LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO FACULTY COUNCIL

November 5, 2003

To: Members of the Corporate Faculty

From: Dr. Nicholas Lash, Secretary, Faculty Council

Subject: Special Meeting held in 13th Floor Ballroom, Lewis Towers, WTC

I. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Kim Dell'Angela, Chair, at 3:10 p.m.

Dr. Dell'Angela offered a reflection from *Modern Prayers from Rome*.

Dr. Dell'Angela thanked Dr. Peter Facione, Provost, for meeting with Faculty Council and enhancing communication with the Council. Dr. Facione thanked the Council for the invitation.

II. Dr. Peter Facione, Provost

A. Plan for Faculty Salary Increases:

Dr. Facione discussed the salary enhancement plan year starting with the fiscal year, July 1, 2004. This would be in addition to normal salary raises. A major goal of the salary enhancements will be to allow recruitment of new faculty while retaining current faculty. Since the goal is recruitment and retention, it will be necessary to study the market. The time frame will be three years, which is quite short. The salary raises will be front-loaded.

In the first year, the target will be to raise faculty salaries so that they are at the 50% level of Research 1 Universities in the nation. This will require over \$1 million. Dr. Facione expressed confidence that the Trustees, at the forthcoming meeting on December 6, would be supportive of the salary adjustment plan. The President had mentioned that raising faculty salaries would be a priority in his State of the University address.

In addition, he wishes to have the trustees agree on a group of between 12 to 15 peer private institutions with doctoral programs to serve as an appropriate base of comparison. These universities are Loyola's direct competition and hence provide an appropriate standard. For Loyola faculty salaries to reach equivalence with those of these institutions will take approximately \$4 to \$5 million.

How will the one million dollars be distributed? How will the additional salaries be allocated? Will those who have good evaluations and have written books during the years receive more money?

Dr. David Schweickart (Philosophy) asked how the additional salary funds would be distributed among faculty. Would adjustments be made for faculty who were productive in previous years but poorly rewarded due to fiscal constraints? Dr. Facione answered that in upgrading salaries, both merit and market conditions must be considered. The plan for allocating salaries has not yet been decided upon, but will be formulated during the Summer 2004 during which Loyola's salaries will be compared with their peer institutions. He stated that the policy of the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee would be followed. It was noted that in determining merit, new deans and chairs would not be fully informed of a faculty member's past productivity. In such cases, the faculty members themselves would have to inform deans and chairs of their past productivity.

Dr. Judith Wittner (Sociology) pointed out that in Liberal Arts and Sciences there are large discrepancies between different departments, such as between Sociology and Psychology, and inquired whether these differences will be reduced. Dr. Facione pointed out that there is a regression model that explains 80 % of variance between departments but that the model leaves out merit.

In response to a question by Dr. Harvey Boller (Business), Dr. Facione stated that in determining faculty market conditions and thereby allocating funds between different schools, each school at Loyola, e.g., Business, Law, Arts and Sciences would be compared with the same schools at peer institutions. There will be different salary increases for Loyola's different schools and different ranks. The ranks consist of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and Librarian.

Dr. Richard Bowen (Psychology) and Dr. Facione discussed the issue of how far \$1 million would go in adjusting salaries. That is, allocating \$1 million to over 500 faculty at the two Lakeside campuses, would result in an average raise of less than \$2000, which clearly falls short of attaining market parity. Dr. Facione pointed out that for the next few years, \$5 million would be required.

Dr. Anthony Cardoza (History) raised concerns that allocating the additional funds for faculty salaries could increase tensions and lead to acrimony among faculty. Dr. Facione acknowledged this possibility. Some stated that in recent years, faculty salaries were distributed somewhat evenly across faculty so that merit was not given much attention. Dr. Cardoza mentioned that in his department, because the amount allocated for faculty salaries was so low, it has been difficult to provide ample awards to faculty. Sometimes the merit raise would simply equal the merit raise. Dr. Nicholas Lash (Business) noted that in the School of Business, merit has been important in determining faculty raises and some faculty have been receiving zero percent raises. It was noted that at the Medical School, money has been taken away. Dr. Facione emphasized that no money would be taken away.

Other Needs

Dr. Facione also wishes to allocate funds to faculty for other purposes.

