

February 12, 2003

To: Members of the Corporate Faculty

From: Dr. Kevin Henson, Secretary, Faculty Council

Subject: Meeting held in the Rubloff Reception Room at 25 East Pearson, WTC

I. Meeting called to order by Dr. Bren Murphy, Chair, at 3 p.m.

Dr. Murphy, in lieu of a prayer, reminded Faculty Council that February 13 is the Jesuit Day for Peace scheduled for 27 Jesuit campuses. She asked faculty to come together to support the call for a peaceful solution to the world situation. The Faculty Council meeting began with a "moment of silence."

II. Approval of January Minutes

Motion: That the January Minutes be approved with the following corrections:

- Misspelling of Dr. Leslie Fung's name.
- Dr. Fung's suggestion was "commended" by Dr. Facione, Provost.
- Changes regarding the discussion about the Dean's resignation.
- Evaluation of Deans: Sentence should be changed to read "approximately 600 clinical faculty."

Action: The motion passes with two abstentions.

III. Chair/Executive Committee Report

A. Various:

Restructuring Governance

Dr. Paul Jay, English, asked Dr. Murphy to forward a copy of his letter regarding the restructuring of CFA to Faculty Council members (see appendix). The CFA will continue until the end of the year. At that point, some of CFA's responsibilities will be distributed to three separate UPC's. The UPC's will be:

- Rank and Tenure Committee UPC
- Faculty Affairs UPC
- Faculty Development UPC -- will review leaves.

There was a discussion about the UPC's. Concern was expressed that some of CFA's current functions would fall through the cracks. Dr. Murphy said that Fr. Garanzini and Dr. Facione are open to discussion on these concerns. Eventually, there will be seven UPC's. There was further discussion about the viewpoints of Fr. Garanzini and Dr. Facione regarding faculty salary and policy issues. While CFA may still review salary equity issues (e.g., systemic race and gender salary inequalities), CFA will not address individual compensation issues. What is currently missing from the restructuring of CFA is a way for individual faculty members to appeal their merit raise decisions. There was discussion that the Board had approved 3% raises but the Provost and deans plan to reserve some of these funds before it goes to the chairs. In the end, some estimated that there will be 2.5% to 2.7% to be distributed to faculty. Some Faculty Council members questioned what will happen to the money reserved by the Provost and deans. Will this fund of money be used by the Provost to adjust individual salary cases if they are way out of line? Dr. Leslie Fung, Chemistry, will request further information about the allocation of reserve pools for pay raises on behalf of Faculty Council.

Faculty Council discussed whether the Faculty Handbook will be revised to reflect changes in the way Loyola is governing itself. Many Faculty Council members believed that large sections of the present Faculty Handbook were no longer clear

and applicable. Nonetheless, the Faculty Handbook remains in effect until it is revised.

Dean Evaluation Process

In a conversation with Fr. Garanzini and Dr. Facione regarding the resolution, Fr. Garanzini said that Faculty Council is doing exactly what it should be doing with respect to evaluating current deans. He had misunderstood how evaluations had been conducted in the past. Faculty Council reiterated the commitment to facilitating and ensuring faculty input in the review process for deans.

Susan Ross reported that the evaluation process is well under way. Evaluation materials are being prepared for distribution to the respective faculty groups. (See Committee Reports below for more detail).

B. UPC's

Dr. Bren Murphy, Dr. Kim Dell' Angela and Dr. Allen Shoenberger will serve on the UCC until May. Dr. Facione and Dr. Barbato are also on the UCC. The UCC will staff the UPC's as quickly as possible. The UCC will solicit issues of concern and relay them to the appropriate UPCs. The two At Large faculty members should stay on until September. Some suggested that a question and answer forum be held to discuss the UPC system with the university community.

It was reiterated that the UCC is not a policy development group. Policy development will be conducted in the appropriate UPCs. Recommended policies will then go to the President for acceptance or written rejection.

Some Faculty Council members noted the importance of ensuring the diversification of formal appointments to UPCs. The new UPCs should not simply duplicate the membership of existing committees.

Faculty, across the university, may make a request to UCC to serve on a UPC.

