SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES

January 18, 2000 (revised)


CALL TO ORDER: President John Slosar called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

CALL OF THE ROLL: Executive Secretary Miriam Joseph called the roll.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the December 7, 1999, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

PRESIDENT'S UPDATE BY JOHN SLOSAR:
- The next Faculty Senate meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2000. The Executive Committee will present a slate of officers for election at the April meeting. Nominations from the floor will be accepted on February 22nd.

- The second resolution from the Faculty Senate Faculty Development Committee will be presented by co-chairperson Roger Lewis for a vote. It will be posted on the Senate Web site in advance of the meeting.

- The educational seminar on taxes and retirement, held in November 1999, will be repeated on February 17, 2000, on the HSC campus in LRC Auditorium A from 3:00-4:30pm. John Slosar will send email notification to all faculty and staff.

- John Slosar reiterated the Executive Committee's position, reported to the Senate at its December 7th meeting, regarding national searches for high-level administrators. He reported that he asked Fr. Biondi for his commitment to that position at the December 21, 1999, President's Coordinating Council meeting. In response, Fr. Biondi expressed his appreciation of the importance of national searches, but said he felt it would be inappropriate for him to commit himself or his successors to an ironclad policy that would require a national search for each and every appointment. He assured John, however, that he will continue to engage in a process of
consultation as he did with the provost's appointment. The Executive Committee is scheduled to meet with Fr. Biondi on February 8th, and will discuss this as well as administrative support for the Faculty Senate.

- The SLU 2000 Committee on Faculty Salaries has convened for the first time. It is chaired by Alan Weinberger (Law). Other committee members are Neil Seitz (Dean, B&A), Jack Renard (A&S), Scotty Scott (CPS), Janet Laney (Provost's Office), Shirley Dowdy (Dean, A&S), and Senate appointees Sharon Homan (Public Health), and John Slosar (Social Service). Approximately 5.5% to 6% over a two-year period will be allocated to supplement faculty salaries. The supplement will be distributed as ordinary salary increases on a per capita merit basis, i.e., based upon faculty evaluations. Essentially the deans are going to be given this salary supplement in addition to the merit pool increase for next year. That amount is 3.5%. The deans will probably get 3.45%, with the difference retained by the provost for special adjustments. The committee is charged with (1) identifying whether a small portion should be used for ongoing faculty recognition awards and (2) designing outcomes to show what impact the salary increases will have on an improved university.

- Affirmative Action Update: Provost Johnson has established the Committee on Faculty Recruitment and Diversity. It is chaired by Leland Ware (Law); its members are Faye Abram (Social Service; chair of Senate Affirmative Action Committee), Fred Wolinsky (Public Health), Asai Asaithambi, Ted Vitale (A&S), Frances Horvath (Dean, AHP), Shirley Dowdy (Dean, A&S), and George Ray (Medicine).

- Revision of the *Faculty Manual*: A task force to address the grievance process has not been established yet. The compilation of suggested *Manual* revisions is available on the Senate Web site under "Announcements." It is raw data at this point. John Slosar noted that discussions with the Provost and General Counsel have occurred and are continuing.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION REGARDING SENATE PRIORITIES**

John Slosar noted that the current year is one of rebuilding for the Senate. He expressed the belief that the structure is in place and the time is right to ask the question, "How can we do things better?" He also asked for input from the senators about what they think the Senate should be doing. The Senate committee chairs and members were also invited to attend today's meeting and provide input.

John noted that one challenge confronting the Senate is how well it represents the faculty at large. He noted the use of email to communicate with the faculty, the published directory of senators and all committee members, and the fact that approximately 140 faculty are serving the Senate as senators or through committee service. John sought input about the interaction between the Executive Committee and the Senate, as well as between senators and their respective constituencies.
Communication was identified as a very important issue. Suggestions for its improvement included:

- Placing Senate meeting minutes on the Web as is being done now, and requiring Senate committee chairs and Senate appointees to university committees to submit activity reports for posting on the Web. (Steve Harris)
- Make Senate reports a standing agenda item on each school’s faculty assembly agenda. (Rick Breslin)
- Establish school-level faculty email lists to facilitate interaction between senators and their school's faculty. (Frank Gilner)
- Resolve issues about who might be authorized to use them. (Steve Harris)

John Slosar noted that the Executive Committee could address these points with VP/CIO Thomas Moberg to facilitate action on behalf of the schools. He also suggested that the Senate might set up its own bulletin board.

Discussion ensued regarding the different methods the Senate could use to both distribute information and solicit information. John Goeke observed that different means of communication may be called for to meet different objectives and/or to communicate with different constituencies. Randy Sprague stated that the Senate needs to better inform people about what it does and get their attention. He advocated exchanging information at school faculty assemblies and bringing that information back to the Senate. Wynne Moskop stated that the Senate needs a way to ensure that major issues (e.g., SLU 2000) come before the Senate as a whole; a listserv would facilitate this. Frank Gilner noted that the role of the Senate is lost when the administration announces initiatives to which Senate committees have contributed; committee contributions often aren’t adequately acknowledged. Tom Dahms requested that background material on Senate meeting agenda items be provided in advance of meetings to allow senators to better prepare for discussion. John Slosar added that Senate committees could be required to submit reports as a way to build accountability between the committees and the Senate; these reports could be posted on the Web.

