

Meeting Minutes Archive**December 5, 2001**

To: Members of the Corporate Faculty
 From: Dr. Carolyn Saari, Secretary, Faculty Council
 Subject: Meeting held on the 13th Floor, Lewis Towers, WTC

I. The Meeting was Called to Order by Chair, Dr. Bren Murphy at 2:03pm.

Dr. Janis Fine, School of Education, sang the "Prayer of the Traveler."

IV. New Business

Dr. Murphy announced that due to our special guests, Fr. Michael Garanzini and Sr. VP Marjorie Beane, we would alter the order of business in today's meeting.

Announcements from Fr. Garanzini:

The budgeting process which Fr. Garanzini shared at last month's meeting is going forward and he is fairly confident about the ability to reduce the deficit. More waste has been found in the operating of the university than was expected. Additionally, the numbers of applications have been running ahead of last year and that was a record breaking year. The faculty salary raise of 3% continues to be part of the budget. Faculty salaries will, however, continue to be an issue as we are not currently competitive with other universities. The current raise will include a separate pool for dealing with salary inequities that have existed in the past - for example, in women's salaries.

Strategic Planning:

Fr. Garanzini is calling our current planning a A strategic agenda@ rather than a A strategic plan@ because the latter should involve more details than is possible at this time. The planning is based around the nine goals that he discussed in his Presidential Message. The agenda will be formally presented to the Board of Trustees in their March, 2002 meeting. The agenda does include getting to a balanced budget by 2005 and this seems possible. Currently, Fr. Garanzini is looking into staffing levels at other universities in order to see if we might be overstaffed in some units such as budget analysts and lawyers.

Sr. Vice President for Administrative Services Marjorie Beane discussed the work on the strategic agenda, circulating a handout on her remarks. See Appendix A, which includes the nine goals in the agenda and a list of the groups that are now working on refining the planning agenda.

Dr. Beane indicated that the goals originally drew on the reports from the CARP Report, the work of the Strategic Coordinating Committee and from Redesign for Results. In this the three "faces" of Loyola are included: quality health care, undergraduate and graduate liberal arts and research, and the professional schools. Overall goals have to do with: dealing with financial difficulties; improving our academic programs; and bringing resources into line with the tasks. There have been several retreats focused on discussing and adopting the goals and there will be another in January. Work groups have been established as follows:

Academic Cabinet: To look at academic policies, headed by Dr. Larry Braskamp, Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs, and including Deans and others. Susan Ross represents Faculty Council there.

President's Cabinet: To review policies and procedures, i.e., there will be a new policy coming out soon about expenses and travel.

Enrollment Planning and Retention: Membership includes administrators, faculty and students. Determine enrollment targets, recruiting strategies, policies on financing our students, and retention strategies.

Strategic Capital Planning Task Force: Limited membership linked to President's Cabinet with recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Charged to develop a master plan for each of our campuses, including student housing and a look at deferred maintenance.

Budget Review Team and the University Budget Committee: Charged to look at how we budget, how to become better stewards of our financial resources, and dealing with right-sizing rather than down-sizing the

university.

Student Service Work Group and Summer Focus Groups: Continuing the redesign process of student services.

Advancement Work Group: This group will determine goals and select priorities for fund-raising which will now be focused more on a school-based model for fundraising. The Deans will be working side by side with Development personnel.

Life Science Planning Committee: Planning for a new building, but this will be integrated into the existing facilities in Damen and Flanner Halls - so there will be a "Science Triangle."

Evoke/Magis/Student Affairs/University Ministry/Service Learning: Work is being done to pull the work of these areas closer together.

Discussion with Fr Garanzini:

Fr. Garanzini indicated that there is much flexibility in all of the plans and they do need to be examined by the faculty and others. However, he has been concerned that if such groups did not begin with something already on the table, the work would not be as productive. Ultimately, there will probably need to be something like a town hall meeting.

Fr. Garanzini also noted that each of the schools will be developing strategic plans for the unit. If faculty do not know how this is proceeding, they should consult their Dean.

