have a draft available by email to the Dean shortly, which will ultimately be sent to the A&S faculty.

B) Faculty Development Dialogue

Associate Dean Laurie Joyner said that part of our strategic plan in our College has been the focus of faculty development in the area of teaching and scholarship. This past semester, the Dean sent a number of colleagues to teaching and learning conferences across the country. Those faculty will talk about their experiences in a Faculty Dialogue Session, Friday January 30, 2004 at 3:30 PM in the Multi-Media Room II. Drs. Mary McCay and Melanie McKay will discuss their experiences at the AACU Conference titled, "Achieving Greater Expectations" and how we should strengthen liberal education in the 21st century. Drs. Donald Hauber and Maria Calzada attended the second conference titled, "Project Kaleidoscope" which is a national alliance dedicated to reform in teaching undergraduate math and various fields of science. Champagne and chocolate will be served. Dean Scully stated that strengthening liberal education is something that should hit home in this College and encouraged all faculty to attend. This will be a continuous dialogue in response to faculty issues that are important to the College.

C) Family Weekend

Dr. Scully asked the College for their cooperation regarding two areas of Family Weekend. During the Shadow Program, parents get to attend classes with their children. The Dean requested that faculty open their classes to that participation. He stressed that this sells the parents on what a liberal education is all about, as well as the quality of the faculty. It also helps to reinforce our interaction with the parents and convince them that this University is

everything they sent their child to Loyola for. The Dean also asked faculty members with study abroad programs to please participate in the Study Abroad Fair as well.

D) Response from Donna Fraiche on College Assembly Resolution

The response from Donna Fraiche, Chair of the Board of Trustees was distributed. The Dean commented that we are well into the search now. Mary McCay, the faculty member serving on the search committee was unable to attend due to other commitments but Dr. Scully said that we need a report to distribute to the College. Dr. Nancy Dupont, addressed that as Chairs of the Senate, she has reservations. She stated that she knew we started with Ms. Fraiche actually suggesting a few hand-selected faculty and went to an elected faculty member but she agrees that A&S does not have enough representatives considered behind the scenes. Dr. Dupont did express that she is pleased that we have anything at all. The Dean concurred that the faculty representation was not ideal.

E) Drama and Speech Production

Georgia Gresham announced to the College that the Drama departments first Spring show, "The Oldest Profession" begins on February 10, 2004 and she hopes to see everyone there.

F) Food for the College Assembly

Dean Scully asked the College for feedback on the food served during the meeting because the Dean's Office is no longer using Marriott services--the contract caterers on campus. The faculty commented that the food was great and were very satisfied with the selection and menu. The Dean further added that we are saving money and he believes the food is better.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A) Intellectual Property Policy (IPP) Report from AAUP

The Dean confirmed that we have been trying to get this Intellectual Property Policy on the table. The policy was sent to Prof. Dane Ciolino for comments, which was distributed to the College previously. Since the last College Assembly, the Provost sponsored a visit from someone in the North Carolina system who helped work out an Intellectual Property Policy for the entire North Carolina state system of higher education. The Dean noted that the copies submitted at the College Assembly are a revision that incorporates some of the old policy but tries to deal with a more general sense and feel, so that there isn't any contention about who is pushing for ownership over different areas. Dean Scully also stated that the best thing to do because it is such a large and detailed document, is to turn it over to a committee for a recommendation to the Assembly.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A) Motion to Refer IPP to a Committee

The Dean suggested a motion to create a committee with members of SCAP, UPT and CPT. Georgia Gresham said that the CPT discussed this issue and the consensus is that it would be too large a group and there may be other people in the College who might know more