Rick Breslin suggested that the Faculty Manual revision could serve as a vehicle through which the Senate could inform the faculty at large of the Senate role in the process and gain greater visibility. Changes to the Manual could be posted as they occur, so faculty would have current information about the Manual and could ascertain the progress of--and participate to a greater degree in--the revision process.

Rick further suggested that the Senate establish a task force to explore Senate communication amongst its membership as well as with the greater SLU community. The consensus of the Senate was that this was a good idea. Volunteer members are Frank Gilner, Rick Breslin, Tom Dahms, John Goeke, Steve Harris, and Miriam Joseph. Gilner will convene the first meeting. Breslin suggested the following charge, which was agreed to by the Senate: “Create organisms, modalities, and media for communicating effectively the business of the Senate to both the faculty and other appropriate constituents.”

John Slosar requested input regarding Senate priorities. Tom Dahms urged that faculty development be highlighted, as that seems to be the thrust of the SLU 2000 initiatives. Fred Wolinsky observed that the Senate bylaws need updating; Slosar said he would refer this charge to the Senate Governance Committee. Wolinsky also asked for clarification regarding the role and function of the Executive Committee on taking positions that affect the faculty. Steve Wernet asked for clarification regarding the charges, role, and relationship of Senate committees to the Senate as a whole.
REPORT ON THE FY2001 UNIVERSITY BUDGET --Rob Altholz, Vice President-Business and Finance, and Sandra Johnson, Provost

Sandra Johnson reviewed the current process, and the ways it had changed from year's past. The President's Coordinating Council (PCC) formulated a recommendation advisory to Fr. Biondi and submitted it to him at the last PCC meeting; he did not participate in the process prior to that point. The PCC also consulted the Council of Academic Deans and Directors (CADD) for advice while the budget process was underway. CADD accepted the PCC's final budget recommendations unanimously. The Board of Trustees later adopted the budget. Johnson noted that the schools have their own budgets and that school budget processes vary by school; they have not been finalized yet. Today's presentation focuses on the university budget. Significant points follow:

- Rob Altholz focused on the university's general unrestricted budget. The hard dollar budget is about $200M. The total SLU budget is about $400M, the difference accounted for by University Medical Group (UMG) (~$125M) and soft money (~$75M).
- SLU 2000 funding is not part of the FY2001 operating budget.
- The FY2000 operating budget is $195, balanced with a projected surplus of $1,362,000 (based on the Fall '99 student census; additional censuses will be conducted in February and late spring 2000). The FY2001 budget will have a $1M contingency, to which the FY2000 surplus will be added.
- University revenue is tuition dependent. A 1.9% increase in overall FTE enrollment is projected for FY2001. The projected 2.0% increase in continuing students reflects retention efforts and the investment in SLU 2000 new faculty positions, which are aimed at freshmen and sophomores.
- Tuition room, and meal plan increases were presented. The undergraduate tuition increase of 6.8%. A deliberate effort was made to keep the increase under 7%. A 1% increase in tuition translates to $1M in revenue.
- The discount rate for SLU-provided financial aid (not Pell grants, tuition remission, designated scholarship funds, loans) will increase from 27.4% to 28.2%. The discount rate for undergraduates is higher than that for graduate and professional students. The FY2001 term bill for a "typical" student reflects a 4.6% increase over the FY2000 cost, with financial aid taken into account. Altholz noted that endowed scholarships will be a focus of the next capital campaign.
- Other Revenue Budgets:
  - Parking $2.8M (equal to FY2000 projections)
  - Pooled endowment income (6% higher than FY2000 budget and projection)
  - Assessment rates of 12% and 6% (unchanged)
  - Indirect cost recovery (IDC) increased 7% per formula ($400)
  - Gifts budget of $1.6M (unchanged from FY2000 budget)
- Personnel Assumptions:
  - 3.5% personnel pool for faculty and staff. Performance evaluations will determine actual increases. Provost Johnson will take .05% off the top for salary buyouts, etc. Johnson noted that an additional amount for faculty will come from SLU 2000. That pool creates just under 6% salary increases for the next two years, over and above the operating budget salary increases. Therefore, the total faculty salary pool for FY2001 will be about 6-6.5%, to be distributed through the schools' usual salary systems. (UMG physicians are not included in the SLU 2000 funding).
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- $500K pool for implementation of new streamlined staff salary pay grades, and minimum grade adjustments
- Lapsing $6M (unfilled positions during the year)

- Fringe Benefits--Rate Increases:
  - New retirement benefit: 1/2% increase for faculty staff over 55 (as of January 1, 2001)
  - Higher health insurance costs
  - Recovery of prior deficits
  - More precise allocation of costs (fringe benefits and salaries) between UMG physicians and other full-time faculty and staff

- General Expense Pool (e.g., non-salary): 1/2% increase over the FY2000 budget. Individual vice presidents have been asked to ascertain if the increase can be minimized or foregone in their areas (especially administrative areas).

- Depreciation: Includes depreciation on $1M of FY2001 capital equipment and projects
- FY2001 Contingency is set at $1M, possibly supplemented by an FY2000 surplus. The first call on the contingency is for revenue shortfalls; the second call is for unbudgeted vital expenses with no offsetting revenue.
- The FY2001 General Fund Budget is $202,781,000 (vs the FY2000 year-end forecasted budget of $190,616,000).

NEW BUSINESS -- None

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Miriam E. Joseph
Executive Secretary