

HNS COLLEGE ASSEMBLY
December 10, 2009 -- 12:30 PM
Bobet Hall, Room 332
Minutes

I. Call to Order

The assembly was called to order by Dean Jo Ann Cruz at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 10, 2009 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Attended: Adams, Altschul, Bednarz, Berendzen, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Bourgeois, Butler, Cahill, Calzada, Chambers, Clark, Cook, Doll, Dorn, Eklund, Ewell, Fernandez, Fiddler, Gerlich, Gossiaux, Henne, Herbert, Hoffman, Hood, Hrebik, Janz, Kelly, Kornovich, Mabe, Meyer, Mix, Moazami, Moore, Mui, Nielsen, Quesada, Randall, Rogers, Rowntree, Salmon, Schaberg, Schwartz, Sebastian, Spence, Tucci, Underwood, Wessinger, Willems, Yakich, Zucker, and Assoc Dean Hunt.

II. Invocation

Rev. Robert Gerlich, S.J., gave the invocation.

III. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 15, 2009 and November 19, 2009 were approved as written.

IV. Announcements and Invited Guest

Dean Cruz welcomed and introduced Ms. Gita Bolt, General Counsel. Ms. Bolt said that she would address the three topics provided to her by Dean Cruz.

- 1) Faculty Salary Disclosure: Ms. Bolt said that as a private institution, there was no legal requirement to disclose faculty salaries. She said she understood that HNS had self-imposed disclosure, as stipulated in the college handbook, which could be changed by assembly votes. She recommended providing an opt-out clause with no penalty to individuals. A faculty member observed that the disclosure was referenced in faculty contracts and asked whether a faculty contract is a legal document. Ms. Bolt said yes, a faculty contract is a legal document.
- 2) Title IX Workshops on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment: Ms. Bolt said that the first training module would be on sexual harassment, as required by EEOC. She said that optional modules would be posted on a calendar to sign-up for training in areas such as retaliation, sensitivity in the workplace, ADA accommodations, FRPA privacy, violence, and interview appropriateness.
- 3) New Federal Regulations that Require Syllabi, ISBN Numbers and Textbook Costs prior to Pre-registration: Ms. Bolt said that the textbook requirements were federal, and syllabi requirements were university ones. She said that the bookstore had already implemented the “e-adoptions” system to generate retail textbook prices (necessary for required, supplemental and bundled materials), based on faculty input of either the ISBN number, or title with author and edition. With regard to syllabi, she said that the Registrar’s Office was working with IT to facilitate faculty postings and that Ms. Kathy Gros would send a message to faculty. Associate Dean Hunt cited the timing problem with required postings six-months ahead for early registration. She asked whether faculty could make changes before the start of course. Ms. Bolt replied that changes could be made.

Ms. Bolt invited questions. In response, she confirmed that workshops would be live and scheduled during the windows, and that ADA stipulations would include psychological factors. A faculty member returned to the topic of salary disclosure. He asked whether a contract would stand as a legal document, with salary disclosure a condition of employment on the contract by vote of the assembly. Ms. Bolt responded that when the law doesn’t require disclosure, it sounds illegal, but she would have to look up the issue. The faculty member asked whether they were doing something illegal within the existing disclosure policy. Ms. Bolt replied that the current policy was not in violation of

law. As Ms. Bolt's allotted time had elapsed and she was due at her next appointment, Dean Cruz ended the Q&A and thanked Ms. Bolt for briefing the faculty.

After Ms. Bolt left, Dean Cruz suggested that a committee be formed before voting on salary disclosure issues. A faculty member suggested that a legal finding from Ms. Bolt on the 1990s policy was needed and that the issue could be democratically revisited every few years.

V. Reports

1. On-line Committee -- Dr. Bernard Cook.

Dr. Cook observed that Dr. Voigt had recently presented the topic to the assembly. He said that the committee, as established by the Provost, will attempt to establish norms and standards for on-line learning, review proposals after they have gone through the colleges, and consider how distance learning affects the institution's character. He said that questions regarding need, demand, and financial self-sufficiency will be posed. He said that if a position of Director of On-line Learning is established, then the committee's position is that the person must have a solid academic background. He said that new subcommittees and preliminary reports are in process. He invited faculty to contact him with questions and concerns. (Copy of Dr. Cook's report is attached.)

