

HNS COLLEGE ASSEMBLY
September 23, 2008

Minutes

I. Call to Order

The meeting of the College Assembly was called to order by Interim Dean Mary McCay at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 23, 2008 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Attended: Anderson, Berendzen, Bernardi, Biguenet, Butler, Cahill, Calzada, Clark, Cook, Doll, Ewell, Farge, Fernandez, Goforth, Gossiaux, Henne, Herbert, Hood, Hrebik, Hymel, Kargol, Kelly, Koplitz, Kornovich, Li, Mabe, McHugh, Moazami, Moore, Moore, Mui, Nicoll, Nielsen, Philip, Ross, Rowntree, Russell, Sebastian, Spence, Tucci, Underwood, Willems, Yakich, Zucker, Wilson (non-voting), and Interim Associate Dean Hunt (non-voting).

II. Invocation

Rev. Leo Nicoll, S.J. led the invocation.

III. Approval of Minutes of August 28, 2008

Tabled.

IV. Announcements

- 1) Karen Reichard, Ph.d.
Director of the Women's Resource Center, Karen Reichard, invited faculty to visit the center. She offered space for meetings, work, and publicity on web pages and bulletin boards.
- 2) President's Open House / Parents' Shadow Day
Interim Dean McCay reminded faculty that Friday, October 3, parents will observe selected classrooms. Sign-up sheets will be posted on classroom doors, unless faculty contact Lynda Favret to decline.
- 3) Fullbright Scholarship Selections in Honors Program
Eileen Doll announced the formation of a committee to interview candidates for Fullbright scholarships. She called for volunteers to serve, particularly those faculty who were recipients of Fullbright grants.

V. Reports

- 1) HNS College Handbook (Craig Hood)
Craig Hood described the status of the handbook revisions interrupted by the "near-miss" hurricane. He said the committee was concerned that faculty members weren't engaged. He referred to his email requesting comments. He urged faculty to submit comments now and visit the Blackboard postings (Word, PDF and sections with comments). He said the committee will meet early next week. He mentioned that most edits came from CRTC late last spring. He cited recusal as an example of the need for engagement in handbook revision. He explained that because the handbook didn't include a recusal policy, a committee member may recuse on an *ad hoc* basis when a department member comes up for promotion. Dean McCay asked Craig to delay further comments until discussion of the related motion on the current agenda. She requested a timetable for the handbook revision. Craig proposed having a draft by next Monday and a vote at latest in November.

- 2) Provost's Council Meeting (Lynn Koplitz and Interim Dean McCay)
- Compression and Equity -- Lynn Koplitz distributed copies of a draft proposal from Vice Provost George Capowich, "*Initial Proposed Outline for Campus-wide Salary Study on Compression and Equity, 9/16/08 Draft*" (copy attached). Dean McCay commented on the meeting she attended with Lynn, Maria Calzada, and Provost Kvet. She said she wants to have CUPA data and ordinals (salaries without names). She reported that five HNS faculty were compressed at \$5,000 total, which she presented to the Vice Provost and Provost. They did not provide the increases; therefore, in salary calculations next year, she intends that the unfunded amount be included in the base. She acknowledged that compression was at the top as well, but proposed first addressing those at the lower end. Kate Adams asked about step raises. Dean McCay said there were none post professor; after 5 years, a faculty member may show accomplishments and apply for a step raise. Mark Fernandez emphasized the need for a shared reference group to determine equity, the fact that the university had identified a reference group, and his interest in relationships between salaries and colleges (e.g., business) with a shared reference group. He said he would bring the reference group issue to UPT and urged faculty to bring it to other committees. Dean McCay observed that Maria and Lynn had been well representing the college. She repeated that data for the whole university was needed.
 - Data Security – Dean McCay reported that computer security will be increased (e.g., encrypted laptops).
 - Initiatives Deadline – Dean McCay said that initiatives (e.g., campus events) should be submitted by Tuesday, September 30 to meet the October 1 deadline.
 - Maternity and Paternity Leave – Dean McCay reported that the maternity-leave clause recently revised by lawyers to include paternity leave had omitted extraordinary faculty. She confirmed with Lisa Alexander that both ordinary and extraordinary faculty members were previously eligible for maternity leave. She suggested to the Provost that the document not go to the Board of Trustees with the current wording.

VI. Old Business

- 1) MOTION (Kate Adams)
- Accept the document "HUNS Materials for Yearly Review and for Tenure and Promotion Packets."* Discussion: The definition of external reviewers was read aloud from the draft document previously distributed to the assembly. Eileen Doll asked whether external reviewers would be reimbursed. Dean McCay said that was not part of the motion on the floor. Maria Calzada asked whether the draft included a provision for someone going for promotion before tenure. Dean McCay said no. The designation "early promotion" was rejected as inconsistent with the handbook. Friendly amendment: Maria Calzada proposed a friendly amendment at Year Six: "*If a person applies for promotion before coming up for tenure, that person must provide external reviews as stated in this document.*" Kate accepted the friendly amendment. Move to call the question was made, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote, no abstentions. Vote on the motion was by voice. The motion passed unanimously, with no abstentions. Adopted document is attached.