Progress toward master plans for the campuses is being made. Fr. Garanzini would like to present these to the Faculty Council in either January or February. These plans should outline which properties we will retain and which we will sell. Attempts to decrease the isolation of the campuses are needed, but we also need to consider how much transportation between the campuses we can afford.

The last of the goals is that of faculty governance. Fr. Garanzini passed out a list of current university committees and their membership. This has been updated this month, but still may have some inaccuracies. Dr. Murphy indicated to Fr. Garanzini that some faculty committee members were concerned over the manner in which committees conducted business, often using the meetings to announce decisions rather than to deliberate them. In some instances, faculty committee members have no responsibility to report back to any faculty group so that adequate communication is lacking.

Fr. Garanzini noted that the governance piece is tricky as he has had to table the issue of the proposed Faculty Senate Constitution since it has not had support in the Board of Trustees and some parts of the administration. Council members reminded Fr. Garanzini that Faculty Council had done two years of work on governance even before the appointment of a committee to write a constitution. Council members are reluctant to ignore all of that work. Fr. Garanzini wants to have a series of three discussions on governance held with a group of people representing various factions of the university, including faculty. He would then anticipate this leading to a white paper on governance that could then be considered further by others including the Board of Trustees. Dr. Murphy indicated that Faculty Council will be electing 8 faculty members to serve on this group.

Christmas luncheon:

Fr. Garanzini reminded everyone of the Christmas luncheon which will be held on December 13 and Dr. Murphy urged council members to attend if at all possible.

II. Approval of the Minutes

Motion: that minutes of the November meeting be approved.

Moved: Dr. Dorothy Lanuza

Seconded: Ms. Lenora Berendt

Action: Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Committee Reports

Awards Committee - Dr. Leslie Fung

The Awards Committee (members include Raymond Dye, Sarah Gabel and Fred Weezeman) submitted a motion formalizing the criteria for the Faculty of the Year Award (FMOY). Discussion centered around guideline **d.** which dealt with categories of faculty who would be ineligible for the award and whether the award is for a particular year or for an exceptional career. It was the Committee's sense of the significance of the award that it recognizes an exception within the academy of excellence with the consensus that it was not just for one year, but for a level of performance established over time and validated by peer ratification of high achievement. Thus, the Committee had recommended that faculty without tenure and below the rank of professor be ineligible. Others wanted it to be possible that exceptional achievement early in a career could also be recognized.

Motion: to remove the statement that nominees be restricted to those with tenure and rank of Full Professor.

Moved: Dr. Allen Shoenberger

Seconded: Dr. James Johnson

Action: motion passed with 15 yeas, 5 nays and 0 abstentions

The amended guidelines then read:

General Guidelines for the selection of Faculty Member of the Year

- a. A well established individual who demonstrates a balance in the areas of teaching, research or scholarly activity and services.
2. An individual whose contribution as a Loyolan identifies themselves with the mission of Loyola University Chicago.
3. An individual whose colleagues support the above and see the candidate as an excellent role model for students and faculty.
4. Ineligibility for FMOY:
 - i. Previous recipients of the award.
 - ii. Faculty members who are retiring or leaving the University at the end of this academic year.
 - iii. Administrators who hold faculty rank and whose primary responsibility is not full-time teaching.

Motion: that the Guidelines be adopted

Moved: Awards Committee

Action: motion passed with 16 yeas, 4 nays and 0 abstentions

FACIT Committee

Dr. Mary Boyd, of FACIT and Dr. Hilary Ward Schnadt, Chair of the FACIT Distance Learning Subcommittee distributed their Distance Learning Vision statement dated July 23, 2001, which Faculty Council had seen previously.

Motion: that Faculty Council endorse this statement.

Moved: FACIT Committee

Action: motion passed with 19 yeas, 0 nays and 1 abstention.

Faculty Status Committee

Dr. Shoenberger distributed the Annual Review of Salaries, 2000-01 which is prepared every year by Louis Cain in the Business School (See Appendix B). This year's report is particularly concerning. Dr Shoenberger then presented two motions in relation to the faculty raises for the next year. The first of these two:

Resolved:

Faculty Council recommends that faculty raises for next year be distributed with a portion as an across the board raise.

