

March 14, 2007
Faculty Council notes
Alanah Fitch, recording

Attending: Harvey Boller, Ian Boussy, Richard Bowen, Pamela Caughie, Mark Cichon, William Cuthbertson. Kim Dell'Angela, Jaweed Fareed, Alanah Fitch, Walter Jay, Patti Jung, Ayana Karanja, Nick Lash, Anna Lowe, Marta Lundy, Gerry McDonald, David Mirza, Linda Paskiewicz, Gordon Ramsey, Henry Rose, William Schmidt, Allen Shoenberger, Peter Schraeder, Michael Zinaman.

1. Invocation

2. Approval of February Minutes approved 16/0/2

3. Chair's Report - Gerry McDonald

Bob Bireley's knee surgery has gone well and he sends his regards. Chris Wiseman could not meet with us in her last visit, but we are on her radar. UCC met with the chairs of the UPCs. Gerry McDonald (GM) was stunned that we were able to have all these folks - faculty and students involved is a good reflection on the leadership in this university. A year ago compared to Santa Clara we were at a disadvantage, but now we are at an advantage.

Letter from Paul Jay - membership of the Faculty Handbook (FH) committee - I have more communication in which he said that President Father Garanzini (Father G) agreed to have more faculty on the handbook committee - an additional 2 faculty members, as well as Dean Crawford of the College of Arts and Sciences. GM then invited discussion as to whether or not members of the Faculty Council (FC) Faculty Status Committee should be suggested for membership on the Faculty Handbook committee. The general discussion that followed touched on how composition of a committee can alter deliberations. Representation from the Stritch School of Medicine Faculty was discussed. Zinamen agreed to participate via teleconferencing. This was followed by a short discussion of how the FH committee would proceed with respect to the "draft" FH submitted to the committee by the Dean's Council and how the process affects the shared governance process.

GM said that his understanding from Paul Jay is that with 2 more faculty on the committee they would be in a better position to reflect views of the faculty. Walter Jay and Gordon Ramsey both asked that we be supplied with "side by side" versions of the FH draft coming out of the FH committee and that resubmitted by the Dean's Council. John Frendreis indicated that the draft the Dean's Council had received had a blank space for the appeals procedure and that they were attempting to provide feedback from their perspective in this issue. He stated that it was modeled from the document that came from the Faculty Affairs (FA) University Policy Committee (UPC) in which it divides the process into three groups: appeals for rank and tenure; appeals for disciplinary action; and appeals for dismissal for cause. GM closed discussion pending the April Faculty Council (FC) meeting. .

GM briefed council on was the need for a new member on the Academic Affairs University Policy Committee (AAUPC). He asked if the FC ad hoc Committee on Committees should be charged with making the appointment? GM ended his report by reminding the faculty of the Forum

on Contingent Faculty cosponsored by FC and the Loyola Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to be held Friday. Pamela Caughie asked what happened to the email debate on how to achieve representation of contingent faculty on FC. GM suggested that FC ConC (Committee on Committees) should make a proposal and bring it forward for discussion.

4. Committee Reports

Nick Lash, Chair of the Administrative Policies and Resources Committee of FC, reported that the committee had received just completed its first on-line survey. The survey for the CAS Dean Crawford had a 55% response rate. He indicated that CAS faculty like write more than War and Peace. Gm thanked the committee for its work.

5. Guest - Susan Cushman, Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Coordinator

Susan Cushman introduced herself and stated that the university created a safety net coalition of faculty, students, staff, administrators, and some community members charged with envisioning a comprehensive strategy for alcohol abuse and the fall out of that. Her report covered 3 areas: 1. Draw our attention to the problem, 2) Report on efforts to address the issue and 3) ask for advice.

Here my computer shut down and I had to switch to handwritten notes which I can not interpret very well. Discussion was essentially the need for "Evidence based" practices on what they thought other groups were using. The intent is to bring together everybody into an environmental approach in that students do not make choices in a vacuum.

The goal is harm reduction. The title of the program is "Choice control character" (CCC). It includes

1. prevention education (this past fall all students required to take an online program education before they got to school, chosen very carefully). The initial evaluation of data suggests that the on-line education has had an impact.
2. The program also has awareness campaigns on the legality of alcohol use and safety when using alcohol.
3. A third component of the program is intervention by faculty member, coach, advisor, Resident Assistant who may have caught the student.
4. A fourth component is related to campus policies: even if you are 21 can not bring a keg of campus. Student life has increased the number of late night activities so students can socialize without alcohol. We pulled Budweiser out of our contract with large signs in the gym - we didn't want to send that little signal to the students, so we removed that signal from the students.

