
CALL TO ORDER: President John Slosar called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the October 26, 1999, Faculty Senate meeting were approved with the following correction: Under GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE FACULTY MANUAL, the final sentence should read "The most significant changes are likely to be a revision of the grievance policy and a definition of physician services."

PRESIDENT'S UPDATE BY JOHN SLOSAR:

- Clarification of Senate attendance policy
  -- John read the pertinent section of the Senate's bylaws, i.e., Article V. 9.: If a Senator or designated alternate misses a total of two regular or special meetings during one academic year, the Senator shall forfeit office. The Secretary shall so notify the senator within two weeks of the absence. The Executive Committee shall evaluate the reasons for each of the two absences in determining whether to reinstate the lapsed Senator or to call for the election of a new Senator for the remainder of the term.
  -- John noted that the method of selection of alternates is up to the schools. Alternates can be elected, but the usual practice seems to be that the Senator simply asks a colleague to sign in and attend for them.

- The Faculty Senate President represents the interests of the faculty on the President's Coordinating Council (PCC). This usually entails at least one three-hour monthly meeting. Special PCC meetings were held on October 29, November 5, and November 16, and another with the Council of Academic Deans on November 23, to determine the operating budget for next year. Fr. Biondi absent himself from these meetings, which were conducted by Dr. James Kimmey. The budget is to be presented to the Board of Trustees this weekend. John has been
Revision of the *Faculty Manual*: The Governance Committee has not met as a committee since the night of the Senate anniversary dinner, but John and committee chairperson Jack Stretch reviewed with Provost Sandra Johnson their extensive compilation of suggested revisions preparatory to delegating tasks. A special task force will be appointed to deal with the grievance process. Probable members include the chairs of the Senate Grievance and Professional Relations Committees, the subcommittee of the Governance Committee that's been dealing with this issue, Assistant General Counsel Ken Fleischmann, John Slosar, and a representative of the Provost's office. The task force will begin its work early in 2000. In response to a question from the floor, John said that the list of suggested revisions will be posted on the Senate Web site. The members of the task force will also be posted on the Web site when those appointments are finalized.

The Executive Committee has begun the process of preparing a slate of Senate officers. This spring, the Senate needs to elect a president-elect, a secretary, and two members-at-large. The slate will be presented to the Senate at the February meeting; at that time, the floor will be opened for additional nominations. The election will take place in April.

The method of distribution of Senate documents will be changed. Rather than emailing the full text of most documents directly to senators, the secretary will send senators an email alert containing a hotlink to the document(s) on the Senate Web site. Senators simply can click on the link in the message to view and/or print the document(s). This will reduce senators' mailbox clutter.

A Resources link has been added to the Faculty Senate Web site. Currently, the resources include the text of Dr. Ruth Murray's 1999 Burlington Northern Faculty Award Presentation on Mentoring, a link to Office of Human Resources policies related to affirmative action and faculty hiring, a link to the new Research Integrity Policy, a link to *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, and a link to the AAUP Web site. The URL is http://www.slu.edu/organizations/fs/resources .

Earlier today, in his December message to the University community, Fr. Biondi announced that he had appointed Sandra Johnson to the position of provost on a permanent basis. His message read: "After consultation with various organizations within the University, I am pleased to announce that I have offered, and Professor Johnson has accepted, the position of Provost on a permanent basis. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate unanimously endorsed her appointment as provost on this basis, and the Student Government Association voted in favor of her appointment to the permanent position. I also consulted with the Council of Academic Deans, the Staff Advisory Committee, and the PCC, and each group supported the appointment of Professor Johnson as Provost."

John provided background related to the Executive Committee's endorsement of Johnson's permanent appointment. Early in the Fall semester, Fr. Biondi approached the Executive Committee. He said that since this was the group that nominated Johnson for the position of interim provost (which was done about 1.5 years ago), he was coming back to the committee to see if it would endorse her appointment as the permanent provost of the university. John noted
that Fr. Biondi made this request of the Executive Committee rather than ask the Executive Committee to speak for the Senate as a whole. At that meeting, the Executive Committee told Fr. Biondi that it could not give him the endorsement he sought. While the committee members felt that Johnson had done a good job, they could not freely approve her appointment at that time. A major impediment was Johnson's statement, at the 1998 Senate retreat, that she would not accept the permanent position without a national search. Several weeks later, John discussed the position and the possible search process directly with Johnson. Several weeks after that, Fr. Biondi again asked the Executive Committee to give a position regarding Johnson's appointment as provost. The Executive Committee conducted extensive, vigorous discussions about the appointment--the pros and cons, the costs and benefits. Ultimately, the members of the Executive Committee did vote unanimously to endorse Sandra Johnson's permanent appointment as provost.