Some Faculty Council members raised concerns about the future role of Faculty Council in the university. It was noted that Faculty Council will have to carve out a spot as it becomes more like an affinity group within the university. Currently, Faculty Council offers a voice for faculty in the university. Is that voice being diminished? Some suggested that while there may be a diminished role for Faculty Council in terms of staffing committees, that FC may develop a larger or more focused advocacy role for faculty. Some suggested that the restructuring of CFA may increase the visibility of some faculty issues. Other issues of concern, which have currently been "embargoed" under CFAs necessary secrecy around tenure and rank decisions, may get a more public hearing now. The relationship between the UPC system and the faculty constitution (approved but not fully implemented) may need to be revisited. It was stated that a UPC showed formation of faculty policy done in a more public forum.

IV. Special Guest: Tom Kelly, Human Resources Vice President

Dr. Kelly responded to questions emailed to him in advance as follows:

1. Combined Charities

The "Combined Charities" proposal, supported by both Faculty Council and Staff Council, is currently being "vetted" by the administration. The administration has opted to hear a counter proposal from the United Way. Tom Kelly will share it with the President's cabinet and probably will act on the proposal, one way or another, in the spring.

2. Health Care

Health care will be continued at present for retirees.? There are different types to be covered:

- 60 years of age with 10 or more years of service
- Pre-65 and post-65
- Pre-Medicare and Post-Medicare

Loyola, like many organizations, is concerned with rising medical costs.? How Loyola will pay for current and future cost of benefits is a concern.? Retiree (age 55 and over) health costs are the highest.? 10-12% of the budget is for retirees.

Tom Kelly said that it is "premature to say Loyola is not going to have retiree health benefits," but they are looking at ways of containing/shifting the costs of that program.? Faculty Council members note that if benefits cease for retirees, faculty would feel double-crossed.? Employees at Loyola the longest would be affected.? It would encourage faculty to retire later rather than earlier.

The Benefit year begins in January.? The Budget year begins in July. \$3 million was allotted to the Lakeside Campus budget,? \$2 million for staff retirement and \$1 million for active and retiree health care costs.

There is Fidelity and TIAA-CREF for faculty in addition to the university plan. Staff has the matched fund program with 4% saved and 2% matched. LUERP is a defined benefit plan by age, years of service and salary.? It is the most beneficial.

The total compensation of benefits is 6 ? - 7 %.? Tom Kelly said it is necessary to fix fundamentals in university benefits.? He also noted that there may be more out of pocket expense for Loyola employees in return for lower monthly health premiums.? Tom Kelly suggested that Loyola has to decide how we want to spend our money.? What are our priorities?? For example, is adoption services as important as retiree health?

3. Tuition

Loyola's employee tuition benefit has been quite open compared to other schools' (e.g., no "waiting period" for new employees).? Most other schools have longer waiting periods than Loyola -- some as long as 7-10 years.? It is likely that Loyola will increase the waiting period for tuition benefits for faculty and staff to one year and for dependents to three years.? Tuition benefits for Ph.D.-level employees would be eliminated.? The tuition benefit is important for retention of staff but not so much for faculty.

The cost is as follows:

Lakeside Campuses:? \$3.2 million per year SOM:? \$1.8 million per year Hospital:? \$3.2 million per year.? Tuition reimbursement is treated as a cash transaction to LU.

For 2002-2001, there were 414 employee and dependents receiving tuition benefits.? The School of Medicine had 163 receiving tuition benefits.? The Medical Center Hospital had 400 receiving tuition benefits where they had to pay federal and state taxes on the benefits

Employees can take one or two courses per semester.?? Most

dependents are full-time.? Of the 414 on LS, 148 are dependent undergraduates.? Of the 163 at the SOM, 106 are dependent undergraduates.

Dr. Kelly was asked if he would consider our Jesuit values when making benefits decisions.? He takes this into consideration.? There will be more confidence after two years of a balanced budget.? It was stated that faculty likes to feel that they are treated differently at Loyola because of the Jesuit values than somewhere else.

4. Recent Layoffs

There was discussion about the recent staff layoffs: Dr. Kelly said that there were layoffs because of the elimination of departments and downsizing."? LUCID is being eliminated and Information Services has been radically restructured eliminating 18 positions by 2004.? Loyola will be 50-60 positions smaller next year than last year.? It was suggested that there should be a reduction in force policy with as much notice as possible and severance benefits given.