Discussion centered around the fact that often the Chairperson or Dean making recommendations for raises needs some flexibility in dealing with the particular needs of faculty within that unit.

Motion: that the above resolution be adopted

Moved: Faculty Status Committee

Action: motion failed with 5 yeas, 14 nays and 0 abstentions

The second resolution:

Resolved: After examination of the comparative salary data, Faculty Council finds that the rapid decrease over the last several years in the comparative position of salaries with other institutions is dismaying. Further decreases are inevitable when next year the current no raise year is included. Loyola faces the real possibility that we may soon be well below average salary compensation levels. For Loyola to continue as a serious, competitive, academic institution, it is starkly clear that steps must be taken in the near term to address substantial faculty under-compensation.

Motion: that the above resolution be adopted.

Moved: Faculty Status Committee

Action: motion passed unanimously

Lakeside Academic Cabinet

Dr. Susan Ross indicated that faculty should be aware that in the last meeting that Dr. Braskamp said he was concerned that faculty did not appreciate the seriousness of the needed budget cuts. After an hour of the meeting, all committee members who were not Deans were dismissed. Dr. Ross is concerned about the manner in which this committee is operating. There is little deliberation about issues, but announcements instead. If the dismissal of faculty representation is a precedent there should be even more concern. We need to be vigilant that our committee members do not become "figureheads for representation when there is no mechanism for participation in the meeting itself." It appears that changes in LUCID and the request that all Department Chairs give up 10% of their budgets occurred without consultation or discussion in the committee.

Dr. Murphy indicated a need to have a serious discussion of our participation in committee meetings and retreats. Perhaps we can do this in our January meeting.

Benefits Committee

Dr. Murphy indicated that Dr. Barbara Leonard will be on leave as a Visiting Professor at the University of Hawaii next semester. Dr. Alan Goldberg leaving the university. We therefore need to have more faculty representatives on this committee. Committee members need to have knowledge of health care and human resources. Dr. Lamont Stallworth suggested Dr. Dow Scott, Institute of Industrial Relations as a possibility. Dr. Murphy would like other suggestions.

III. Chairperson's Report

Dr. Murphy reminded Council that we need to give Fr. Garanzini eight names of people to be involved in the conversations about governance. She then distributed a list of names generated by the Executive Committee. Council members could add other names, but no other names were suggested. Council members were then asked to vote by circling the names of the individuals they want to serve in this capacity. The votes were counted after the meeting and results are that the following people have been selected:

Michael Clarke (CAS - English), Lydia Don Carlos (SSOM), Alan Gitelson (CAS - Political Science), James Johnson (CAS - Psychology), Dorothy Lanuza (Nursing), Tassos Malliaris (Business), John McNulty (SSOM), and Carolyn Saari (SSW).

V. Adjournment

Motion: That meeting be adjourned

Moved: Dr. Nicholas Lash

Seconded: Ms. Lenora Berendt

Action: meeting adjourned at 4:24pm

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Saari
Secretary, Faculty Council

Members Present:

Arts and Sciences: Dr. Robert Bireley, (History); Dr. Leslie Fung (Chemistry); Dr. Sarah Gabel (Theatre); Dr. Paolo Giordano (Modern Languages & Literatures); Dr. Bren Murphy (Communications); Dr. Susan Ross (Theology); Dr. Arnold Vandernat for David Schweickart (Philosophy); Dr. John New (Biology); Dr. James Johnson (Psychology); Dr. Fred Kniss (Sociology); Dr. Jeanne Zechmeister (Psychology).

Professional Schools: Dr. Anthony Castro (CBN and Anatomy); Dr. Janis Fine (Education); Dr. Robert Flanigan (Urology); Dr. Jennifer Haworth (Education); Dr. Gloria Jacobson (Nursing); Dr. Dorothy Lanuza (Acute, Chronic and Long-term Nursing); Dr. Nicholas Lash (Business); Dr. Kenneth McClatchey (Pathology); Dr. Marc Hayford (Business); Dr. Carolyn Saari (Social Work); Dr. Allen Shoenberger (Law).