The Executive Committee felt strongly that a larger issue was involved, i.e., that of national searches. One of the Executive Committee's considerations was that the university's executive vice president was appointed without a national search, and now the provost had been appointed without a national search. The Executive Committee determined it needed to take a strong stand regarding the issue of the policy for replacing administrators. Ultimately, John hand-carried two communications to Fr. Biondi's office. The first pertained to Sandra Johnson's appointment.

Dear Fr. Biondi,
At your request, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate at its meeting on October 5, 1999, took under consideration the proposal to appoint the Interim Provost, Sandra Johnson, as the Provost of Saint Louis University. After due consideration, the Executive Committee unanimously concurred with your proposal and supports Professor Johnson's appointment to the position of Provost. Signed by John Slosar, Faculty Senate President, on behalf of the Executive Committee.

The second letter read as follows:

Dear Fr. Biondi,
At its meeting on October 5, 1999, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate discussed the importance of national searches in filling senior administrative vacancies. The Committee unanimously endorsed the position given below.

In the spirit of shared governance, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate strongly urges the President to adopt the following as standard procedure in cases of vacancies in administrative positions:

All senior-level administrative positions (Vice-Presidents, Executive Vice-President, Provost, and comparable positions) shall be filled through a national search. In those cases where such vacancies occur, and it is necessary to appoint an interim officeholder, a search committee shall be appointed and a national search process initiated at the same time that the acting or interim appointment is made. Signed by John Slosar, Faculty Senate President, on behalf of the Executive Committee.
John noted that the Executive Committee was asked to treat this information and Fr. Biondi's inquiry as confidential until Fr. Biondi made his announcement. In response to questions from the floor, John explained that Fr. Biondi had made it clear he would appoint Sandra Johnson regardless of her position on a short-list of nominees in a national search; thus the cost of a search seemed to outweigh any benefits. Also, the Executive Committee felt the issue was less about Johnson than protocol—it agreed to the candidate wholeheartedly and the process reluctantly. Therefore, it would support Fr. Biondi's request this time but expects a national search next time an administrative vacancy occurs.

"THE FUTURE OF ITS AT SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY" -- PRESENTATION BY TOM MOBERG, CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Dr. Moberg distributed handouts outlining his presentation (the text is available on the Senate Web site at http://www.slu.edu/organizations/fs/resources.html ). Selected additional notes follow.

Part I: Introduction -- Moberg acknowledged the goals identified by the Technology Planning Council (TPC) in its three-year plan and said he had modified them for incorporation into his current plan.

Part II: Some Goals for the Near Future

#4: Provide access to high performance networking and greater access to information -- Moberg is talking to Washington University, Southern Illinois University-Springfield, and the University of Missouri regarding a consortial effort with Internet II, particularly for networking applications in medical education.

#7: Facilitate research -- He doesn't know at this point what this will entail, but realizes its importance.

#9: Develop a collaborative, cooperative IT planning environment -- More feedback loops are needed between planners and stakeholders.

#10: Build a consistent, predictable, proactive IT funding and budgeting system -- This is an extremely important goal.

Part III: Some Activities and Directions

- Improving the campus network and access to information -- Hopes to have remote access service updated in Spring 2000.
- Developing a desktop refresh program -- Need a predictable campus refresh system. Dell has been selected as the preferred non-Apple PC provider for its range of services.
- Creating a managed, integrated, distributed support system -- Working out shared support system in various areas. Positions may or may not be part of ITS, but are in some way linked to ITS. They will have the advantages of both centralized and decentralized positions. The Law School is a model.
• Tuning the IT governance structure -- A Board of Trustees Committee on Science and Technology has been established; it is still delineating its job. Larry Figgs (Public Health) is the Faculty Senate representative. Moberg formed the Information Technology Advisory Council (ITAC) to replace the TPC. ITAC is advisory to Moberg. It's role still is being clarified; it has more faculty and student representation than the TPC did.