2. Operating Budget -- Dean Jo Ann Cruz and Dr. Maria Calzada.

Dr. Calzada presented slides (copy is attached).

She said that the data came from the Program Support Page in the Office of Institutional Research (<http://www.loyno.edu/oir/intranet/program-support-page.html>), and that the "Other" column was obtained by subtracting Faculty Salaries from the Total Budget column. She said she does not know what budget items are included in this "Other" category. Dean Cruz said that she had sent questions to Ms. Adrienne Blanco; e.g., what "Other" includes. Dr. Calzada said that a simple division by *FTEFac* reveals a measure of "Other" budget per faculty, and the college's "Other" budget per faculty is \$6,684. She explained that in contrast, the College of Social Sciences's "Other" budget per faculty (not including LIM, Nursing and Counseling) is \$10,311 and that similarly dividing the "Other" column by *Eqv stu 16* gives a measure of "Other" budget per student. She said this measure also reveals a skewed budget of \$572 per student in HNS and much higher numbers in other colleges (e.g. \$1,122 per student in Social Sciences, not including LIM, Nursing or Counseling). Dr. Calzada estimated the tuition revenues per student at \$12,769. Using this number, HNS student revenues are approximately \$16.5 millions, which represent roughly 65% of the university Total Budget. She said that it appears that our college is subsidizing other colleges' budgets, while at the same time experiencing severe budget constraints.

Dean Cruz distributed and read the following handout:

Recommendations Relating to the Operating Budget

- 1) *Recommended that, should the number of incoming students for the fall of 2010 be above projections, and, as a result, additional tuition revenues accrue to the University, those revenues fall to the academic budget and particularly to the operating budgets of the colleges.*
- 2) *Recommended that, in order to address inequities in operating budgets between colleges, the University set aside a certain % of any increase in operating budgets over the next five years to address operating budget inequities between all the colleges as well as those particularly relating to HNS.*

Motion to put the recommendations on the floor was given by Dr. Kate Adams and was seconded, for voting at the next assembly. Dean Cruz accepted amended wording to the first recommendation: Change "above projections" to "above 800 students"; and change "operating budgets of the colleges" to "restore operating budgets to pre-2004 levels of the colleges." Dean Cruz said that she would take faculty members' suggestions to the CPT and Chairs. The assembly requested that the CPT work on the language of this motion to make it stronger.

VI. Old Business

1. Indirect Cost Redistribution Recommendation -- Dean Jo Ann Cruz.

Dean Cruz reintroduced the four-point recommendation as presented to the assembly on November 19, 2009, distributed and recorded in the minutes. She said the recommendation was passed by CPT and the Council of Chairs (via electronic ballot).

Dr. Maria Calzada moved to approve the recommendation. The motion was seconded. A friendly amendment to change wording from “would like” to “request that” was accepted. Motion to vote on points 1, 2 and 4, while taking point 3 off the table was accepted. The revised recommendation was given for vote:

- 1) *The science departments request that the provost establish a committee on undergraduate research which includes previous successful P.I.'s from the sciences to develop a new indirect cost sharing policy including a description of how funds will be used to support undergraduate research and generate more funded grants.*
- 2) *We request that the policy to remain 50% to general fund and 50% to P.I. while the new redistribution policy is negotiated.*
- 3) *In the future, we request that major policy changes which affect undergraduate research should be reviewed by the undergraduate research committee and should be fully vetted by the deans and the faculty.*

Vote was by voice, with all ayes, no nays and no abstentions heard. The recommendation will go to the Provost's Office.

Tabled: *“The Science division is considering not including Indirect Cost in future grant proposals if a committee of successful P.I.'s is not established to discuss and negotiate a new redistribution policy with the administration.”*

2. Location for Salary Disclosure Data -- Dean Jo Ann Cruz

“That the College Handbook requires the Dean to make available salary-disclosure data in the Office of the Dean rather than delivering it to the library.” Discussion was brief. The question was called. Motion to vote by Dr. Barbara Ewell was seconded. Vote was by show of hands. Votes in favor were a majority. There was one abstention. The motion passed.

