Humanities and Natural Sciences College Assembly  
October 17, 2013  
12:30 p.m. – 1:50 p.m.  
Bobet 332  

MINUTES

I. Call to Order  
The assembly was called to order at 12:35 p.m. by Dean Maria Calzada in Bobet Hall 332.  
Attended: Adams, Allison, Altschul, Anderson, Bednarz, Berendzen, Biguenet, Biswas, Brazier, Brungardt, Butler, Buzard-Boyett, Chambers, Chauvin, Corbin, Dewell, Doll, Eggers, Eklund, Fernandez, Goodine, Gossiaux, Gruber, Hienecke, Henne, Howard, Kargol, Kelly, Kahn, Khan, Koplitz, Kornovich, Kuelman, Leland, Li, McCay, McHugh, Melancon, Murphy, Neuberger, Nichols, Peterson, Quesada, Rosenbecker, Rupakheti, Saxton, Schaberg, Sebastian, Shanata, Stephenson, Tan, Thibodeaux, Thum, Tucci, Underwood, Vacek, Villarreal, Willems, Zucker, (student rep), and Associate Dean Hunt.

II. Invocation  
The invocation was given by Dr. Sylvester Tan, S.J.

III. Approval of Minutes  
The minutes of September 19, 2013 were approved as written, with one abstention.

IV. Announcements  
1. Dean Calzada announced 10/22 or 10/24 Sexual Harassment Sessions are required of all employees held at 12:30 in 114 Miller Hall.  
2. Jane Chauvin announced BESE gave final approval of Loyola’s proposed Secondary School Teacher’s Certification, remarking how impressed they were by the cooperation of every Chair. Classes will begin in the spring, the web site will be up on Monday and PR will be released on Friday and Monday.  
3. Mary Brazier reported that Glenn Hymel’s recovery is coming along and he hopes to return to work next week.  
4. Uriel Quesada announced 11/6 student capstone lecture “A Night in Brazil” on Antonio Carlos Jobin and a 11/18 panel on the Changing Face of Latin America.  
5. Ashley Howard announced a screening and panel discussion of “Herman’s House” tonight in Nunemaker.  
6. Oct. 17, Prof. Jon Garthoff will talk on "Decomposing Legal Personhood."
7. Sylvester Tan announced Judith Rock will speak on “Learning from Muscle, Blood and Bone: The Eloquent Body and the Jesuit Ballets” on 10/24. She will also lead a dance movement workshop on 10/23.  
8. Karen Rosenbecker announced a new major and minor track will be added to Classical Studies.

V. Old Business

1. Faculty Handbook Changes – Dean Calzada
   Faculty Evaluation changes were approved. Pre-Health Professions Board changes were approved with corrections.

2. SORC – Lynn Koplitz and Dean Calzada
   Dr. Lynn Koplitz and Dean Calzada presented the 2002 Ad Hoc Task Force data to continue discussion of SORC from last month’s Assembly. They showed a graph with the distribution of 2009 SORC scores with “more variability than some faculty may assume,” and a scatterplot of the 2009 merit raises versus SORC scores (3% raise) and two other hypothetical raises (1% and 6%). The hypothetical example of 1% showed flat merit increases (not much difference among the different scores), while the 6% showed differential raises for the different SORC scores. Dean Calzada presented three possible motions for the Assembly to consider. The question was raised as to whether the rating system might also be examined. Several comments were made about the relative weight of published articles, books and service work. Discussion of the process used by other schools raised the question of how the Business School evaluates faculty raises and Dean Calzada agreed to find out. Discussion emphasized the usefulness of SORC scores to leverage for equity raises and questioned if proposed three year cycle would shortchange the faculty, especially since, as the largest college, HNS need for data is crucial. Dean Calzada explained that leverage for equity raises should come from external comparisons (CUPA data) and that the distribution of the equity raise pool uses the SORC scores. Concern was voiced that without yearly reviews SORC would fall apart.

