

Loyola University Administrative Senate

Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, September 9, 2003, Monroe Library Seminar Room 4

Present:

Timothy Albert	Lisa Maloz
Carla Buice	Charles Marshall
Jay Calamia	Paula Quenoy
James Egan	Robert Reed
Kathy Gros	John Sears
David Huffman	Suzanne Terrillion
Bret Jacobs	Angela Vachetta
Amy Keeler	Reid Wick

Absent:

Michelle Andrews (proxy to Robert Reed)
Richard Bell (proxy to Jay Calamia)
Shannon Duplantis (proxy to Jay Calamia)
Germaine Turner (proxy to Robert Reed)

- I. **Call to Order** - Mr. Sears called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.
- II. **Approval of the Minutes** - The minutes of the August 12, 2003, meeting were approved.
- III. **Announcements** – No announcements were made.

IV. **Committees**

Parking – Mr. Reed reported that the committee met on August 11, 2003. The parking situation was discussed and it was noted that parking during the fall semester is very tight. The committee received news that the Career Fair will be moved to a Thursday this year, which is a day with less parking problems. Traditionally, this event has always been held on a Monday or Wednesday, which has really been a problem. Mr. Egan asked why traffic is worse during the fall semester. Mr. Reed replied that there are always more students enrolled during the fall semester.

University Planning Team - Mr. Calamia reported that the UPT discussion related to deciding firm financial and enrollment numbers for three primary sources of revenues: 1) Tuition and Fees, (traditional undergraduate and graduate programs); 2) Non-Traditional Programs (Institute for Ministry, Continuing Legal Education, Total Quality Management, Summer Bridge, Criminal Justice, etc.); and 3) Auxiliary Enterprises (Resident Halls, Student Fees, Recreational Complex, etc.).

Mr. Sears reported that Dr. John Cornwell is beginning to help Fr. Knoth implement the whole notion of transparency and interrelatedness. For example, more information about the university is going to be made more readily available to more people so they can do better planning and better understand the relationships between planning, budgeting, and assessment. A first step in the process is to identify all of the committees on campus, determine their mandate, the membership rationale, and their place in the planning, budgeting, and assessment process. Mr. Sears stated that the Administrative Senate is more organized and in much better shape than

many other committees, which he attributes to the work that has been ongoing over the past several years and in particular the revisions to the by-laws and constitution.

Fringe Benefits – Mr. Marshall reported that renewal information from respective carriers is being gathered. At this time, the committee has received some preliminary information from Blue Cross that costs will be increasing. Discussions during the last year indicate that Fr. Knoth wants to reach a point where the university is paying 70% of the coverage and the employee is paying 30% of the coverage. There was some shift toward this goal last year, which is why the employees' rates increased by a greater percentage than the university's rates. Any plan changes or rate increases to employees for the coming year were still in the early stages of discussion.

The cost of dental insurance will be increasing. Life insurance will probably be changing carriers because Met Life is significantly increasing its rates. The committee discussed the possibility of changing the voluntary life insurance plan to a plan where everyone will be given the equivalent of one times salary paid for by the university while the additional one times salary or more would be optionally paid for by the employee. This would give individuals under 55 years of age a savings.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Sears distributed a Benefits Questionnaire for all members of the Senate to complete. He stated that he would report the results at the next Fringe Benefits Committee meeting.

Handbook Committee – Mr. Sears opened the floor for early suggestions on the type of review process the Administrative Senate would like to implement for the handbook. He suggested that all Senators familiarize themselves with the memorandum that was written, under David Huffman's leadership, about concerns the Administrative Senate had regarding various fringe benefit changes, policies, procedures, etc. relating to the previous draft version of the Staff Handbook. Mr. Sears agreed to make the memorandum available to new members.

Several members emphasized the importance of reviewing the entire document and being given ample time to discuss the document. As a first step, it was decided that Mr. Sears would ask Ms. Metzner to review the above mentioned memorandum and detail how the new procedures manual responds to the Administrative Senate's previous concerns. Members expressed the need to have her response to these questions before Ms. Metzner personally addresses the Senate at a future meeting concerning this matter.

V. Unfinished Business

A. Goal Setting

Mr. Sears reviewed the two possible Administrative Senate Objectives that were discussed during the August meeting and concluded that the concerns expressed could possibly be one objective. He stated that both of the objectives are attempting to determine if Institutional Objective 5(b) from the University Planning Team is actually being implemented in a way that is consistent with the expressed direction of the goal. He recommended that a subcommittee be established consisting of at least one representative from each division to flesh out how the Senate is going to accomplish the objective.

Objective 5(b) states that administrative staff compensation will be enhanced. Compensation is made up of two basic elements: salaries and benefits. As an approach, Mr. Sears suggested studying what has happened to the budget for both of these elements and do some calculations. In order to do this, he suggested establishing a working committee that could approach this objective from the various views of the various divisions of the university and bring in other people as consultants for technical expertise. Mr. Egan asked how Human Resources determines whether these goals are being met. Mr. Sears responded that he has no idea and has not seen anything in terms of an evaluation report, but in the absence of any qualitative or quantitative benchmarks you are sort of at sea.

Mr. Egan asked what “internally equitable” means. Mr. Sears responded that he didn’t know exactly. However, from a Human Resources viewpoint, if there is an administrative assistant in Institutional Advancement and an administrative assistant in Academic Affairs and you look at the job descriptions and the job descriptions are essentially the same, everything else being equal, there should be no reason why one administrative assistant in one division should be paid more or significantly more than the other. That is not to say one could not in other circumstances. Mr. Egan asked how Human Resources takes into account longevity of employment. Mr. Sears responded that longevity would be taken into account through changes to the grade ranges. **(Now that the University formally embraces only a merit system for salary adjustments, the whole question of longevity is no longer relevant.)** There is also the question of external equity because if you stay employed in one place there is always the problem of salary compression. External competitive market salary forces are not influencing an individual salary within an institution. Mr. Egan inquired if it was the university’s premise that fair market compensation for employees is being met. Mr. Sears stated that those discussions are being held.

Mr. Huffman asked what the subcommittee would be charted to do. Mr. Sears stated that the subcommittee should 1) determine the kinds of questions that come to mind after the objective is understood and fleshed out; and 2) determine the kind of information needed to evaluate the achievement of the objective. Mr. Huffman asked if a small committee could do this or if the whole body would be more appropriate. Mr. Sears replied that this would be a steering committee. There was a consensus that a small committee could determine questions that need to be asked, gather data and report back to the larger group. Mr. Egan, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Keeler, and Ms. Quenoy volunteered to serve on the Senate Objective 5(b) Study Committee. Mr. Sears asked these individuals to meet and report back to the Senate during the October 2003 meeting. The whole group will decide where to go from there.

Mr. Sears steered the Senate to the second objective. He emphasized that the second objective is really directional. This topic began last year with a Survey of Organizational Satisfaction that the Administrative Senate completed. It was suggested at the last meeting that the survey be expanded. Mr. Sears suggested that perhaps another committee be established to determine how the survey should be expanded. After discussion, it was decided to wait until the newly established Senate Objective 5(b) Study Committee reports back to the Senate in October before any decisions were made concerning Objective 2.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