VI. New Business

“That the College Faculty Handbook provide an op-out clause for faculty who do not want to disclose their salaries.” -- Dean Jo Ann Cruz.

The item was not considered.

VII. Move to Adjourn

The assembly was adjourned at 1:55 PM.

Attachments:

Distance Learning (Dr. Bernard Cook)

Operating Budget (Dr. Maria Calzada)

Distance Learning Task Force
Bernard Cook, HNS Representative

Over 3.9 million students in the United States were taking at least one online course during the fall 2007 semester. This constituted a 12 percent increase over 2006.

The percentage growth rate for online enrollment far exceeds the 1.2 percent growth of the overall higher student population.

Over 20 percent of all U.S. higher education students were taking at least one online course in the fall of 2007. This was up from 9.6 percent in 2002.

Approximately one third of baccalaureate institutions consider online education to be of critical importance to the institution.

In 2005 Jesuit universities offered more than 50 distance degree programs from BAs to Doctor of Pharmacy.

The number of university students taking distance courses through Jesuit universities in 2005 was 51,000.

Movement toward distance learning

1. Geographic reach and increase student base
 - Reach location-bound students
 - Working students
2. Retention
3. Flexibility in meeting the needs of students
4. Additional institutional income

Loyola is already ahead of many others. We possess a strategic advantage as a result of:

1. Katrina
2. Blackboard
3. Faculty training

Distance learning at Loyola must complement our mission, identity, and character.

Compatibility with Jesuit values/Promote Jesuit values

1. Education of the whole person
 - Information
 - Critical thinking
 - Values
2. *Cura personalis*
3. *Magis*
4. Persons for others
5. Service of faith
6. Promotion of justice

*HNS College Assembly 12/10/08
Operating Budget Slides – Dr. Maria Calzada*

	Total Budget	Faculty Salaries	Other	FTEFAC	Other/ FTEFAC
HuNS	\$6,613,000	\$5,873,700	\$739,300	110.6	\$6,684
SS	\$4,557,800	\$2,927,100	\$1,630,700	65	\$25,088
BU	\$3,430,000	\$2,604,400	\$825,600	29.3	\$28,177
MA	\$3,478,200	\$2,702,500	\$775,700	67.3	\$11,526
LAW	\$6,863,500	\$4,071,900	\$2,791,600	40.3	\$69,270

SS* \$2,394,600 \$1,965,800 \$428,800 39.1 \$10,967

***No LIM or Nursing**

SS** \$2,104,500.0 \$1,739,500.0 \$365,000 35.4 \$10,311

**** No LIM, Nursing or CNSL**

University \$25,331,000 \$18,568,000 \$6,763,000 312.5 \$21,642

	Total Budget	Faculty Salaries	Other	Eqv stu 16	Other/Eqc stu 16	100%* "Revenue" Bud	"Rev" - Tot Bud
HuNS	\$6,613,000	\$5,873,700	\$739,300	1293.4	\$572	\$16,515,425	65% \$9,902,425
SS	\$4,557,800	\$2,927,100	\$1,630,700	848	\$1,923		
BU	\$3,430,000	\$2,604,400	\$825,600	415.8	\$1,986	\$5,309,350	21% \$1,879,350
MA	\$3,478,200	\$2,702,500	\$775,700	383.6	\$2,022	\$4,898,188	19% \$1,419,988
LAW	\$6,863,500	\$4,071,900	\$2,791,600	847.6	\$3,294		

University \$25,331,000 \$18,568,000 \$6,763,000 3,576.60 \$1,891

SS* \$2,394,600 \$1,965,800 \$428,800 358.5 \$1,196

***No LIM or Nursing**

SS** \$2,104,500.0 \$1,739,500.0 \$365,000 325.2 \$1,122 \$4,152,479 16% \$2,047,979

**** No LIM, Nursing or CNSL**