

Loyola University Chicago Faculty Council
Nov. 9 Minutes
by Alanah Fitch

Attending: Alanah Fitch, Dawn Lynn, Fred Barnhardt, Chris Kendrick, Patti Jung, Ayana Karanya, Pam Fenning, Nick Lash, Walter M. Jay, William Schmidt, Ian Boussy, Peter Schraeder, David Schweikart, Kim Dell'Angela, Gerry McDonald, Rich Bowen, Linda Paskiewicz, Janis Fine, David Mirza, Marta Lundy, Gloria Jacobson, Robert Bireley, John Makowski, Tom DeStefani, Gordon Ramsey, Harvey Boller, Allen Schoenberger

- I. Invocation
- II. Approval of Minutes
- III. Chair's Report
- IV. Report from the Awards Committee
- V. Presentation by LU Lakeside AAUP
- VI. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee (terminated for time)
- VII. Presentation by Tom Kelly on University Benefits

I. An invocation was offered by Janis Fine.

II. Minutes of the October Meeting were discussed and approved subject to a revision which included John Frendreis' comments on how policy can be set which specifies how Lakeside faculty will be used in teaching at the Rome Center. John indicated a policy could be formulated by the Academic Affairs UPC. The minutes were passed 21 for, 0 against, 2 abstentions.

III. Chair's report (Gerry McDonald) covered several main topics

A.) Governance

A.1.) Governance Review by Faculty Council The executive committee (EC) of faculty council (FC) suggest that a small ad hoc committee with a chair from FC and members drawn from the university faculty at large (possibly AAUP, former members of FC) be formed to review governance. Interested parties should contact Gerry McDonald.

A.2.) Governance Review Taskforce Composition. Gerry indicated that the shared task force has formed and that a large number of the individuals suggested by FC were included on the taskforce.

B.) Role of FC in Governance

B.1.) Populating University Committees. JF has suggested that one major role of FC in governance is in providing lists of names of individuals to populate university committees. EC discussed how FC can provide names to John Frendreis to populate committees on the university. Ian Boussy indicated that EC also explored the issue of whether or not the Faculty handbook spells out service obligations which might encompass university committee work. Kim D. said that service as a whole was indicated but not specified by type. Gordon Ramsey indicated that many people fulfill their service obligations by service external to the university (disciplinary committees, etc.). The Chair suggested that a letter go to all faculty with examples of committees and types of work and another letter go to Departmental Chairs outlining our request for service.

B.2.) JF attendance at all FC meetings (and Barbato, also). One tangible expansion of the impact of FC would be to have executive vice presidents attend FC meetings. The executive committee discussed inviting the Acting Vice-Provost John Frendreis to attend all FC meetings and invites FC members ideas on this.

B.3. Green Sheets - Allen Schoenberger indicated that John Frendreis has also suggested that a role that FC should take on is the reform and implementation of the faculty evaluation forms (Green Sheets) which had been suspended unilaterally by prior Provost, Pete Faccione. Allen S. Indicated that in the past FC had worked extensively on the format of the Green Sheets. Gordon Ramsey asked if it was worthwhile working on this matter while we are without a “permanent” Provost. Ian Boussy suggested that it would be good for FC to take control of this issue. Walter Jay demurred saying that FC should provide oversight but not be in charge of actually formulating the green sheets. Bob Bireley asked if the criteria and process by which faculty are evaluated should be in the faculty handbook. Kim D. said that was the case, it was later pointed out that the handbook only specifies that a process should be in place, not what the process is. David Schweikart said that the policy which defines the connection between the evaluation process and salaries should be set by a University Policy Committee. Gerry M. asked that FC think about these issues and send email comments to him in the next two weeks.

C) Dean Evaluations The Dean evaluation process will proceed and has been handed to Nick Lash’s committee to be pursued. The Dean’s (as reported by JF) are amenable to evaluation and would like to meet with members of Nick Lash’s committee. Kim D. said the JF indicated surprise of the Deanly willingness.

D) The Values Component to the Core Curriculum Gerry McDonald indicated the people are still very concerned about how a class proposed for the core curriculum is evaluated for a values component. This issue has been sent to the education committee of Faculty Council (chair is Robert Bireley).

Questions from the FC on the EC report: David Schweikart asked what the status of the search for a replacement of John Frendreis was. Walter Jay answered that JF has no knowledge and is not involved in any discussion of this matter. Allen Schoenberger added that JF discussed Green sheets (faculty evaluation forms).

