

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, October 28, 2015
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC; IC 332, LSC; Cuneo 405, SSOM

Members Present: Battaglia, G.; Bohanon, H.; Classen, T.; Conley, J.; Gillespie, L.; Graham, D.; Holschen, J.; Keller, R.; Knight, A.; Lash, N.; Lombardo, R.; Melian, E.; Miller, H.; Morris, P.; Ruppman, T.; Shoenberger, A.; Thomas, A.; Wantuch, E.

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:10pm by Tim Classen.
2. Approval of September minutes. Moved: Lash. Seconded: Lombardo. Motion passed 18-0-0. (Attendance amended.)
3. University Senate (Classen): The meeting on 9/25 was dominated by discussion of student issues—about half was given over to discussion of the new guidelines and policy on student demonstrations. In addition, several (up to 6) extra positions on the Presidential search committee were requested, including representatives from undergrad and graduate students.
4. SSOM/HSD (Classen, Battaglia): On April 23rd 2014, Faculty Council passed the following unanimous resolution concerning the new SSOM BSI (Base, Supplement, Incentive) salary plan:
 1. That a summary evaluation of the results of this year’s trial run of new BSI criteria on projected faculty salaries be distributed to all affected faculty, and to Faculty Council prior to implementation;
 2. That faculty input be broadly solicited, and the points assigned to defined tasks be refined to ensure there are sufficient means available to all faculty by which they could maintain or increase their salaries by performing scholarly activities unencumbered by constraints imposed by external funding agencies or University administration;
 3. That the SSOM administration accept the BSI Task Force’s recommendation to retain the “grandfathering” provision, which has allowed faculty not hired under any of the BSI plans to maintain their current compensation plan with an option to join a BSI plan at their discretion; and
 4. That the SSOM administration provide comparative faculty salary data annually by rank and department as provided for all other schools in the University.
 - Base is 70% of salary (350 + 350 points), Supplement is 30% (500 points) on 1,200 point BSI system. Incentive payments can range up to \$40,000 annually for points above 1,200. The “shadow period” for BSI took place between September 2013 and June 2014. The first year of data collection was July 2014 to June 2015. July 1, 2016 (FY17) annual salary (base and supplement) for the July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 contract period and incentive pay will

be determined using FIS identifiable hours in fiscal year 2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015).

- Motion item #1 (above) requested a summary of the BSI data be circulated to affected faculty and to Council, but this has not happened.
 - Motion item #2 should be addressed by the BSI Compensation Committee at SSOM to adjust point values for different activities based on evidence from first two years of data (shadow + 2014-15).
 - Motion item #3 is disputed by Dean Brubaker (and some members of the BSI task force) as to whether a grandfathering recommendation was made as part of the task force's recommendations.
 - Motion item #4 has not been provided – request from HSD provost Callahan?
- Discussion:
- There is little that faculty can do, it seems, to increase supplement and incentive points other than to write (successful) grant applications, preferably to agencies that kick money back to the University (otherwise if they don't, you only get half the points). Several faculty have reported that their BSI assessments have contained a number of errors, as well as changes made without faculty being informed.
 - Faculty get a new contract in January. There has been talk of three year averaging; that might delay salary change until as late as 2017. But Dean Brubaker says changes are retroactive and will affect salary by January 2016.
 - Any reductions below base in January 2016 will constitute issues of serious concern to all of us. Should the AAUP be brought in on this? The national office has a lot of experience (legal and otherwise) in handling these matters. Mike Harkins, Illinois AAUP state chair, is willing to help and visit.
 - There are issues on the clinical side as well. Clinical contracts are technically by way of Trinity—about 85%, with about 15% from SSOM. There seems to be considerable inconsistency between departments on how points are to be gained and allocated.
 - Classen: I will write to Dean Brubaker requesting the BSI shadow year report, and the salary data.