Graduate Institutes and Professional Librarians: Ms. Lenora Berendt (Libraries); Ms. Kerry Cochrane (Libraries); Dr. Lamont Stallworth (Institute of Human Resources and Industrial Relations).

Guests: Fr. Michael J. Garanzini, President; Dr. Marjorie Beane, Senior Vice President for Administration; Dr. Mary Boyd, FACIT; Dr. Hilary Ward Schnadt, FACIT; Dr. Barbara Leonard; Dr. Darice Birge, CAS Associate Dean.

Appendices

Appendix A

Handout on Strategic Planning
Senior Vice President for Administrative Services, Marjorie Beane

Why plan and why a Strategic Agenda?

Last year's work on any number of projects like CARP, SCC and Redesign for Results found there were a number of things that were implicit as a strategic agenda. The nine goals came from these projects.

Present Challenges:

1. How to deal with our financial difficulties
2. How to focus and improve our academic programs to avoid erosion and to grow our reputation in the months and years ahead
3. How to bring the resources of the institution to the tasks just mentioned, in a manner that ensures we are taking full advantage of the resources of this great institution

Vision for the Strategic Agenda

Draw from the strengths of the three faces of Loyola University Chicago:

Quality health and medical care
Undergraduate and graduate liberal arts and research
Professional schools

It is the goal of Loyola University Chicago as a Jesuit university to form men and women with a passion for justice and a commitment of active service to the wider world.

The Goals

1. Support and help focus our educational mission at the undergraduate level so that it is increasingly characterized by its holistic focus, academic excellence, and engagement with the wider community. Its goal as a Jesuit university is to form men and women who are persons for others, with a passion for justice and a commitment to active service to the wider community.
2. Support and focus our graduate programs and research activities in a manner that is realistic and appropriate, given our size, resources, and traditions, and in a manner that achieves distinction by adding value to the undergraduate experience and reinforcing our Jesuit mission.
3. Support and focus our professional programs in order to help them achieve further renown and distinction as programs that incorporate the Jesuit tradition, are responsive to the needs of the professionals in this region, and influence professional practice.
4. Strengthen our recruitment and retention efforts in order to achieve full enrollment and ensure the

quality of our student body that advances the undergraduate educational mission. At the undergraduate level, our goal is to grow and ultimately stabilize the size of our incoming class to 1,600 and then shape class profile/character resulting in increased selectivity.

5. Bring discipline to our financial operation, clarify our financial planning processes, and raise the reliability of our financial data.
6. Strengthen our commitment to students through better accounting of our resources, better support programs, better housing and health services by introducing new structures and more effective delivery systems that more directly complement the academic program and impact retention.
7. Focus our efforts to develop our capital assets at the three major campuses, creating synergies between and among them via academic initiatives that link faculty and students.
8. Develop our advancement efforts to increase our visibility in the community, contribute more to the support of the academic programs, extend our relationships with alumni, foundations, and friends in the Chicago area and beyond by communicating internal needs externally, and external needs internally and by connecting internal constituencies with external ones.
9. Clarify our decision-making and advisory processes within the university community, with special attention to the role of faculty and staff.

Planning Process and Timeline

- Refine the goals
- Determine what we want to achieve in the next three years
- What it will take to make this happen
- How we will know that we have reached our goals
- Presented to the Board of Trustees in March 2002

Select Steps in this Process

- State of the University Address
- Leadership Retreats
- June on Planning
- October on Information Services and Enrollment & Retention
- November on Finance
- January on the Three Campuses of Loyola

Planning Groups/Committee Work:

- Academic Cabinet
- President's Cabinet
- Enrollment Management and Retention Committee
- Strategic Capital Planning Task Force
- University Budget Committee and Budget Review Team
- Student Services Work Group and Summer Focus Groups
- Advancement Work Group
- Life Science Planning Committee
- Evoke/Magis/Student Affairs/University Ministry/Service Learning

Continuation of the academic planning processes within each school

Appendix B

Annual Review of Salaries 2000-01 Faculty Status Committee

The salaries in effect during the 2000-2001 academic year as reported in the March-April 2001 issue of *Academe* put us in the third quintile for Full Professors (49.7) at category I universities, the third quintile for Associate Professors (42.7), and the third quintile for Assistant Professors (46.4). This is a diminution for Full Professors, but it represents no change for the other two ranks. As the table below indicates, the percentage ranking continues to decrease across all three ranks. We are now paying less than average salaries in all three ranks.