Tom Kelly noted that there is a policy.? An employee who is laid-off? would receive one week severance pay for each year of employment.? Insurance can be retained for six months at employee rates.? Individual positions here and there could be eliminated.? Most are related to enrollment and recruitment.? There will not be a review of Security.

V. Committee Reports

A. Dean Evaluation Committee, Dr. Susan Ross, Theology, Chair

Dr. Susan Ross, Theology, has the mailing list for the dean evaluations.? It is ready for printing.? The deans to be evaluated are:

- Dr. Margaret Fong, Dean of School of Education
- Dr. Joseph Walsh, Dean of School of Social Work
- Dr. Stephen Slogoff, Dean of Stritch School of Medicine

It was suggested that the evaluation of Dean Yost be postponed due to the large amount of faculty to be contacted in the Medical School.? Furthermore, there were questions regarding Dr. Yost's move from Acting to permanent Dean (Should he be evaluated this year or next?? Is it years of service or years in appointment?).? Some suggested than in addition to the survey materials, a team spend a day interviewing in each college.

B. Awards Committee, Dr. Leslie Fung, Chemistry, Chair

Notices have been sent out for election of the Faculty Member of the Year.? There was a slight problem with the Medical Center list.? Nominations should be received by February 28.? Right now no nominations have been received.? The Awards Committee will nominate the Faculty Member of the Year, if qualified and with consent, for the U.S. Professor of the Year.

Last year's Faculty Member of the Year Award will be formally presented at next month's Faculty Council meeting in Maywood.? Dr. Fung asked if there were any suggestions for the Awards Committee.? One suggestion was that the staff award and Faculty of the Year Award be presented at a joint ceremony.? Some suggested that the audience's for each of these awards may not adequately overlap.

C. Elections,? Dr. Barbara Velsor-Friedrich, Health Promotion, Primary Care, Health Systems and Dietetics, Chair

Dr. Velsor-Friedrich asked Faculty Council if it would be possible to e-mail voting forms rather than sending hard copies to everyone.? An e-mail process would lower costs and be more convenient.? Dr. Allen Shoenberger, Law, however, replied that we would have to change Faculty Council Constitution to do so.? Faculty member must be full-time in order to vote.

D. Faculty Status Committee,? Dr. Allen Shoenberger, Law, Chair.

Dr. Schoenberger brought the following motion to Faculty Council for consideration:

"Resolved, Faculty Council requests that the Provost resume immediately the publication of comparative Loyola faculty salary data in the format that has been employed for a decade.? Faculty members have made clear to us that they wish to have access to such data."

A vote was taken with all in favor and no abstentions."

E. Research Committee,? Dr. John New, Biology, Chair.

The Research Committee is preparing a resolution to bring to the Faculty Council addressing the apparently "arbitrary and capricious" manner of allocating research laboratory space at the Medical Center.

VI. Adjournment

Motion: That the meeting be adjourned.

Moved:?Dr. Nicholas Lash, Finance

Seconded:?Dr. Kevin Henson, Sociology

Action: The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin D. Henson
Secretary to the Faculty Council

Members Present:

Arts and Sciences:? Dr. Robert Bireley, (History); Dr. Bren Murphy (Communications); Dr. Susan Ross, (Theology); Dr. David Schweickart, (Philosophy); Dr. Ian Boussy (Biology); Dr. Leslie Fung, (Chemistry); Dr. John New, (Biology);? Dr. Sarah Gabel (Theatre); Dr. Janis Fine (Education); Dr. Jennifer Haworth (Education); Dr. Kevin Henson (Sociology);? Dr. James Johnson, (Psychology); Dr. Fred Kniss, (Sociology)

Professional Schools:? Dr. Raymond Benton, (Marketing); Dr. Nicholas Lash, (Finance); Dr. David Mirza, (Economics); Dr. Christian Johnson (Law); Dr. Allen Shoenberger (Law); Dr. Anthony Castro, (CBN and Anatomy); Dr. Kim Dell'Angela, (Pediatrics); ?Dr. Wickii Vigneswaran, (Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery); Dr. Gloria Jacobson, (Acute, Chronic, and Long-Term Nursing Care); Dr. Barbara Velsor-Friedrich, (Health Promotion, Primary Care, Health Systems and Dietetics); Dr. Carolyn Saari (Social Work)