5. Chair's Report (Classen):

- Presidential Search Committee: We met on 10/8/15. On October 9th, Tom Kelly called to ask for nominations for an additional faculty member by the following Tuesday. Three members of FC were nominated, and I (Classen) was chosen. Parkinson called last week. He told me the search committee is looking for a person in a leadership position, especially from a professional school. Non-Jesuits are eligible. The committee now stands at five trustees and six non-trustees. All members have signed a nondisclosure agreement:

no names of candidates can be disclosed. The committee is currently looking for a search firm. One of the firms we were looking at is the one that worked with Marquette to get them their first non-Jesuit. I will speak to Robert Bucholz of the History department about his experience as a faculty member of the last presidential search committee. It is very important that I hear from faculty their views about what to look for in a new president. Kelly told me that Parkinson would be amenable to meeting with FC.

- Tasks for committees: I have circulated a new list of this year's tasks for the Council's standing committees. We need to talk about the Faculty Handbook and get a recommendation out on that by the end of November, one focused more narrowly on grievance procedures.
 - Question: what about SSOM faculty issues? Do we need to take them up now that Trinity is in the mix, as a Handbook issue? TC: This is something to consider, especially after November. At Maywood, anywhere students rotate in, your appointment must be a Loyola academic faculty appointment, even if your salary is 100% Trinity-sourced.

Academic Affairs Committee: IDEA: TC would like the committee to accumulate evaluation and workload provisions for each school. He'd like a survey of the school-based systems of evaluation that are in play. How is teaching assessed in each school? How is IDEA used to inform that evaluation? How is teaching evaluated across the University? FAS: What is the outcome of using FAS? How is it being used? What parts are used/important to administration?

Service Committee: We need to examine the allocation of membership. Do we have the right numbers? How can we fill vacancies? What is the optimal size of the Council? (There are no Deans' evaluations this year.)

- Question: Is there a sense of why FC numbers have gone down in recent years? TC: In part because of the perceived importance of the University Senate. Anecdotally we know people aren't sure what the difference is. People have asked me "Does FC do anything?" A lot of US work has nothing to do with Faculty or Faculty issues. FC is still essential to the governance of the University. Some schools, like HSD, don't give credit for service to FC, so that impacts participation. Time commitments also affect it. Let me stress the importance of communicating our work with our constituents. I will send an email out to the University at large, but also please inform your various units about what we are doing.

IDEA Updates: There is a new portal. Go to luc.edu/IDEA and log in. You can see historic evaluations. Eventually 3-year averages can be created (when there is enough data). MBA is on quarters, so they have been testing the new IDEA portal, which was contracted through a company called Campus Labs. Response rates can also be tracked in real-time. The portal is

more accessible. It's easier to put together a report than before. The issue, though, is still: what is being done with the data? How is it being used?

Invitations: I will be inviting Robert Munson, Senior V.P. and CFO, and Provost Attoh to future meetings.

6. Visit from Winifred Williams, Chief Diversity Officer

- Ms. Williams gave an overview of her background and her responsibilities, which include all components of HR and strategic oversight for diversity at the University. She then detailed some new automation initiatives in HR, such as: automating the annual performance appraisal process (beginning with staff evaluations), the job posting process for both faculty and staff, and DocFinity, an electronic filing cabinet system designed to reduce paper.
 - Question: Will the automated performance review system be another layer, or will it replace something? Answer: It will just streamline the process. Currently our evaluation process is paper-based. This will allow for a more streamlined process.
 - Question: How many HR positions will be eliminated due to all of this automation? Answer: We aren't going into this with that in mind. We want to be more proactive and have the ability to do more analysis. Our goal isn't to reduce positions, thought that may happen naturally over the next 18-24 months. Right now some people spend a lot of time dealing with paper. We'd like to be able to shift responsibilities through this process.
 - Question: Have you taken over some of what Tom Kelly used to do? Answer: Yes. Almost all of it. Tom was V.P. of HR. He has been promoted to Senior Vice President for Administrative Services. We now report to him.
 - Question: Is this a decent year for health care increases? Answer: Yes. Definitely. We use third party to give us analysis of the market. Our increases are very modest compared to similar institutions. You will soon receive information on this, but our increase will be about 6%, which is based on claim experience. The number of claims filed determine the increase. There have been a lot of claims this year. Also, previously spouses and legally domiciled adults have not been required to carry their own insurance through their employers. That will happen this year.
 - Question: How is the matching program for retirement savings that was instituted a few years ago going? Answer: We are trying to get more participation in that. A large portion of our employees are under 40, so they aren't thinking about that now. There are a variety of generations that we work with and each has different needs and wants. We have to find a balance for everyone.