Compensation is salary plus fringe benefits. This past year, Loyola reported a 3% increase in the percentage fringe benefits is of salaries. This is now reported as 28%. Two and three years ago, this number increased by 1% for no obvious reason. Last year it decreased by 1% for no obvious reason. This is something about which

questions should be raised, but it appears to reflect the fact that there are shifts in accounting practices and that some benefits increased in percentage terms faster than salaries.

Loyola's retirement package remains generally below that of equivalent schools. Academe reports the average retirement contribution across all category I universities is 10%. An increase in tax-sheltered income is one way to stretch lean raises.

Percentile Comparison to All Category I Universities							
	Salary				Compensation		
	F	Asc	Ast		F	Asc	Ast
92-93	72.9	73.3	68.3				
93-94	81.6	79.8	71.4		76.3	74.1	65.4
94-95	78.3	74.7	59.5		72.8	71.3	55.9
95-96	75.5	71.2	56.0		70.5	68.8	55.4
96-97	72.0	67.8	52.0		71.2	67.4	56.2
97-98	70.7	64.5	55.7		68.9	68.4	66.5
98-99	68.8	56.6	40.0		66.7	58.0	43.2
99-00	56.1	50.1	49.2		51.5	47.0	50.6
00-01	49.7	42.7	46.4		58.7	48.8	51.4

From this information, it is clear that budget balancing as it relates to faculty compensation is not limited to "early transition." It has led to a severe diminution in the relative position of Assistant Professors. This would appear to jeopardize the university's future. Below average salaries repel above average faculty.

Beginning in 1985, we defined a panel of 101 category I and IIA schools in cities for which specific information is reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Each year there are a handful of schools that do not report salary information to Academe; this past year there were 88 schools that reported salary data. (note 1) This is the smallest number of schools since this survey began and includes several schools that typically report higher salaries than Loyola. Consequently, the number of schools reporting salaries higher than Loyola for Professors is the same as last year. However, Associate Professors fell five additional places, while Assistant Professors fell an additional one. A look at the results for only category I schools indicates that both Professors and Assistant Professors fell three places, while Associate Professors fell five places. The lack of movement suggested by the total is a result of gains with respect to the category IIA schools, and this reflects the absence of several schools from the sample.

With respect to the "real" salaries, those adjusted for regional differences in the cost of living as defined by the BLS, Consumer Expenditure Survey, 1994-95. Professors and Associate Professors had exactly as many schools reporting higher salaries as last year, while Assistant Professors gained two places. The panels for categories I and IIA schools reveal that all three ranks fell three places with respect to category I schools. Once again, it is the absence of several category IIA schools that is responsible for the lack of evidence of deterioration in the total.

The comparison with the Catholic schools in our panel is confounded this year by the fact that four of the thirteen absent schools are Catholic. Given such a large portion of the sample is missing, the suggestion of improvement vis- is other Catholic schools cannot be supported statistically.

This report normally compares Loyola with our closest competitors: DePaul, Notre Dame, and Marquette. In nominal terms, Loyola Professors received more than Marquette, but less than Notre Dame or De Paul. Professors at De Paul averaged \$6,500 more than those at Loyola. Loyola paid the least at the other two ranks. The same pattern persisted in real terms, but Loyola Professors received only \$500 more than those at Marquette.

The percentage increases reported for Loyola's continuing faculty are 1.20, 2.55 and 2.81, respectively. These numbers are "for faculty members remaining on staff... This increase is that for individuals as opposed to a percentage change in salary levels from previous year."

Time series regressions for the past 25 years of Loyola's salaries by rank produced the following results (all highly statistically significant);

Professor	6.26%
Associate Professor	5.52%
Assistant Professor	5.51%
Consumer Price Index	5.20%

Our average salary increase over all ranks appears to be in the bottom 10% of category I schools for the third consecutive year." There is no question this pattern of raises has been an important contributor to the continuing deterioration of faculty morale. A logical response in a situation where faculty believe they are being paid less than their counterparts elsewhere is to reduce their effort.

