

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**Agenda for Meeting of Wednesday, November 18, 2009, 3:00-5:00 PM**  
**25EP Room 1101**

Members present: H. Boller, R. Bowen, H. Cannon, N. Derhammer, M. Dominiak, K. Egenes, A. Fitch, W. Jay, C. Jurgensmeier, S.J., D. Kaplan, T. Kilbane, J. Kostolansky, N. Lash, J. Lieblich, H. Miller, E. Myers, G. Ramsey, H. Rose, B. Schmidt, P. Schraeder, D. Schweickart, A. Shoenberger, N. Sobe, M. Udo, S. Urban, E. Wojcik

**Called to order 3:10 pm.**

1. Invocation—Charles Jurgensmeier, S.J.

2. Approval of October Minutes – Motion: B. Schmidt, Second: N. Lash; passed unanimously

3. President's Report (Peter Schraeder)

- Meeting with Senior Academic Officers – P. Schraeder and W. Jay will meet with C. Wiseman; P. Schraeder and W. Jay met with P. Whelton (SSOM) on Nov 6<sup>th</sup> to discuss the following three issues:
  - Contract issues: They specifically brought up the new language in Stritch SOM contracts. The main concern is the phrase “and as may be prescribed by the administrative officers of the university”. This phrase was initially in the part-time contracts but was included in full-time contracts this year. P. Whelton assured them that next year's full-time contracts will not include this phrase.
  - Handbook issue: Regarding applying for tenure, the word “prospectively” is an issue pertaining to which set of guidelines are to be followed, the ones a faculty member was hired under or updated guidelines. P. Whelton's interpretation is that the new guidelines apply to only new hires. P. Schraeder and W. Jay will discuss this with C. Wiseman. Will faculty have the option of choosing either set of guidelines? (N. Lash) “Likely not” was the response. For promotion to Associate or Full Professor during the normal time period, the guidelines under which the faculty member was hired are to be used. For those that apply beyond the normal period, the new departmental guidelines will apply (for those spending a long time in one rank). This issue will be discussed with C. Wiseman. What about the Faculty Handbook applicability? (R. Bowen) Faculty are covered under the new handbook. Promotion and Tenure guidelines for each department apply.
  - P. Whelton offered to have P. Schraeder and W. Jay meet with the Deans of the SSOM to discuss selection and hiring of senior academic officers and Deans – they will likely do so in December or January.
- General discussion ensued on the financial status of the medical center and the possible effect of any healthcare reform passed by Congress.
- Faculty Council Website Update: FC was asked to review the Web site in advance at <http://www.luc.edu/faccouncil/> and offer suggestions for inclusion or improvement. Committee lists are to be updated, along with missing minutes and major issues. Christopher Abplanalp is the Webmaster. Send recommended changes to P. Schraeder.

- Faculty Contracts (SSOM and Lakeside Campuses) – see the above discussion
- Faculty Input in the Selection of Deans & Senior Academic Officers – P. Schraeder will draft a proposal after discussion with the Executive Council. This issue will be discussed with senior officers once the Faculty Council agrees on a proposal. What about the acting nursing Dean, whose evaluations are being analyzed now? (M. Dominiak) Transparency in Dean evaluation should be respected. (R. Bowen) This is not so at other universities. (N. Lash)

4. Faculty Salary (Allen Shoenberger) (see attachment) AS presented report on the Faculty Status Committee's work on salaries:

- Salary data analysis (all data is for existing faculty in rank): nominal and real salary data were presented. The real data reflect the cost of living at the university location. Medical schools are not included, but nursing schools are included in the data.
- Salary rankings: LU is about halfway down the list for all ranks (compared to all similar universities) for nominal, but lose ground in real salaries due to the cost of living in Chicago. These data do not include benefits.
- Percentile comparisons – these reflect nominal salaries and compensation. LU is close to the 60<sup>th</sup>ile in salaries and between 53% and 60% for assistant and full professors respectively for total compensation. All salaries have slightly outperformed the cost of living rate. LU contributes 8% toward retirement up to the Social Security wage maximum (presently 108k\$), then adds one percent. This represents a 2% lag in contributions toward retirement compared to other peer universities that typically have 10% contributions.
- Questions: Over the career of a typical faculty member, 2% represents a large differential. (R. Bowen). Many faculty do not contribute themselves (W Jay). These represent nine-month contract salaries (in response to a question by M. Dominiak).
- Resolution by the Faculty Status Committee: Motion (by standing committee): See the attached resolution. Passed unanimously. Vote: 21-0-0
- Medical benefits have decreased substantially with the new plan (see #4 of the resolution). Medical benefits for retirees are significantly lower at LU (M. Udo) than other universities.