Asking for increased faculty engagement. There is not a lot of research on the impact of faculty, but initial reports suggest that faculty can be very influential on student attitudes towards drinking. The CCC web page suggests ways that faculty can engage the issue of alcohol in their classes:

1. infuse alcohol issues into your curriculum, how to recognizing student might have alcohol related issues
2. holding quizzes on Friday to deter drinking on Thursday nights -seriously those things work

The presentation was followed by question and answer period.

As part of the QandA the following information was elicited. The pre-enrollment survey was prepared by SIU. The survey has a question on public misconduct, there is no follow up question on whether behavior was then changed. The data on the survey is not broken down by years. It is administered directly to incoming students because this is the group that alters its drinking behavior on entry to college. Once the college drinking behavior is established it tends to be maintained. The CCC would like to have a question about alcohol or drug use have anything to do with premature exit from college but have “run into a wall” in getting the question into the exit survey. Campus AA for students is a fairly weak system because of the transitory nature of the student population.

Other drug use was discussed. The most popular is marijuana - 17% users current (used in last month) as proposed to 75% for alcohol. Other drugs (amphetamines) drops to 2-3%. One study suggests that 4-6% of students are using drugs for ADA. Data was not known for graduate and medical students.

Another computer crash here. This is a real problem in rural areas where Grandpa and grandma are involved and children are highly exposed. Prescription drugs nation wide are being more problematic - stimulants are more easily available through prescriptions for ADA. Suggested that the University should buy out Bruno's and retire the license. The owner of Hamilton's was on the coalition - but she could not say that it helped much - he stopped coming after a while.

The session ended with a request for ways in which faculty can get involved:

1. Departments with strong advising roles could be in a position to pick up on behavioral changes.
2. Faculty are unaware of legal issues with respect to privacy. The CCC web site might be a place to clarify those issues.
3. Some classes might lend themselves to using alcohol use as a topic - statistics, theology, chemistry. Could ask faculty to brainstorm on integration of the topic.
4. Faculty have to send grade data to the dean's office for student progress. Could not this data be made available and checked for alcohol use correlation.

John Frendreis stated that he has, in the past, as acting provost, suggested a multi disciplinary approach using a case load model. “My idea doesn't have a lot of traction - some concern about privacy questions, intrusive advising - how soon they intervene - I personally think that it is a good idea. I, in fact, suggested that we should enlist the school of social work in designing that approach”.

6. Guests - Alan Raphael, Chair of the Budget and Finance UPC, John Frendreis

Alan Raphael began his remarks indicating that he wanted a close relationship between the UPC and FC. Harvey Boller asked for statistics on faculty salary equity. Kim Dell' Angelo asked if the data included the medical school. Acting Provost John Frendreis (JF) stated that he had prepared a summary of faculty salary data for FC.

Report from the Acting Provost John Frendreis on Faculty Salaries:

JF indicated that salary increases are all at risk every year. While in general the increase is supposed to be based on merit some raises reflect equity and promotion issues. (A \$3,500 bump from Assistant to Associate and a \$7,000 bump from Associate to Full). An annual evaluation is done typically in January. In units with departmental structures (CAS, School of Business) evaluations are done by chair, reviewed by dean, then by myself with the dean, and then the president sees them. As you go up the chain the usual kinds of question are asked - why is this person low/high. The distribution of salaries is looked at and then the particular place the faculty member has within the distribution. Two of the closest levels of review are with the Dean and myself.