It is important to realize that these data represent the average of each rank; they are not the experience of any one faculty member. The most disturbing conclusion resulting from this study is the extent to which the Assistant Professor rank has been affected. The fact that the average salary for those continuing in this rank actually fell is something that needs to be carefully investigated.

(note 1) The sample was defined to include all category I and IIA schools in major metropolitan areas in 1985; one or two of those schools have changed categories in the interim. This past year Chicago State, Farleigh Dickinson, Florida International, Johns Hopkins, Mills, Seton Hall, Houston, Maryland-Baltimore, Dallas, Detroit, Portland, and San Francisco did not send data to Academe.

Salary Rankings
(Number of Schools > Loyola)

2000-2001 Salary Data

I. 101 Universities and Colleges (55 I and 46 IIA)							
All	Nominal			Real			
	Prof	AcProf	AsProf	Prof	AcProf	AsProf	
1989-90	60	53	61	65	57	69	
1990	44	52	51	52	62	50	
1991	35	48	56	41	54	64	
1992	30	37	45	41	49	57	
o1993	22	31	36	26	44	55	
n1993	22	31	36	24	39	49	
1994	26	37	46	26	40	50	
1995	31	37	45	33	45	55	
o1996	32	39	51	32	45	56	
n1996	32	39	51	63	75	59	
1997	36	44	51	47	61	71	
1998	38	48	61	51	65	79	
1999	50	55	53	62	76	72	
2000	50	60	54	62	76	70	
I only							
1989-90	44	35	45	46	35	44	

1990	36	36	36	39	38	34
1991	30	34	41	34	36	41
1992	26	27	35	30	30	35
o1993	19	22	29	22	30	38
n1993	19	22	29	22	28	33
1994	22	27	36	23	28	33
1995	27	26	34	28	31	38
o1996	27	30	39	28	33	39
n1996	27	30	39	37	45	36
1997	30	35	40	36	41	44
1998	32	38	47	38	44	50
1999	40	41	42	46	49	46
2000	43	46	45	49	52	49
IIA only						
1989-90	16	18	16	19	22	25
1990	8	16	15	13	24	16
1991	5	14	15	7	18	23
1992	4	10	10	11	19	22
o1993	3	9	7	4	14	17
n1993	3	9	7	2	11	16
1994	4	10	10	3	12	17
1995	4	9	11	5	14	17
o1996	5	9	12	4	12	17
n1996	5	9	12	26	30	23
1997	6	9	11	11	20	27
1998	6	10	14	13	21	29
1999	10	14	11	16	27	26
2000	7	14	9	13	24	21

II. 24 parochial colleges (8 I and 16 IIA)

	Nominal			Real		
	Prof	AcProf	AsProf	Prof	AcProf	AsProf
1991	7	10	10	8	15	14
1992	4	9	8	8	14	14
o1993	4	8	5	4	13	12
n1993	4	8	5	4	10	11
1994	4	10	8	4	11	10
1995	5	9	10	7	13	12
o1996	6	9	11	6	12	13
n1996	6	9	11	6	12	13
1997	6	9	8	11	17	12
1998	7	7	9	10	13	16
1999	10	12	9	15	21	18
2000	9	11	8	13	18	15