IV. Report from the Awards Committee (Rich Bowen). FC members should attend the Dec. 21st noon faculty/staff Christmas luncheon as it will be a new common venue in which the Faculty member of the year will be honored.

V. Presentation by the Loyola Lakeside American Association of University Professors (LLAAUP)(Hugh Miller past President and Pamela Caughie, Current President)

Miller and Caughie expressed appreciation in being able to visit with FC. Caughie commented on some of the issues covered earlier in the meeting. She indicated that LLAAUP was not concerned about the composition of the University Task Force per se but about the process and its transparency. She also commented on the status of a search committee to replace Acting Vice Provost John Frendreis. She indicated that LLAAUP had heard JF would be asked to stay on, which was counter prior comments from Father G. that an external search would be undertaken. She indicated that the AAUP would communicate to Father G. that if he (Father G.) is even remotely

considering asking JF to stay on he should ask for faculty input pro and con.

She then turned the discussion to a memo on governance prepared by the LLAAUP. *The memo is attached, below. Need a copy to attach - someone please send?*

Rich Bowen asked how the Xavier system approximate what the LLAAUP proposes. Pam Caughie answered that it matches in principle but details are lacking however a January forum that LLAAUP is sponsoring (along with student government) will have several experts present to answer such questions. She asked that FC co-sponsor the governance forum. Kim D. said that it was incorrect to state that Father G. opposed a true faculty senate model in that the faculty senate model passed did not include legislative power and he did not see how he could propose to the board a senate model that did not include power. Ian Boussy expressed frustration in discussing models of faculty council governance without having explicit proposals with details. Kim said that there are numerous charters which could be examined but they represent public universities in which there are different sets of obligations. The Santa Clara shared governance model was discussed. It was pointed out that the model was only incompletely adopted at Loyola with the University Policy Committee structure but that the other part, a strong faculty senate with oversight power, was not. Pamela Caughie suggested that the governance at Loyola could be tweaked by rectifying that omission. Bob Bireley indicated that he still doesn't understand the difference between a faculty council and a faculty senate. Bob indicated his support for the structure proposed in the motions passed at the last FC meeting (explicit over sight of the Faculty Affairs and Academic Affairs University Policy Committees (FAUPC and AAUPC). Bob said that we probably don't want to have to run all of the committees and that it is difficult to engage faculty unless there is a crisis. Pam said that faculty are reluctant to serve because they feel that administration does exactly what it wants regardless of the committee deliberations. Ian Boussy asked for clarification on the what is meant by having a policy committee "report" to FC. David Schweikart clarified that the FC council motion on this does not envision the policy committees as being standing committees of the FC, but that we request over sight for the faculty affairs committee and that there be a policy which requires the other committees to inform FC of their work. He does not think that FC should have over sight over all committees as a) it would be hard to find the faculty labor to do this and b) the decision making process would tend to be sluggish.

Rich Bowen wanted to know what will now happen to the memo drafted by the LLAAUP. Pamela Caughie indicated that the memo was just for FC.

V. Faculty Status Committee Report (Allen Schoenberger, Chair)

Allen S. started to discuss the issue of faculty salaries and the lack of progress despite the recent salary bumps - but Tom Kelly arrived to discuss benefits. Gerry McDonald suggested that members of FC should review the data from the Faculty Status committee by email and vote on any motions via email as there was some urgency in getting a motion passed in time for the Board of Trustees next meeting.

VI. Presentation by Tom Kelly on Faculty Benefits

Tom Kelly was given a list of questions to respond to. Those questions are included below with his responses. His nearly verbatim and slightly edited responses occur in italics. Where the secretary is uncertain a bold text follows. When the response has been truncated it appears as

normal type.

1. Are there plans to change the LU BC/BS insurance (either version) so that it is equally attractive to faculty/staff who live downtown or in the northern suburbs as it is to those who live in the western suburbs?

We currently have two options - more traditional PPO option - preference toward Loyola health system - which was pretty aggressively priced - an effective strategy for those out west but not in the north so we have worked to price differently. We have been working to get them closer

Dawn Lynn said that she was never able to get a pamphlet that was clear on what options each coverage plan covered. Tom said that there is now a printed booklet with a grid indicating the different types of coverage. He also said that the web page has a benefits link.

2. How do the benefits available to academic faculty/staff compare to those available to employees at LUMC? What about Med. School faculty/staff?