- Question: You spoke of the transition from paper to electronic systems. Are you concerned about hacking? Answer: Most definitely. No one is immune. We've seen this happen several times in the retail sector. ITS has been working very hard to thwart similar attacks here. We can't let that immobilize us on that. We need to move forward. We send data back and forth every day. So far, we've had success. ITS does give us pushback and guidance when necessary.
 - Question: Is the retirement package (the buy-out, not investment) the same at HSD as it is at the University? What does it constitute? Answer: You're speaking about full-time tenured faculty at Stritch? (yes). We are working to align with Trinity but LUC faculty will be in line with University faculty. The benefits are not changing. I will send you the details because I don't have that information here.
- Ms. Williams then detailed some the Employee Survey results from the survey distributed in March. There was a 78% participation rate, which was up 1% from the same survey in 2010. Lake Shore campus had the highest rate of participation, followed by Water Tower Campus. The favorability score was 84%. There was a 65% retention rate among employees. That sounds good, but that means there are a third of our employees who were not sure they were staying or were definitely leaving. There was an 84% favorability score on diversity.
- Ms. Williams then summarized the areas which had improved from the last survey. Areas of improvement for this time included the categories of "Respect and Care" (feeling like your voice is being heard and not feeling repercussions for speaking out), "Strategy and Direction" (the direction the university is going and receiving information in a timely or appropriate manner), and "Pay and Benefits". There will be meetings during the benefit enrollment period to discuss some of the questions related to this last category. They are also going to embark on a study of pay to see if we are competitive.
 - Question: Will HR be willing to share that data with FC? We have been discussing how we can get such data. Answer: Yes, most definitely. I can be a resource for that. We can work with individual departments on that as well.
- Ms. Williams then gave some details about areas for improvement from the previous survey that came directly from faculty. [There was a staff supplement and a faculty supplement to the survey.] Communication from leadership was 48% favorable. Each unit has been assigned a resource person/planning coordinator to work on an action plan for addressing areas of concern.

- Question: How do these results compare with your experience in other industries? Answer: There are several data points that we can compare to other Jesuit schools and other high performing industries. There are a variety of interests at work that drive what people think are important. There's an expectation of automation which raises or lowers people's engagement. Not everybody is looking for more money. Some people want more time off. Our overall favorability is higher than the Towers Watson [a benchmark she mentioned a couple of times] industry norm. The results of the survey will be on the HR website very soon.
- Question: Will there be an analysis of the labor wage versus academic wage? Will it change? Or does it need to? Answer: Yes, there will be a conscious effort to streamline that. We will look at administrative overhead [which she defined as all support staff, not just administrators]. We are moving toward a spirit of transparency.
- Ms. Williams then moved on to discuss diversity, indicating that there are various groups around campus concerned with diversity. Several units have their own diversity committees, in addition to the Department of Student Diversity and Multicultural Affairs. The new Executive Council on Diversity and Inclusion was created to assess what exists at the University and to facilitate communication and collaboration among those interested groups. The ECDI is intended to be the thought leadership for the University. It will define what diversity is for Loyola, coordinate programs, serve as a resource for interested units, prioritize resources, etc. The ECDI is made up of the following constituents: Faculty Council, Staff Council, Student government, President's cabinet, HSD, Graduate School, Academic Administration.

7. Motion to adjourn: Lombardo. Second: Gillespie. Meeting adjourned 5:25pm

Respectfully submitted by
 Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary
 (with grateful thanks to Tracy Ruppman for assistance)