Salary Breakdown by University

		Nominal			Real	
	I-IIA	Prof	Assoc	Asst	Prof	Assoc
New York	0.9551					
Adelphi University	I	76.5	63.7	54.3	80.1	66.7
Columbia University	I	120.2	76.0	60.0	125.9	79.6
Fordham University	I	97.2	72.1	54.9	101.8	75.5
Hofstra University	I	97.2	67.8	52.8	101.8	71.0
Long Island University	IIA	83.6	63.8	56.1	87.5	66.8
Manhattanville College	IIA	75.2	61.6	50.1	78.7	64.5
New York University	I	120.8	76.0	66.7	126.5	79.6
Drew University	IIA	75.5	54.0	42.5	79.0	56.5
Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.						
Rutgers, State Univ.-Newark	I	110.1	79.9	61.7	115.3	83.7
Seton Hall University						
Philadelphia	0.8226					
Bryn Mawr College	IIA	89.6	64.4	50.6	108.9	78.3
Drexel University	I	89.1	67.6	64.3	108.3	82.2
Temple University	I	95.4	69.3	50.0	116.0	84.2
University of Pennsylvania	I	120.3	83.5	73.1	146.2	101.5
Villanova University	IIA	94.2	64.8	53.7	114.5	78.8
Rutgers, State Univ.-Camden	IIA	103.9	76.2	56.2	126.3	92.6
Boston	0.9664					
Boston College	I	108.2	72.6	57.7	112.0	75.1
Clark University	IIA	77.9	59.2	51.9	80.6	61.3
Harvard University	I	135.2	79.2	71.6	139.9	82.0
Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.	I	117.0	78.7	72.1	121.1	81.4
Northeastern University	I	88.1	64.4	58.3	91.2	66.6
Tufts University	I	92.6	68.4	52.0	95.8	70.8
Univ. Massachusetts-Boston	I	81.9	67.4	54.1	84.7	69.7
Pittsburgh	0.7262					
Carnegie-Mellon University	I	105.0	73.5	68.1	144.6	101.2
Duquesne University	IIA	74.7	57.0	48.9	102.9	78.5
Univ. of Pittsburgh-Main	I	90.9	63.6	53.1	125.2	87.6
Buffalo	0.6585					
Canisius College	IIA	64.6	58.1	44.1	98.1	88.2
St. Bonaventure University	IIA	55.1	45.6	42.5	83.7	69.2
SUNY College at Buffalo	IIA	63.5	52.9	46.4	96.4	80.3
SUNY at Buffalo	I	94.5	67.4	54.5	143.5	102.4
Chicago	1.0000					
Chicago State University						
DePaul University	I	91.1	66.8	53.0	91.1	66.8
Illinois Institute of Tech.	I	88.8	65.9	58.2	88.8	65.9
Loyola Univ. of Chicago	I	84.6	60.4	51.2	84.6	60.4
Northeastern Illinois Univ.	IIA	69.7	56.0	48.3	69.7	56.0
Northern Illinois University	I	74.7	55.5	47.5	74.7	55.5

Northwestern University	I	116.2	78.5	65.8	116.2	78.5
Roosevelt University	IIA	71.5	55.5	47.7	71.5	55.5
University of Chicago	I	124.8	79.5	67.1	124.8	79.5
Univ. of Illinois-Chicago	I	90.2	64.7	55.4	90.2	64.7
Wheaton College	IIA	66.4	55.4	45.5	66.4	55.4
Notre Dame University	I	106.0	70.8	59.0	106.0	70.8
Detroit	0.9236					
University of Detroit						
Univ. of Michigan-Dearborn	IIA	74.2	59.4	51.3	80.3	64.3
Wayne State University	I	87.2	67.0	52.5	94.4	72.5
Milwaukee	0.9213					
Marquette University	I	77.5	60.6	51.3	84.1	65.8
Univ. Wisconsin-Milwaukee	I	78.1	60.5	52.0	84.8	65.7
Univ. Wisconsin-Parkside	IIA	66.4	55.7	43.6	72.1	60.5
Minneapolis	1.0422					
Univ. Minnesota-Twin Cities	I	93.6	66.1	55.4	89.8	63.4
Cleveland	0.7437					
Case Western Reserve Univ.	I	92.9	67.2	56.8	124.9	90.4
Cleveland State University	I	72.5	56.9	45.2	97.5	76.5
John Carroll University	IIA	73.5	56.2	46.9	98.8	75.6
Cincinnati	0.8699					
Miami University-Oxford	I	82.4	60.0	45.9	94.7	69.0
Univ. of Cinti-Main Campus	I	80.5	60.1	48.2	92.5	69.1
Xavier University	IIA	69.5	56.9	45.5	79.9	65.4
St. Louis	0.8207					
Northeast Missouri St. Univ.	IIA	65.0	51.5	42.6	79.2	62.8
Saint Louis Univ.-Main	I	84.9	59.8	48.7	103.4	72.9
Univ. of Missouri-St. Louis	I	78.1	57.8	48.0	95.2	70.4
Washington University	I	106.4	67.0	64.7	129.6	81.6
Kansas City	0.9051					
Univ. of Missouri-Kansas City	I	83.4	58.7	47.0	92.1	64.9
Washington	1.0716					
American University	I	97.3	67.0	52.4	90.8	62.5
Catholic University	I	74.4	54.7	46.6	69.4	51.0
George Washington University	I	98.3	72.2	56.9	91.7	67.4
Georgetown University	I	107.4	68.0	53.4	100.2	63.5
Baltimore	0.8969					
Johns Hopkins University						
Loyola College in Maryland	IIA	77.6	61.1	47.1	86.5	68.1
University of Baltimore						
Univ. of Maryland Balto Prof. Schs.						
Univ. of Maryland Balto.Co.	I	86.2	61.1	52.3	96.1	68.1
Atlanta	1.0702					
Georgia Institute of Tech.	I	104.1	73.0	62.3	97.3	68.2
Georgia State University	I	101.5	65.0	53.7	94.8	60.7