about this issue. The CPT also recommended an ad hoc committee, where interested parties could nominate themselves or others could nominate them. The nominees would be reviewed by the CPT with an interest to be insured that all divisions are equally represented to deal with the different discipline type issues regarding the policy. In addition, up to two (2) members from SCAP, CPT and UPT be represented. Professor Gresham said that the committee should be small enough to meet and move this policy along quickly and efficiently. Ms. Gresham also voiced that it is imperative to have a balance between divisions. Paulette Swartzfager added that since this policy involves the interest of part-time and adjunct faculty as well, she moved to amend the motion to include a part-time or adjunct faculty member, who is not tenure-track, to be included on the committee. After discussion, the question was called for all those in favor to amend the current motion on the table. With a vote of **YEA 29, NAY 19** and **ABSTAIN 16** a question of a quorum was raised. After a recount, the motion to amend was passed and there was a quorum. The Dean then asked for any discussion on the main motion now that it had been amended. Dr. Mary Blue asked about the function of the committee. The Dean stated that the committee will take the two (2) documents and decide what is in the best interest of the faculty, get faculty input, and bring it back to the College Assembly for approval. Mary Blue then asked about the position of the consultant brought in by Provost Harris, since he is an attorney for UNC Chapel Hill; she is concerned about his position regarding this policy. Professor Gresham asked how the adjunct faculty will be placed on the committee. The Dean was not sure because if the College has an election it will probably not be until May before we look at this policy and he is eager to get this started. He added that if each of the committees select two representatives, he is confident that he can get the appropriate people on the committee. Paulette Swartzfager said that rather than have a College-wide election, have the selected members from SCAP, UPT and CPT select an adjunct faculty member, which Dean Scully accepted as a friendly amendment. The Dean assured the faculty that nothing will happen to this policy unless there is approval from the College but we need an Intellectual Property Policy in order to meet SACS guidelines. The Dean asked for any other discussion on the motion. With no further discussion, the questioned was called with all in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion: To refer the Intellectual Property Policy (with comments from AAUP and Professor) to a committee composed of two A&S representatives each from SCAP, UPT, and the College Planning Team for their recommendation to the A&S College Assembly. The A&S members of each committee will select those who will represent them. The tenured and tenure-track faculty will select an adjunct faculty member to represent the constituency.

B) Motion to Raise Pool of Faculty Salaries

Dr. Marcus Smith distributed copies of the motion as a new business item. He said that as a Senate Representative of the University Budget Committee (UBC) and sitting through the procedure last year, the UBC goes through choreographed steps to determine tuition and fee raises and then at the end of the process, salaries are discussed, and are usually capped by prior discussions. The current percentage for salary raises, on a merit basis, is less than inflation (CPI). Dr. Smith said that the faculty as a body is falling behind inflation, which is the reason for his motion and if you want a raise, you need to ask for one. Dr. Mark Fernandez addressed the College and said that at one time there was an accepted mandate to be 2% above the CPI, which was done away with when the University hired salary consultants. He said that one way to force the motion is that we return to that policy. Dr.

Connie Rodriguez said it is her understanding from the Provost that the Strategic Agenda will be presented this semester to the general population for approval one last time before it goes to the Board. Dean Scully said that the motion is not a bad one and comes at a very appropriate time because it was explained by the Provost about having a timetable that begins in November and is ratified by the UBC sometime in the Spring and then submitted to the President for approval before we meet in the Fall. The Dean did add a cautionary note that higher education nationwide is experiencing financial uncertainties, and that the number recommended may not be realized, but the recommendation is there and the sense of the faculty will be there, which is very important. Dr. Francis Coolidge said that it is important for faculty to put out what we think we deserve because we are competing with the Law and Business School. He said that if we keep quiet based on the well being of the financial condition of the University, then raises will go elsewhere. Fr. Rowntree said what is useful is that there are projections and numbers and to get the latest version and be able to see from the University as a whole, what sort of faculty raises were built into the projection. Dr. Kurt Birdwhistell said that anything under CPI should not be considered merit. Dr. Lynn Koplitz stressed that you can not hire new faculty and pay current faculty reasonable salaries that will keep them at this University, if this is what we are going to get for a merit pool increase. She said that the current process is dominated by everything else and the University merit raise pool comes last, which is completely backwards. Dr. Gary Herbert voiced that the College Assembly passed a motion about 10 years ago regarding this issue that until we reach a level of CPI it was decided that there would be no such thing as merit raises. He said that this was already decided, voted and the minutes were approved. Professor Georgia Gresham expressed that she feels that no one, including administrators, should get above CPI until everyone is above CPI. Dean Scully said that the problem with everyone above CPI is that the Board policy directs that raises be based on merit. Professor Lane Savadove said that 2% above the CPI is not anywhere in the ballpark of the top 20 schools in the liberal arts setting. He stressed that if we want a status of respectability within the liberal arts environment, the number need to be 7% to 8% above CPI. Dr. Scully asked to see the information on this. Dr. Fernandez suggested checking the Almanac in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* to see the average of Universities in our category to get a realistic number. Dean Scully said that this issue will not be settled today and will be voted at the next College Assembly. The Dean also added that he expected an additional allocation for equity this Fall.

A final announcement that there is a Town Hall meeting scheduled Thursday, February 5, 2004 regarding athletic scholarships. The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 PM.