• Reorganizing ITS to enhance service -- Reorganization of ITS was launched in August 1999; there is a better functional alignment. Some new positions were created; staffing changes are being made. Recognizes need to vastly improve the helpdesk system. The Instructional Media Center (IMC) and Biomedical Communications (BMC) are now part of ITS. Moberg wants a much greater service orientation among ITS staff; he has instituted midyear performance reviews of ITS staff. He also has worked to enhanced staff compensation to better attract and retain quality employees.

• Enhancing University education spaces -- The $5 million Danforth Grant is being used to improve Level 1 classrooms and create new Level II classrooms. Over the holidays, ITS is putting new computers into 36 Level III classrooms. Moberg's plans for the SLU 2000 funds include taking over refresh for all campus labs and classrooms. He intends to start the refresh program with 500 computers per year and move toward refreshing lab and classroom computers every other year. One-year old machines would enter a cascade program and be placed in faculty and staff offices.

Moberg concluded by saying that these plans can be achieved from a technical perspective. He noted, however, that there are cultural, scheduling, and security problems, among other issues. He wants to address the issues holistically. Finally, he asked that faculty direct any feedback or suggestions to him (mobergtf@slu.edu).

Question: Confidence about Y2K? -- Moberg thinks the central and administrative systems will be OK, but doesn't believe all desktops will be remediated because of time constraints. SLU started dealing with Y2K a year late and had no desktop inventory at all until only two months ago. ITS will shut down the central systems at 4pm on December 31, then bring up each server systematically the next day to monitor each one. Moberg asked the faculty not to turn on their computers again until at least January 3, if possible, to better avoid the anticipated January 1 virus attacks and be sure to have virus software on their machines. To avoid problems with non-compliant desktops, ITS is going to try to replace them as quickly as possible. ITS is addressing hardware compliance; faculty need to be concerned about software compliance.

Question: What is Internet II? -- The Internet's early emphasis was on educational functions, but it quickly has been taken over by the commercial sector and the government no longer supports it. The educational community uses it, but high end researchers cannot accomplish what they need to do now. About 50-60 high end educational research institutions are trying to create a new high-performance network for research and education. Many other institutions are interested, at least for specific applications. Moberg wants SLU to "sit at the table" as the new network is developed.

Question: What can faculty do to help ITS meet faculty needs? -- Be clear what those needs are. Express them in terms of educational efficacies, institutional mission, teaching and learning, i.e., how will your work be enhanced. Talk to ITS; make use of venues for conversation with ITS such as its Summer Institute. The ITAC representatives are good channels of communication with ITS, but in addition, Moberg said he would gladly meet with any department, division, or other unit.
Question: There will be 700 desktops refreshed this month. Who owns the cascaded machines? -- The university owns them. Moberg noted that he wants to eliminate 700 bad machines and that there isn't a university-wide cascade program yet. Ownership is less an issue than disposal.

Question: Is "preferred vendor" a "sole vendor"? -- There probably always will be at least two vendors, one of which is Apple. The main reason for a preferred vendor is the advantage of bulk purchase. Moberg noted that the purchase system includes an authorization step; exceptions to the university's preferred vendor may be possible if, in Moberg's opinion, there is a driving educational reason.

Question: Are any discounts applicable to laptops? -- Moberg said that notebooks are an area where he can allow more "fuzziness" than with the standardized desktop, and that there probably will be help with laptop pricing. Dell will set up a SLU-specific Web site for ordering. Faculty will be able to add more things to their machines if they have funds.

Question: Will Dell discounts be applicable to personal purchases by SLU faculty, staff and students? -- Dell will have a special discount rate. Also, Dell will load SLU's standard software on SLU-owned machines at the factory, but Moberg doesn't know yet if Dell will do that for personal machines.

REPORT OF THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE -- FAYE ABRAM (SOCIAL SERVICE), CHAIR OF THE FACULTY SENATE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMMITTEE

Faye Abram reported that the Affirmative Action Committee reviewed the responses made to Larry Figgs's presentation at the October 26, 1999, Senate meeting on the committee's call for renewed university commitment to affirmative action and the recruitment/hiring of minority faculty. The Committee couldn't bring its proposed resolutions back to the Senate until today's meeting because of the November Faculty Assembly. Given the time constraints due to the SLU 2000 initiative for hiring new faculty, and the fact that Provost Sandra Johnson responded favorably to the committee's resolutions and affirmed her own commitment to diversity in faculty appointments, Faye and John Slosar met with Johnson to discuss implementation of the resolutions.