   Motion #1 was made, with the change of replacing the trigger for SORC reviews to a 2% raise pool or every three years, whichever comes first. Motion #1 was seconded. Motion #1 reads: “The SORC review process will happen whenever the salary raise pool is at least 2% or every three years, whichever comes first. SORC reviews will be cumulative, including all years without a review. The Assembly will consider this again in a year.” The Assembly will consider this motion at the November meeting.

   Motions #2 was proposed and seconded. Motion #2 reads: The Assembly directs SORC to review its processes and present a motion with proposed revisions to the Assembly no later than March 2014.” The Assembly will consider this motion at the November meeting.

   Motion #3 was proposed and seconded. Motion #3 reads: “On years with salary raise pools less than 2%, ordinary faculty raises will be a mixed model, 50% fixed and 50% percentage based.” This motion will also be considered at the November meeting.
VIII. Move to Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Attachments (2)
Attachment 1

10/25/2013

Review of Findings and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Salary Task Force

17 October 2002

Mary Blue (Communications)
Maurice Brungardi (History)
Jane Chauvin (Education)
Mark Fernandez (History)
Frank Jordan (Biological Sciences)
Lynn Koplia (Chemistry)
Dean Frank Scully (Ex Officio)

Charge of the Ad Hoc Salary Task Force

Examine different models for awarding merit raises including percent of salary and absolute dollar raises and bring a recommendation to the Assembly on how to implement the Klemm Committee recommendations.

and

Develop models of determining compression and appropriate faculty salaries in different disciplines and bring a recommendation to the College.
Problem:

The final model used to award merit raises must be periodically evaluated and tweaked to ensure that it is fair and equitable.

Recommendation:

The College will form an Ad Hoc Salary Task Force of six faculty members at least once every three years to evaluate the fairness and equity of the model used to award merit raises to faculty.

Problem:

Should evaluation scores used in the model provide more resolution among faculty and should a zero be a zero?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College will adopt a point system for evaluation of faculty in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service that includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Outstanding</td>
<td>4 Outstanding</td>
<td>4 Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Meritorious</td>
<td>3 Meritorious</td>
<td>3 Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Exceeds</td>
<td>2 Exceeds</td>
<td>2 Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Meets</td>
<td>1 Meets</td>
<td>1 Does not meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Does not meet</td>
<td>0 Does not meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem:

How should the model be weighted to reflect the amount of time faculty spend in teaching, research, and service?

**Alternative 1**

The college will evaluate faculty for merit raises using equal weighting of teaching, research, and service.

**Alternative 2**

The College will evaluate faculty for merit raises with variable weighting of teaching (30-50%), research (30-50%), and service (10-20%) that will be negotiated between the faculty member, the chair, and the dean.
What do faculty think about %, $, or 50/50?

- Percentage: 45
- Dollar: 9
- 50/50 hybrid: 46
- Something else: 3

N=35 Blackboard and email respondents
Attachment 2
Report on SORC

Distribution of SORC scores

SORC SCORES IN 2009

Count
How does available pool affect raises

Raise Pool Comparison on 2009 SORC Data

Possible motions

1. The SORC review process will happen whenever the salary raise pool is at 2% year or every three years, whichever comes first. The SORC reviews will be cumulative, including all years without a review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>C.Y.A. (Year)</th>
<th>Next Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent Increase give the dollar amount the College has to distribute that year.
Possible motions

2. The Assembly directs SORC to review its processes and present a motion with proposed revisions to the Assembly no later than March 2014.

Possible motions

3. On years with salary raise pools less than the C.P.I. or less than 1.5% ordinary faculty raises will be
   a. 1. a fixed dollar amount regardless of salary or rank
       ([total ordinary salary pool]/[number of ordinary faculty])
   a. 2. a variable amount based on percentage of each faculty member's salary
   a. 3. a mixed model, 50% fixed and 50% percentage based