- Funds must also be related to student-faculty ratios at peer institutions. Some departments at Loyola have become too thin. Hence, some funds are necessary to increase faculty in some departments.
- Funding should also be provided for new initiatives and programs. He has requested the
 deans to provide him with new programs. The School of Education has provided a list of
 suggestions.
- For faculty development, additional money will be necessary to fund proposals. There have been many good proposals for summer grants. Dr Facione reported that last year there were 42 proposals for summer stipends. The committee, on the basis of quality, determined that 34 proposals deserved funding. Of the 34, the best 11 were not ranked, but the next group of 23 was ranked. The committee decided that the remaining eight proposals should not be funded. Only \$96,000 in funding was available. The Deans were asked to contribute and eventually \$210,000 was available to fund, at some level, 32 of the 34 proposals

B. Research

Are junior faculty given preferences in the awarding of grants over senior faculty?

In response to a question by Dr. Dell'Angela (SSOM), Dr. Facione answered that junior faculty are not given preference. He went on to state, however, that deans should not put junior faculty on training grants. Instead, senior faculty should be employed. For grants for junior faculty, it is important that the money be used to support research activity that is germane to attainment of tenure.

Dr. Facione was disturbed that grant requests from Liberal Arts and Sciences have been down. He believes that faculty are internally driven to do research. While administrators may discourage, they cannot eliminate, the drive to conduct research. Nonetheless, he acknowledged that technical procedures, sometimes requiring one to wait over two-and-a-half years, could discourage leave applications. He went on to discuss what he felt were problems of culture at some professional schools that may discourage research and grants.

- He again mentioned that deans sometimes use junior faculty for training grants rather than for research-oriented grants.
- In some units, department chairs become irritated if faculty receive grants. This makes additional work for chairs such as in hiring replacements.
- There are also cases where a dean or chair will communicate to a grant seeker that he or she may apply for a grant to work on a certain project, but that the administrator will support the application only if the grant recipient agrees to work on a different project, of the administrator's choosing.
- There are examples where administrators will support a grant only if the recipient follows the procedure designated by the administrator. That is, "do it my way."
- Some mediocre researchers may downgrade the research of others.

Some charged that at the Medical Center, indirect costs appear to be more important than the quality of the research in deciding grants. Dr. Facione noted that he does not control research at the Medical Center.

Dr. Marta Lundy (Social Work) inquired if Dr. Facione was unreceptive to training grants, which in Social Work are quite important. He responded that there are always exceptions. The key point, however, is that deans should not exploit assistant professors. He also went on to mention that he wishes to raise standards for tenure.

It was pointed out that when Dr. Leslie Fung was Chair of the Research Committee an extensive study was undertaken examining research policies at other universities. It was suggested that perhaps this study should be resurrected. It is on the Research Committee website.

C. Library

The President regards a learning center, which would house a new library, to be a top priority. This will be the next new building at Lake Shore campus though currently its site is yet undetermined, and there is no time line. Today the library is operating at 105% of capacity. There is no money in the library's budget for storage. Hence, books not being used are being removed. Faculty members are welcome to the books not being used. The Library Committee is being reinvigorated.

D. Fall Break

Dr. Dell'Angela mentioned that there were many complaints about moving the fall break to so late in the semester. Dr. Facione mentioned that he had received many complaints; though last year student input was positive regarding this change. Two groups that approved the change were Student Life, which reported less vandalism from Halloween, and some faculty who prefer to have the semester break after more than half of it is completed. Nonetheless, many want to return to the previous, earlier fall break. Dr. Facione acknowledged that changing the fall break might have been a mistake. He also wondered why there was not more controversy about the change in the spring break. Discussion also took place regarding whether the drop date should be pushed back further in the semester, so that students have more information about their status before deciding whether or not to drop a class.

E. Other Issues

Faculty Size and Staff Support

Dr. Bowen (Psychology) pointed out that the number of faculty in his department has declined from 33 to 20 full time equivalent faculty. They also have lost some faculty who became deans but have not been replaced. Furthermore, the hiring process is constrained by a need for the faculty to be part of a special program or niche. New faculty lines are slow to be approved.

Dr. Facione pointed out that there has been a loss of 200 faculty and 300 staff in the last seven years (primarily through attrition), which explains why at times efficiency is not what it should be. He recognized that some clerical and other duties are now being performed by faculty due to the downsizing of staff, but indicated that similar problems are also plaguing other universities. It will take time to rebuild. In rebuilding, Loyola's goal is to achieve national prominence; hence, Loyola is following a strategic plan wherein hiring is an important componant. Toward this goal is a focus is on building upon areas of strengths and interdisciplinary programs. Thus, individual departmental needs are always the top consideration.