5. Faculty Senate (David Schweickart) – This will be the second item on the December meeting agenda.

6. Faculty Teaching Loads – This will be the first item on the agenda for the next meeting

7. Additional Business? None.

8. Adjournment: Motion: C. Jurgensmeier, Second: H. Boller, Passed unanimously. Adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Attachment: Proposed Faculty Council Resolution from the Faculty Status Committee

Faculty Council is pleased to note that the university has virtually achieved the 60 percent target for salaries. However, the following observations present a less comfortable picture.

First, the continued 2 percent lag in contributions by the University towards retirement (where Loyola contributes 8 percent of salary towards retirement and 9 percent after the social security wage base is passed) continues to impact negatively on Loyola's competitive condition in the marketplace for faculty, and indirectly (and sometimes quite directly,) means that Loyola faculty delay their retirement because they simply cannot afford to retire. It is clear that the norm across most universities is an average contribution rate of 10 percent. It is in the university's interest to facilitate retirement not deter it. **We would like an increase of 2% in retirement contributions to the 10% level.**

Second, we note that [because] the social security wage base has been rising in recent years at a far higher rate than the percentages of salary raises at the university, there has been a net decrease in the university contribution towards many faculty retirement plans. This means that the percentage the university contributes to one's retirement plan has been declining over time.

Third, when considering retirement, faculty and staff also must consider health care coverage issues. Assuming a health care plan of some nature is enacted by Congress, one of the foreseeable results is that more money will be infused into the medical care system, shifting demand higher and contributing to an increase in inflation in medical care costs. We note that while Social Security retirement benefits are not going up for this next year, the cost retirees will pay for Medicare coverage will increase. **With that in mind, the current retirement medical plan for faculty and staff should be reexamined to ensure that it is indexed for inflation.**

Fourth, while the salary raise for the current year of 2 per cent is commendable, we note that the recent changes in the health care plans for faculty and staff to require a Loyola Preferred Plan for Blue Cross/Blue Shield, likely means that the entire 2 percent salary increase for many employees will be consumed by the increase in deductibles and other scheduled amounts attendant upon that Health Care Plan revision.

Fifth, when the University had a Benefits Committee, that committee year after year was presented with the possibility of developing a health care preference favoring the use of Loyola facilities, but because of the physical distances involved for many faculty and staff, year after year the committee rejected any change to the health care program that forced or penalized failures to use the Loyola facilities, [even though yearly increases in health care premiums were required] although it quickly endorsed the idea of offering inducements to use Loyola facilities. A promise was made when the hospital was built so far from the other campuses that faculty and staff on what are now the Lakeside campuses would not be required to use the Loyola facilities. Each year the faculty and staff on that committee consulted with their colleagues to ascertain that this was the preferred choice. Further, each year that consultation suggested that increases in premiums paid by the employee were preferred to increases in out-of-pocket payments when services were rendered. Now, without consultation of any sort, the very type of plan that had been rejected for more than two decades, was imposed upon the university employees.

**Sixth, Faculty Council believes it is imperative to create a University Benefits Committee to**

**ensure that faculty and staff input is considered before major benefit changes are announced to university employees.**

This committee would function as a consultative panel for faculty and staff input on major plan designs as it had for several decades at Loyola.

Whereas, ... we request the following

**We would like an increase of 2% in retirement contributions to the 10% level.**

**With that in mind, the current retirement medical plan for faculty and staff should be reexamined to ensure that it is indexed for inflation.**

**Sixth, Faculty Council believes it is imperative to create a University Benefits Committee to ensure that faculty and staff input is considered before major benefit changes are announced to university employees.**