Graduate Institutes and Professional Librarians:? Kerry Cochrane (Libraries)

APPENDIX: LETTER FROM PAUL JAY (CHAIR OF CFA) TO FACULTY COUNCIL

Bren,

At this late date I don't think I can make the FC meeting tomorrow, but thanks for the invitation (I teach at LSC at 6 p.m.). But please share the following response with Council since it reflects my current view of things:

As I read the President's e-mail message the new governance charter is in its final form and is now being implemented. While it will be "provisional" in the sense that its effectiveness will be reviewed at the end of two years, I don't see a context at this point for any significant reflection, discussion, or revision of the document. The President invites "additional comments and recommendations," but these recommendations will only be considered at the end of the two-year provisional period. If, as you wrote, the President now wants FC to communicate with the entire faculty about the provisional governance structure, it clearly can't be with the aim of getting feedback and suggestions for the charter itself, for it is already finalized for a two-year trial run. Moreover, the role of the UCC looks limited at this point to, as the President writes, "soliciting names for the seven 'University Policy Committees' and distributing committee assignments."

While I support the general plan to create university policy committees, and while I see many virtues to the new charter, I'm troubled, as I'm sure many other faculty will be, by the fact that it is being implemented without wider discussion and consultation, especially with faculty. With all due respect, the "Group of 30" is not an elected body, nor was it formed with the understanding that it would undertake the task of drafting a new governance structure for the university. It has evolved from an informal discussion group into a body which has rewritten the Faculty Handbook and totally remade the university's governance structures while most staff and faculty were barely aware of its existence. It remains to be seen how all of this will be received by the wider community.

My particular concern is with the impact these new structures will have on CFA, and with the limited role the current committee has had in influencing the decision-making process. I was not made aware of the existence of the governance charter until January 16 when Pete Facione casually referred to it in an e-mail to me. A few days later, after having read the document, I pointed out to Pete that it had very little to say about the future role of CFA. On January 30, Pete sent to me and the rest of CFA the proposal for dissolving CFA. He asked that CFA discuss it at a meeting with him the very next day. We did so. At that meeting it was pointed out that while under the restructuring proposal a number of the current responsibilities of CFA would be delegated among the Faculty Affairs UPC, a Tenure and Promotion Committee, and a Faculty Development Committee, a number of those current responsibilities would disappear from the purview of faculty committees altogether. They include the following:

Reviewing and recommending the appointment of chair holders. The President would act directly on recommendations from the Provost and relevant deans. Reviewing and recommending the appointment of professors emeriti and emeritae. The Provost would act directly on recommendations from department chairs and deans. Reviewing and recommending the appointment of chairpersons. The Provost would act directly on recommendations from departments and deans. Reviewing the evaluation of departmental chairpersons. Such evaluations would be handled by deans in consultation with an ad hoc faculty advisory committee, and the Provost. Reviewing and making recommendations relative to the curtailment of programs. This would be handled by the Provost in consultation with the Academic Affairs UPC and University Budget Council. Reviewing and recommending the termination of full-time tenure-track faculty. This would now be the sole prerogative of the Senior Academic Officer. < Recommending actions relative to merit salary increases. There appears to be no mechanism in the current proposal for any of the faculty committees to review proposals for merit salary increases (as CFA has done for more than 20 years).

It may be that some, or even all, of these current responsibilities could be abandoned, but I doubt the wisdom of such a move. Under the proposal now being implemented they would all disappear.

At our meeting on January 31 Pete agreed that I should solicit from CFA members responses to the proposal to dissolve CFA and suggestions about how the proposed changes should be approached. My understanding was that there would be plenty of time for our responses to effect the final outcome of the proposal. This now appears not to be the case, since the President has announced the implementation of the draft charter as is. It seems whatever recommendations we have will have to wait two years. This wasn't my understanding on the 31st.

I simply want you to be aware of the facts as I see them, and of my concerns as chair of CFA. All of us on the committee agreed that we didn't want to appear to simply give away the farm. We thought it important that we scrutinize the proposed changes and make sure they are in the best interests of the faculty before they are implemented. At this point I'm not sure we will have that opportunity.

Paul