Several faculty complained about the grading of multiple choice questions. In the past, such grading was fast and efficient. Now, it is slow and cumbersome. Staff are spending time on this task and expensive new equipment is being purchased. Such changes do not appear to be cost-effective. Because of cuts in information systems staff (from 122 to 85), problems are occurring and much time has been lost. Due to broken equipment, one faculty member spent the 4th of July grading 90 papers.

Dr. Facione pointed out that the budget is now balanced, but a number of problems still must be solved. For example, class size has become a big problem. In one year, the average class size has increased dramatically. In the College of Arts and Sciences it has increased from 23 students to 30, over a 30% increase. Also, although full time faculty teach 70 percent of sections, they teach only 20 percent of freshman classes. For writing, the average is less than 25%, whereas it is over 25% on a national basis. In a high quality private school, the average class size should be approximately 18. Dr. Facione further commented that it made no sense, in a school as heterogeneous as Loyola, for all faculty members to be assigned to teach six courses.

Core Curriculum

Dr. Schweikart (Philosophy) inquired regarding the new core curriculum and how much input faculty and departments would have. Moreover, he inquired why such major changes were to be put in place. "Was the core broken?" Dr. Facione responded by stating that indeed the core was conceptually broken. It was of very poor quality, a "mess," and there were complaints emanating from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Faculty Grievances

Dr. Mary Malliaris (Business) asked whether Loyola should have an ombudsperson. Dr. Schoenberger (Law) mentioned that in the past there was an ombudsperson who basically dealt with the staff. Due to fiscal constraints, the position was eliminated. Dr. Facione stated that given the many pressing needs that Loyola faces, establishing an ombudsperson would not be a top priority. For faculty with grievances, an interim faculty grievance committee was formed last summer. This information was greeted with apparent surprise by those present as none of the faculty was aware of the formation of this committee.

Summer Teaching

Dr. Bowen (Psychology) pointed out that the number of summer courses available for faculty to teach had been reduced. A number of faculty, previously, would teach two courses in the summer, but this was no longer possible under the new system. Dr. Facione mentioned that it should be possible for faculty to teach numerous different combinations of courses, including courses of varying lengths. Some complained that the new summer schedule might not be fair to the students. Dr. Facione responded by stating that Loyola's summer schedule was not uncommon.

The Role of Research at Loyola

The final question raised was what is the advantage of the university's supporting of research. Dr. Facione gave several reasons why supporting research was very important to Loyola.

- Research support is important to attract, retain, and nurture the type of faculty for whom inquiry is part of their nature.
- Research support gives faculty an opportunity to flourish.
- The alternative, a teaching–machine campus, is one where the faculty do the same thing year after year. When assistant professors are hired, if successful they will remain at the university for approximately 25 years. At teaching-machine campuses, they will burn out after a decade.
- Research-oriented faculty will work to improve curriculum.
- Research-oriented faculty will attract better students.
- Research is an essential part of being a university.

Closing comments on research

Dr. Facione provided his personal perspective on the importance of research and scholarship to faculty. He stated that he feels individuals become faculty because of a deep and abiding spirit of inquiry that is an essential part of who they are. He hopes that the approach to research at LUC will honor that part of the faculty better in the future.

III. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas A. Lash

Members Present

Arts and Sciences: Dr. Richard Bowen (Psychology), Dr. Ian Boussy (Biology), Dr. Anthony Cardoza (History), Dr. Brian Lavelle (Classics), Dr. Gerry McDonald (Math/Computer Science), Dr. David Schweickart (Philosophy), Dr. Judith Wittner (Sociology).).

Professional Schools: Dr. Harvey Boller (Business), Dr. Kim Dell'Angella (Pediatrics), Dr. Anthony Castro (CBN and Anatomy), Dr. Karen Egenes (Nursing), Dr. Christian Johnson (Law), Dr. Nicholas Lash (Business), Dr. Marta Lundy (Social Work), Dr. Mary Malliaris (Business), Dr. Kenneth McClatchey (Pathology), Dr. Allen Shoenberger (Law).