There are 5000 staff and employees of the Medical Center, 1000 associated with the STritch School of Medicine and 1700 other (note by AF - these particular notes are not verbatim and are not entirely clear to me as the acronyms were fast and furious). The SOM and lake side groups have the same plans except those with Humana. In terms of office hours the calendar of the SOM is followed. The Medical Center employees have had separate plans for the last 6 years - they have their own health welfare and retirement plans. The one other exception are about 100 physicians that are employees of the center that participate in the University plan.

Linda Paskiewicz of nursing asked if one is organized into plans based on location or by administrative reporting as nursing is on both campuses and now reports academically to the Vice President for the Health Sciences Tony Barbato. Tom Kelly indicated that the Medical Center should be able to provide services. **(Alanah again: I may have missed important nuances here)**

3. Since it appears that the Humana option is being phased out, are there plans to add additional options in the future?.

Humana - keeps getting smaller network and more expensive costs - we decided we would not contribute more to Humana than we do in HMO Illinois. We have 85 individuals at Lake Shore in Humana. All but 15 could switch to HMO Illinois without disruption of service. The economics will eventually force the decision. We are concerned about looking for a lower cost health option - the HMOs are losing ground in this market - we have 600 HMO Illinois and very satisfied - so we are not looking to drop that but it is a struggle - it is a shrinking market - it is a struggle we try to manage - we tried to increase the wellness benefit for out of pocket expenses for diagnostics.

4. Are there plans to phase out HMO IL?

The are no plans to phase this out.

5. Are there plans to further change retiree benefits?

There was some discussion at this point about tax sheltered benefits. Tom Kelly indicated that they are looking at TIA-CREF and Fidelity. They have the product but it is not on the platform currently used by Loyola. Tom Kelly also indicated that they are examining the impact of the new Medicare part d which provides some prescription drug care for retirees. *We announced that we would expect our retirees to enroll and we would participate - everyone is struggling with this right now - there are no vendors right now - the government just decided in October who the vendors would be - that would be ok if they chose 3 or 5 but they chose 14 or 15 individuals. We are pretty close to final negotiations with Blue Cross/Blue Shield - we announced an account based contribution to retiree health a couple of years ago - we don't plan on changing that. Last spring we did another round of communications with comparison sheets to about 300 faculty and staff who got individualized statements describing the differences. This was a decision made through the finance UPC - that group really pushed for the university to stay in the retiree health game.*

7. The announcement about the change in retiree health benefits said that further information would be forthcoming in 2004-2005 and 2005-2006. I don't recall seeing any such further info, nor can I find it on the website. Here are a couple of specific questions: If an employee receives the \$2750 for the maximum 15 years, with interest as projected, what will the account be worth at the time of the 15th contribution? If an employee retires at 65, what is the projected annuity payment.

Tom Kelly replied \$52,000 and that you could take this amount and draw down or you can structure it to look like annuity which works to \$300 a month. David Mirza indicated that the yield on the amount is lower than one would get with a treasury bond. Tom Kelly replied that the 3% yield was a balance of what the university felt it could afford as it could change over time.

Marta Lundy brought up the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) which she gave high marks to. Tom Kelly explained that this is a web based service provided by a local firm who works with other local educational organizations to provide easily used information on work place issues, elder and child care referrals, screening for substance abuse, legal services, etc., This service does not apply to the Stritch School of Medicine. Marta Lundy felt that it was exceptional and should be more highly visible in the University community.

Ian Boussy suggested that questions 6&10 should be addressed before time ran out.

6. What is the status of the proposal that health benefits be extended to same-sex domestic partners?

Tom Kelly indicated that same-sex domestic partner health benefit package concept has been endorsed by FC, Faculty Affairs UPC, Student Affairs UPC, and, very recently, by Staff Affairs UPC and has just been forwarded to the President's Office. Tom Kelly believes that it will still take some time because it has to be sensitively negotiated with the archdiocese.

The meeting was not formally adjourned due to departure of many faculty. The answers to the following questions were not recorded.

8. It seems likely that the change in retiree health benefits may create some severe disincentives for employees wishing to retire. Has LUC considered that anyone with health problems, or with a spouse or dependent on their insurance with health problems, may feel that they cannot retire under these circumstances, transferring the anticipated problems with retiree health costs to the employee health plans?
9. Giving Loyola's aging faculty, are there any plans to make it more attractive for some faculty to retire? The health care issue certainly seems like a disincentive; are any incentives planned?
10. The general feeling amongst folks I know at Loyola is that at present HR exists to cut benefits for faculty and staff, rather than to help us. What is your reaction to this?