

Nov. 8, 2006
Faculty Council

Present: Harvey Boller, Ian Boussy, Richard Bowen, Heather Cannon, Pamela Caughie, Kim Dell'Angela, Janis Fine, Alanah Fitch, Paul Jay, Patti Jung, Ayana Karanja, Chris Kendrick, Nick Lash, Marta Lundy, Dawn Lynn, Gerry McDonald, David Mirza, Linda Paskiewicz, Gordon Ramsey, Henry Rose, Bill Schmidt, Allen Schoenberger, Peter Schraeder, David Schweickart.

1. Invocation: Janis Fine

2. Approval of October of minutes -

Preschool can not accommodate infants (children under two); Dean Holz spelled with an e)
Item 6: response to Shared Governance - same quote used twice; some debate on what happened with a particular paragraph; discussion about voicing disapproval. Minutes approved: 18-0-2 (two abstentions).

3. Chair's Report: Gerry McDonald (GM)

William Honig Budget and Finance University Policy Committee (BFUPC) guest; faculty members of FAUPC and John Frendreis invited, but could not make it. Announcement - flu shots free upstairs until 3. Transit of mercury is going well. It is being co-sponsored by FC. May have had an impact on the election.

GM has send an email to all current faculty of university policy committees (UPCs) whose terms have not ended and asked them to stay on. 8/12 responded, all are affirmative. Will need to fill 10-12 positions on the UPCs. GM will get together with other members of the Faculty Council Committee on Committees (FCCC) to fill the other positions. GM received an email from Chuck Weber indicating that administrative members of UPCs will not continue on and can be replaced by faculty. With respect to the search committee at the Strich School of Medicine for the position of head of the hospital (combines role of administrator and faculty oversight) were able to get Strich faculty members of faculty council to meet with the candidates.

4. David Schweikart (DS) - the Sabbatical Committee

The time frame is June 2007 to come up with a sabbatical policy. DS had a graduate student gather preliminary information on 31 peer and aspirational institutions. Bob Bireley, Thackary Gray, and Patricia Huntington have agreed to be on the committee. DS hopes to have a committee composition that is representative of all the schools and colleges.

GM (Gerry McDonald, President of FC) clarified that the committee is an ad hoc committee that will report back to FC for consideration and possible endorsement at which point the policy is submitted to the FAUPC.

Allen Schoenberger asked if we needed to comply with a June 2006 time-line particularly with respect to the expected change in Provosts.

5. Committee Reports

Faculty Status - Faculty Salaries - Allen Shoenberger

AS presented data culled from the American Association of University Professors National group, publication *Academe*, which details the salary status of a wide range of institutions, categorized by extent of research. AS indicated that the FA committee of FC uses “Category 1” institutions for comparison. According to the analysis of FAC of FC LUC faculty are still under the 60% percentile for salary for Full professors, about at that level for Associate, and under for Assistant. The committee thinks that the comparisons are useful at F, but not at the Associate because people can be promoted at LUC to Associate and stay there longer than is usual at other institutions. 10/11 for 20 years of service were assistant professors. Many faculty at a rank skew up the salaries at the associate level. The data is not broken down to the departmental level. The *Academe* data systematically excluded medical school data but does include law school data. AS indicated that the committee is fairly confident that their comparison pool is similar to the administrations comparison pool because both analyses predict a short fall of about 1 million. AS indicated that the committee is NOT recommended a “catch-up” level of 60% as FC has never accepted that the 60% is the appropriate level. FC would like to see a higher level.

The university contribution to faculty pension plan (TIA-CREF) was discussed. According to the AS the university has resisted making increases in the contribution because there used to be more than one pension plan which made calculating contributions equitably difficult. There is now only one plan so the FA committee of FC is recommending an increase of the university contribution. Discussion on this aspect indicated that DePaul is making contributions of 10% or greater. For LUC to come to this level will require “real” money. Another issue is that no money is paid to TIA-CREF when a faculty member is teaching summer school.