JF stated that two other reviews have been institutionalized at the lakeside campuses. The first is an internal equity analysis which began in response to the Women's Commission. "We take all the tenure track faculty and run a predictive model to predict their salaries and we have a high predictability 77% of variability - it is a fairly good model - we put race and gender and a series of things are irrelevant (rank, school you are in, division, years worked at university, - correlated with years in rank) that model predicts 77% variance among 429 tenure track faculty at the lakeside including the nurses....thankfully and as was true the other times we ran the analysis gender and race was not a statistically significant. We take this analysis and predict peoples salaries and calculate residuals for the deviation of predicted and actual salary. (The data is next sorted) by department and rank and then I go over with each of the faculty with the deans looking for people paid 5k or more below what the model says they should be paid. You would expect there to be deviations from the model because it inadequately measures productivity. So the idea is to look at an individual person to see if the model predicts that there should be a change. I have paid close attention to women and historically under represented (faculty) to see if there are individual cases that are inexplicable to me. Then we address those equity issues. About 1% of the pool was set aside for equity issues -practically speaking the raise pool is above 4%. The final step: we do market analysis to compare market salaries to our benchmark middle weight schools - using COUPA (College and University Personnel Administrators) data which we use to set administrator and staff salaries - we seek the market data from there and we calculate the average at the 60% and compare it to our average because we want to be at the 60%. (There was) a question was whether or not the benchmark institutions reflect cost of living. I looked to the most current data for cost of living 4th quarter 2005 and looked at the numbers for the cost of living for each fo the metropolitan areas for the schools where are comparison is located. Chicago is 117 the average of the other schools is 120 - so that suggests that the benchmark data does not give us a systematic deviation from the comparison schools. Some places are very low on the list (Nebraska, St. Louis) but these are offset by San Francisco - when you average it is 120. In any one year not all of these schools are in the COUPA data base."

JF then presented data for four unnamed "units".

"Net aggregate - we are over the benchmark as an institution - but to address the cells below the benchmark we would need substantial money. The first time we did it the number on the right was 4.5 million in the hole. We felt so many were under that we wanted to bring everybody up to 60. When we discussed (this) with the Deans they....said...that they would prefer \$ to deal with

individuals. Now for the entire University excluding nursing and medicine (428 faculty) it shows that we are ~1 million over the benchmark over the aggregate - with cells over 1.1 million and 563,801 under. The last step in the equity issue is to sit down with the deans in which there are cells below the benchmark and look at if it is truly a market issue or a historical issue.

Back to hand written notes. Patty Jung - Your benchmarks are only to a group of middle weight schools. Is using 60% of the middle weight going to help us move to our aspirational schools?

J.F. - I've not done that.

Patti - that would be particularly relevant to PhD programs.

JF yes that is part of question in the Business and Law school to have larger data base to define who we want to be like. That strategic planning has not been completed.

Hank Rose - Is a similar process used for the fringe benefits side?

JF - don't do it the same way. That part is done by HR. HR calculations have not been systematically pointed toward 19 middle weights.

Alan Raphael - this is a topic that very much concerns me. If the University only operates on what it can spend - we may not be competitive. The budget issue which we can affect is health. Data suggests Health care will rise rapidly so if the University maintains 30% contribution we will be paying much more so net compensation may drop.. I hope to run this issue to see if it is of interest among the committee. I would like to keep same comparables.

JF - we are self insured by Blue Cross/Blue shield -..... in last two years, premium went down.

Nick Lash - in business schools, 80% faculty are paid less than new hires. Is that true at LU.

JF - no in any other unit - no - we raised Ass. Prof. to at least \$1 more than the new hires. It is probably not possible in the business school.

Report from the Acting Provost John Frendreis on Enrollments

JF. Update on enrollment Funnel for UG is strong (5% increase) - trying to shift selectivity to shift \$ for average ACT of 27. ACT usually not below 22. Hope to shift by 5 points in 5 years. Low school 2% rise in LST score in fall - able to hold size and quality well. Grad school also looks good.

Report from the Acting Provost John Frendreis on Faculty Leaves

Faculty leaves - the issue is in discovery process - nothing since. Most places have on paper automatic leaves every 7 years. All then say you have to apply but it isn't a big deal. Not every school operates this way, Notre Dame does not. They insist on ???(note from Alanah Fitch, this section of notes was handwritten - can't write as fast as I can type)external before you apply for internal. Our pattern of leaves over the last five years is quite high acceptance rate (80, 74, 78, 81%) and there is also the automatic mid probation leave.

GM asked a final question: Are there any issues you think are relevant now that you are leaving the dark side? JF: I think governance is on the right track. Two issues are pending A) non-tenure ft faculty - need a discussion (as to whether we) should would have two categories of faculty - essentially about what kind of job security non-tenure track should have and what kind of professional development they get. 2. There is no faculty admission committee, also need to focus on academic honesty.

8. Adjournment 5:20 p.m.