2) MOTION (Kate Adams)

Approve the HNS Handbook. Discussion: Craig Hood explained that the committee memberships were given according to what existed on the web. He explained the need for odd numbers for voting purposes. Faculty questioned the proposed large size of the CRTC (10 + 1 NS, 1 H at-large alternates). Connie Mui suggested SORC as a model (3 + 3, 1 at-large). Dean McCay agreed. Evan Zucker stepped forward and gave background; he described the change from 3 divisions having 3-year terms to 10 departments having 2-year terms. Faculty questioned whether the proposed recusal policy would make the voting number even. John Biguenet expressed concern that a recusal policy would mean the committee would lose informational benefits and expertise. Barbara Ewell said recusal could include natural advocacy positions, but no vote. She said she agreed with Connie regarding reduced size. Mark Gossiaux said the chair could speak on behalf of a department member. Dean McCay asked whether the alternating at-large members would come from departments not seated; she recommended that at-large members be from unrepresented departments. Evan explained that the handbook's wording came from CRTC's varied practice. Lynn said she was on both CRTC and SORC; she observed that the odd number was more important on CRTC and it could be important to have someone from the department with confidential information in difficult cases. Craig said that although not written, he recalled the CRTC could call upon the department for clarification on an *ad hoc* basis. Kate said she favored the smaller committee, with recusals maintained for fairness. CRTC recusal was described as a culture rather than rule. Mark said a member may recuse from discussions and votes, yet be called by the committee, as are chairs, should questions arise. Thom Spence said he favored a small committee with recusal enforced, otherwise each department would need a faculty representative. Joseph Berendzen said that one individual elected by the college might misrepresent another; the chair should represent the department's view. John Biguenet said it would be better to hear from the chair rather than a department member who happened to be on the committee. Lynn observed that such committee members tended to "show" themselves, and the chairs were valued. Evan said there was no simple way to rotate to replace two-year terms. John Sebastian said he wouldn't want to go up in a year having a brand new CRTC and he would want experienced members. Maria asked whether a recused member would have an alternate as substitute. Evan said yes. He said a decision as to structure of the committee was needed. Dean McCay called for a straw vote on the following:

- *Seven-member CRTC (3+3+1 at-large)* – show of hands indicated a majority in favor, with two opposed, and abstentions not recognized.
- *Eleven member (1 per department, alternating 1 H, 1 NS)* – show of hands was inconclusive.
- *Recusal (to be defined)* – show of hands was inconclusive.

The college handbook drafts remain on Blackboard for comments. The motion was continued.

VII. New Business -- None.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT -- The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 P.M.

Attachments

HuNS Materials for Yearly Review and for Tenure and Promotion Packets

Each year departments will send recommendations to the dean for retention or non-retention of untenured ordinary faculty. These recommendations will be based on the department's evaluation of your teaching, scholarship, and service. You should provide your department each year with a portfolio that describes your work in each of these areas. The suggestions below will help you prepare for annual reviews and, ultimately, for your tenure application. They incorporate the requirements for tenure and promotion documentation specified by the College Rank and Tenure Committee (CRTC). They include additional suggestions to help you in building your tenure file as you move through the pre-tenure years.

Year One: Faculty member should be advised to begin a portfolio. Suggested contents:

1. **Listing of courses taught, with numbers and course titles.** Syllabi and examples of assignments strongly recommended.
2. **Listing of courses created, if any,** with numbers, course titles, course descriptions and syllabi.
3. **A statement about creative teaching methods,** online courses, linked courses, first-year seminar courses, etc. with examples of creative assignments.
4. **All student evaluations.**
5. **Letters from faculty visiting and evaluating classes.** In some departments, chairs or mentors will help you arrange these visits. One peer evaluation per semester is strongly recommended.
6. **Any collaborative research** with students and/or other faculty members.
7. **List of publications and conference presentations** for review by the department (the faculty member should be saving all publications and any letters from reviewers who have commented on them).
8. **Any grants applied for.** List those funded and not funded.
9. **Department, university, and/or community service.** This includes committee work.

Year Two: Second year faculty members must be reviewed twice: once in early November to determine a third year contract, and once in February for a fourth year contract. The portfolio should contain all of the above documents, plus:

1. **Listing of all courses taught in the second year,** with syllabi. First review will look at first semester of second year syllabi as well as all first year syllabi.
2. **Advising Statement** (if applicable). List programs advised for, number of advisees.

Year Three: Third year faculty should be well on their way to having a packet that is almost ready for the pre-tenure review in the fourth year. It should contain all of the above.

See college guidelines at
chn.loyno.edu/intranet/documents/GuidelinesTenure.Promotion.pdf
Provost's guidelines at
<http://www.loyno.edu/provost/documents/MaterialsforTenurePromotionetc.pdf>

Year Four: Updated packet from year three. This is the Pre-tenure review year. Although letters from external reviewers are required, for the full tenure application, they are NOT required for the fourth year review. The department should review the packet carefully to make sure nothing is missing.