Miami	0.8417					
Florida Internat'l Univ.						
University of Miami	I	90.8	60.4	54.1	107.9	71.8
Dallas	1.0272					
Southern Methodist Univ.	I	95.7	62.3	59.2	93.2	60.7
University of Dallas						
Univ. of Texas at Dallas	I	86.0	63.4	66.9	83.7	61.7
Houston	0.9975					
Rice University	I	108.9	69.4	65.7	109.2	69.6
Univ. of Houston-Univ. Park						
Los Angeles	0.9387					
California Inst. of Tech.	IIA	122.2	85.9	73.4	130.2	91.5
Cal. St.Univ-Long Beach	IIA	75.7	60.6	49.3	80.6	64.6
Cal.St.Univ-Los Angeles	IIA	75.8	60.7	49.7	80.7	64.7
Loyola Marymount University	IIA	92.8	64.1	47.4	98.9	68.3
Pepperdine University	IIA	89.1	74.7	62.4	94.9	79.6
Univ. of Calif.-Los Angeles	I	112.7	72.4	63.0	120.1	77.1
Univ. of Calif.-Riverside	I	97.4	66.3	60.5	103.8	70.6
San Francisco	1.1805					
San Francisco State Univ.	IIA	76.2	63.5	51.5	64.5	53.8
Mills College						
Santa Clara University	IIA	103.9	75.0	64.2	88.0	63.5
Stanford University	I	126.7	88.1	69.1	107.3	74.6
Univ. of Calif.-Berkeley	I	113.6	73.2	62.5	96.2	62.0
University of San Francisco						
San Diego	0.9063					
San Diego State University	IIA	76.5	61.4	50.1	84.4	67.7
Univ. of Calif.-San Diego	I	104.3	67.0	58.2	115.1	73.9
Portland	0.9346					
Portland State University	I	68.5	52.4	45.7	73.3	56.1
University of Portland						
Seattle	0.9782					
Seattle University	IIA	81.1	60.2	48.0	82.9	61.5
University of Puget Sound	IIB	77.5	58.1	48.0	79.2	59.4
University of Washington	I	85.5	62.6	53.6	87.4	64.0
Honolulu	1.087					
Univ. of Hawaii at Manoa	I	77.3	57.9	49.0	71.1	53.3
Anchorage	1.1289					
Univ.Alaska-Anchorage	IIA	67.2	53.0	45.2	59.5	46.9

NOTE:

*The institution's category of these following universities/colleges has CHANGED:

From (1992/93)

Drew University	I
Bryn Mawr College	I
Canisius College	IIB

Univ. of Missouri - St. Louis	I/A
Univ. of Maryland - Balto. Co.	I/A
Portland State University	I/A
University of Puget Sound	I/A

*NO RECORD for these following universities/colleges:

Adelphi University, University of Detroit, Santa Clara,
University of San Francisco

In 1999, neither Seton Hall nor DePaul reported; Santa Clara did.