In a December 6, 1999, letter (copies distributed to senators at today's meeting) to Faye and John, Johnson said:

As we discussed, I am establishing a working committee to make recommendations as to how we can assure that the University's commitment is implemented in our faculty appointments process. I am asking the committee to review current efforts in pool development, selection and recruitment and to make recommendations as to how we all can strengthen these efforts in line with our goals. I would like the suggestions to be concrete and to reflect that academic departments and deans have key roles in the faculty appointments process.

The membership of the committee will include faculty members, deans, and departmental chairs. In addition to Dr. Abram, Fred Wolinsky will serve on the committee, and Leland Ware has agreed to chair. Vicki Riek and Ken Fleischmann will participate as resource persons. I will appoint the deans and departmental chairs within the next few weeks.
I welcome the interest of the Senate in this issue and look forward to the work of this committee.

Faye reported that she will forward any email comments she receives to the task force. She will be on sabbatical during the Spring 2000 semester, but will continue to chair the Affirmative Action Committee and serve on Johnson's working committee.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AND REQUEST FOR ACTION ON TWO RESOLUTIONS -- ROGER LEWIS (PUBLIC HEALTH), CO-CHAIR OF THE FACULTY SENATE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Roger reviewed the points raised at the October 26, 1999, Senate meeting presentation of the committee's report. He noted that references to implementation were removed from the proposed resolutions, leaving the focus on policy issues. Prior to today's meeting, Roger emailed two revisions of the report and resolutions to all senators and requested feedback; he attempted to incorporate into the current report the responses he received. Roger noted that Resolutions 1 and 2 support what is in the current Faculty Manual but is not emphasized sufficiently there and isn't being done in practice. He asked the Senate to endorse both resolutions by voting its approval.

Discussion followed on Resolution 1:
The Faculty Senate regards a strong student/faculty relationship as a worthy goal to achieve as a hallmark of Saint Louis University. The Faculty Senate, thus, recommends an institutional commitment to a vigorous system of student advising and mentoring. Each school should develop policies and procedures that would support advising and mentoring of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.

Steve Harris noted that the resolution didn't address structural advising issues such as the need for improvement in the work of the Office of Academic Advising. Roger responded that the discussion that followed the resolutions in the report did this.

Joya Uraizee pointed out that some schools already have in place policies regarding student advising and mentoring. She suggested a friendly amendment, i.e., Each school should develop and/or enhance policies and procedures..., which was voted on and passed.

John Griesbach inquired as to whom the resolutions would be directed. John Slosar said they would be sent to the provost. He noted that the recommendations that accompany the resolutions in the report are coming from the Faculty Development Committee and are not being endorsed by the Senate.

Discussion ended and the resolution, modified only by the friendly amendment, passed on a voice vote.
Discussion followed on Resolution 2:

The Faculty Senate recommends that each school vigorously enforce an annual faculty review based on clear, objective criteria which has previously been articulated in the Faculty Manual. These evaluations should serve as the primary means for determination of compensation/promotion raises. The Faculty Senate recommends that systematic, and periodic evaluations of departmental chairs and school deans by faculty of each school be implemented according to the Faculty Manual.

Steve Harris noted that Recommendation B under "Faculty Development Issues" contradicts the current A&S process that, he said, seems to work pretty well. Roger said he'd take this under advisement.

Ian Redmount raised questions about the wording of the resolution. He maintained that its wording implied that the evaluations called for in the resolution would supercede existing rank and tenure procedures. Roger responded that this was not the committee's intent. John Slosar and Steve Wernet suggested changing the phrase "compensation/promotion raises" to "compensation and salary increases."

Andy Lonigro suggested changing the phrase "objective criteria" to "objective academic criteria," pointing out that some units in the university also base evaluation on income generation.

Steve Harris argued that the Faculty Manual criteria are subjective, not objective. John Griesbach concurred and added that the criteria are somewhat vague. John Slosar suggested a friendly amendment to the resolution, which Roger accepted; i.e., The Faculty Senate recommends that each school vigorously enforce an annual faculty review based on clear, objective criteria which have been previously articulated in the school. These evaluations shall serve as the primary basis for the determination of compensation and salary increases. The Faculty Senate recommends a systematic and periodic evaluation of the departmental chairs and school deans be implemented according to the Faculty Manual.

Fred Wolinsky pointed out that, given the extent of the suggested changes to the resolution, it was appropriate to send the resolution back to the committee for further discussion.