Year Five: All of the documents from Year Four, updated. During the fifth year, the faculty member and other members of the department should provide the department chair with lists of external reviewers qualified to evaluate the applicant's scholarship. For the purposes of the College Rank and Tenure Committee, "external" will be defined as experts in the applicant's field of study outside Loyola. In the interests of impartiality, reviewers should be required to identify any relationship they may have with the applicant. The department chair will be responsible for obtaining no less than three but no more than six letters from external reviewers by fall of the candidate's sixth year.

Year Six: Tenure Year. The tenure packet should include all of the above information as well as copies of books and other publications. The department chair will forward the external review letters to the CRTC and will write a clear and unambiguous letter to the CRTC concerning the faculty member's past work and potential for future work and contribution to the university.

Promotion Before Tenure Year: If a person applies for promotion before coming up for tenure, that person must provide external reviews as stated in this document.

Initial Proposed Outline for Campus-Wide Salary Study on Compression and Equity

09/16/08 DRAFT (For Discussion at Provost's Council Meeting)

As part of the planning and budgeting process, the Vice Provost within the Office of Academic Affairs has been charged to conduct a university wide study of faculty salaries during the 2008-09 AY.

Units of Analysis: Two separate analyses, using the same methodology, will be conducted. One will focus at the institutional level and the second will focus on individual academic departments.

Methodology: The study will use an analytical model that is based on recent research on the subjects of salary compression and equity within academia.

Key Research Question Related to Compression: How does the existing salary ratio between junior and senior faculty compare to the ratio that would exist if all faculty were treated equally or were receiving the same salary return for measured productivity traits?¹

Five-Step Regression-Based Procedure:

1. Estimate a model for senior faculty salaries based on personal and performance characteristics.
2. Substitute junior faculty characteristics into the step 1 model to obtain predicted salaries if they were paid according to senior faculty schedule.
3. Calculate difference (residual) between each junior faculty member's actual salary and the predicted salary.
4. Calculate the mean predicted residual for all junior faculty (test statistic)
5. Determine the statistical significance of the test statistic. If no salary compression exists the test statistic will not be significantly different from zero. A significant positive residual indicates the presence of compression, while a significant negative residual shows that senior faculty obtain an appropriate increase in compensation based on their performance and productivity.

See Tables on next page for illustration of these analytical steps.

¹ The analysis of salary ratios to determine equity and the presence of compression is necessary because focusing on means between groups (e.g, average differences between junior and senior faculty; mean differences between women and men) or raw salary differentials (i.e., comparing salary differences between individuals or groups within disciplines) does not account for variation, is not able to attribute observed differences to job performance traits, and does not determine whether observed salary differences are too small or too large. (Oaxaca, 1973; Toutkoushian, 1998; Barbezat, 2004; Duncan, et al, 2004; Dharmapala, et al, 2007).

TABLE 1
SALARY DETERMINANT MODEL FOR SENIOR FACULTY (Step 1 Above)

Dependant Variable = Annual Salary

Explanatory Variables ²	Regression Coefficient
Discipline	---
Sex	---
Productivity	---
Performance	---

The senior faculty model is then used to estimate the junior faculty model (Step 2 above).

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE AND PREDICTED SALARY RATIOS (Steps 3-5)

Variables ³	Senior Faculty Salary	Junior Faculty Salary	Average Salary Ratio	Predicted Salary Ratio	Mean Residual ⁴
---	---	---	---	---	+.019
---	---	---	---	---	+.055
---	---	---	---	---	-.125
---	---	---	---	---	-.233

² One key element is measuring the relevant variables that contribute to salaries (e.g., performance, productivity, personal traits such as sex and race, discipline, etc.) This table is intended only as an illustration and does not contain all possible explanatory variables, which will be determined collaboratively with Provost's Council and faculty committees. The selection of variables that specify the model is a crucial issue because of the effects that model specification have on results (McCulley, et al, 1993).

³ These can include a variety of things such as College, discipline, sex, etc.

⁴ This represents the test statistic that is used determine significance using a t-test.

References

- Barbezat, Debra A. (2004). A Loyalty Tax? National Measures of Academic Salary Compression. *Research in Higher Education*, 45 (7), 761-776.
- Dharmapala, P. Sunil, Jay B. Ghosh, and Hussein M. Saber (2007). Market- and Merit-Based Adjustment of Faculty Salaries. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Operational Research*, 24 (1), 1-19.
- Duncan, Kevin C., Lisa Krall, Joel G. Maxcy, and Mark J. Prus (2004). Faculty Productivity, Seniority, and Salary Compression. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 30 (2), 293-310.
- McCulley, W. and R. Downey (1993). Salary Compression in Faculty Salaries: Identification of a Suppressor Effect. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53 (1), 79-86.
- Oaxaca, R. (1973). Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets. *International Economic Review*, 14 (3), 693-709.
- Toutkoushian, Robert K. (1998). Using Regression Analysis to Determine if Faculty Salaries are Overly Compressed. *Research in Higher Education*, 39 (1), 87-100.