William Honig, guest visitor from the Budget and Finance UPC suggested that the compensation picture ought to be broadened to look at other ways, beside, salary of making LUC an attractive place to work. AS indicated that tuition benefits comes under that category. He also indicated that the FA committee of FC believes that tuition benefits have been attributed to ALL faculty members as a “real” dollar amount, regardless of use of those benefits. According to AS the “real” cost was about 5k\$ but the cost attributed as a benefit to faculty was \$595,000.

Motion

Resolved: ***“Based on our annual salary review, we move that a) a third year of “catch up” salary be made available to reach the universities’s stated goal, and b) the university contribution to TIAA_CREF be increased to 10%”***

passed 21:0:0

Several faculty members brought up the issue of “frozen” salary levels for summer teaching. Currently the summer salary comparison for the Law School is 70% of local market. Some discussion on a related topic in which Chairs are pressured to look for external part time faculty for summer school classes because they are cheaper.

6. Faculty Handbook - Paul Jay

Note: 4.5 pages of transcribed notes were taken for the discussion of the Faculty Handbook. The discussion was non-linear circling around to several consistent points. The secretary (Alanah Fitch) has taken the liberty of arranging those comments topically rather than as they occurred temporally.

Non-tenured Faculty

Ian Boussey had to leave early but wanted to indicate that non-tenured faculty in Biology felt that the faculty handbook draft does not represent them well in that the following topics are worded in a way that excludes them: teaching leaves, summer leaves, unpaid leaves wording excludes them, also lost something lost in their contracts (2004) made them eligible to be PI on external grants after 6 years and eligible for faculty enhancement.

Hard-Copy vs Electronic Publication Links, and Repository of Permanent Digital Files

A lively discussion about the merit of a hard copy (it is the faculty contract!) Vs digital copy of the handbook took place. There were many, many, concerns with electronic publication in the form of linking to key documents where those documents reside in digital files of other entities. Vigorous lobbying for making a permanent file of digital documents under the control of FC ensued. It was pointed out that logistically this would either require administrators to reference the FC controlled web pages or to patrol the LUC web page for constantly changing documents.

Role of the Faculty Handbook as a contractual document

The faculty handbook is our contractual document. Does the contract have to specify all procedures or policies?

David Mirza. It is helpful to get perspective of what we are talking about - my perspective I look at the handbook as a list of general principles (a constitution) it is not a long document now as a result of the constitution we promulgate policies which can be overturned if doesn't agree - we could look at it as Napoleonic code or common law if we agree on the principles then the handbook will supersede any law or policy as long as there is a mechanism to view whether or not the policy agrees with the spirit of the constitution or not.

Allen Schoenberg particularly wanted to see that definition of academic freedom go into the document (not linked out).

Pamela Caughie particularly wants to see grievance procedures spelled out within the actual document (not linked out).

Paul Jay indicated that on the very last page of the proposed handbook - there is wording to carefully stipulate that "*procedures on changing the handbook; 2nd paragraph - careful to stipulate that in all cases is the responsibility of the FAUPC that all policies have been duly enacted by procedures duly outlined in the handbook*" This is to ensure that policies that have been posted on the web by some administrative body must conform with the faculty handbook statements and do not constitute a legal change to the faculty handbook.

Several faculty discussed where changes in benefits might fit in the faculty handbook (as a written portion or as a linked portion). Kim D'elAngelo pointed out that organization structure changes and since the faculty handbook is to be a "living document" it can not be tied to specific benefits. Other council members objected that the benefits are part of a promised package. Allen

Shoenberger said: benefits are dealt with by Human Resources with no faculty oversight

The collaborative (iterative) process of the Handbook development How Faculty Council Will Respond to the Faculty Handbook Committee

Faculty Affairs committee (Nick) should be in charge of a formal response from FC to the Handbook committee - January is more realistic response than Dec.

7. Adjournment 5 p.m.