Tom Dahms called the question. Slosar called for a vote on the question, i.e., should debate end. The vote to end debate passed. Dennis Tuchler moved to recommit the resolution to the committee. Andy Lonigro seconded this motion, which takes precedence over a vote on the resolution itself. The motion to recommit passed.

Summary: Resolution 1 passed with slightly modified text and Resolution 2 was sent back to the committee.

REPORT OF THE COMPENSATION AND FRINGE BENEFITS COMMITTEE AND REQUEST FOR INPUT -- STEVE WERNET (SOCIAL SERVICE), CHAIR OF THE FACULTY SENATE COMPENSATION AND FRINGE BENEFITS COMMITTEE

Steve distributed copies of the committee's report (see attachment A), which summarized its Fall 1999 and proposed Spring 2000 plans and activities.

The committee's historic focus on wages and salaries is being broadened to compensation.
Discussion about the Kysar Plan dealt with retirement contributions and improvements in the medical plan premium, dental, and salary plans. The salary and fringe benefit information provided by the committee last spring was incorporated into the SLU 2000 Faculty Salary Plan, which is to be put in effect over the next two years. In October 1999, the provost informed the committee that the proposed university budget is attempting to improve the salary base and attempt to address the retirement contribution, dental plan, and medical plan premium for dependents (no details yet on these items). This spring, the committee will pursue enhancements to the Kysar Plan.

Increases to base salary from the SLU 2000 Faculty Salary Plan have been earmarked for the next two years. Other SLU 2000 initiatives have wage, salary, and compensation impact. There is concern about merit and incentive plans. SLU 2000 is attempting to put into place some way of measuring the impact of increments to the base salaries of faculty. There is a concern to benchmark. The Board of Trustees wants to know the impact of moving large dollars into base salary. The committee is concerned about this and understands that various task forces will soon start work on addressing these issues. The committee intends to monitor the implementation of the SLU 2000 Faculty Salary Plan.

In addition to further work on the Kysar Plan, the committee identified new areas of focus. (a) Information is being compiled on Fachex and a tuition exchange plan in hopes of making revisions to these practices. (b) Salary compression is a concern. (c) The committee is seeking input as to whether to explore long term care coverage. (d) The committee has concerns about the tracking of various salary initiatives. Responsibility for tracking some initiatives may fall to this committee, but responsibility for tracking other initiatives may be delegated elsewhere. (e) The committee is seeking input as to whether to pursue early retirement programs.

A suggestion was made that a formal maternity leave policy be explored.

The term salary initiative "productivity plan" was questioned. Steve explained that this was part of the SLU 2000. The university will set aside a certain amount of money to be given as bonuses for extraordinary productivity by faculty. It will not be added to base salary; it will be a one-time award. The definition of "productivity" is up for debate. Steve said the ultimate source of these initiatives is the Board of Trustees, which is concerned about the outcome of its infusion of money in the SLU 2000 initiatives.

Steve asked senators to contact committee members with additional items for the committee to consider.

NEW BUSINESS -- None

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

Respectfully submitted,
Miriam E. Joseph
Executive Secretary
Faculty Compensation Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
December 7, 1999

Work Schedule for the Committee

Fall: Identify and Investigate Issues of Concern

Spring: Propose and Present Solutions

Mission of the Committee

Historically --wages and salaries

Committee Work

Last Spring: Met with Provost and Executive Vice President

Discussion of the "Kysar Plan"

Recommendations: Retirement contribution go to 10% beginning with faculty and staff over 55 years of age

Improve medical plan premium

Improve dental plan

Improve salary plan

Outcome: Salary recommendations incorporated into SLU 2000

Proposed budget attempts to address retirement contribution, dental plan and medical plan contribution

Fall 1999: Met with Provost, Vice Presidents for Finance and Human Resources

Issues discussed: Faculty Salary Plan (SLU 2000)

Improvements to base salary

Merit and Incentive Plans

Outcome/Benchmarking for impact

Kysar Plan: enhancing retirement; dental plan; dependent medical premium
Spring 2000 Work Plan:

Future Focus -- compensation broadly defined

1. Salary

2. Fringe Benefits:
   a. Retirement
   b. Medical Coverage
   c. Dental Coverage

3. New Areas of Focus:
   a. Dependent Tuition Plans
   b. Salary Compression
   c. Long Term Care Coverage
   d. Salary Initiatives (incentive plans; merit plans; productivity plans; faculty development; impact assessment/benchmarking)
   e. Early Retirement Programs