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 January 18, 2000, Faculty Senate meeting were approved with the following corrections: T. Benis and T. Johnson both were present at the meeting.

INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION ABOUT GREAT ISSUES COMMITTEE

Chairperson Derek Goewert and Member Jamar Johnson informed the Senate that speaker selection for 2000-2001 is underway. Faculty are invited to suggest speakers; the deadline for suggestions is March 24, 2000. The committee hopes to bring speakers into classrooms more frequently and arrange faculty participation in debates with speakers. The committee has been restructured to allow permanent faculty representation; the faculty representative is a non-voting member. Names of faculty interested in serving on the committee should be sent to John Slosar; suggestions for speakers should be sent to greatissues@hotmail.com.

PRESIDENT'S UPDATE BY JOHN SLOSAR:

- The Faculty Assembly is scheduled for March 21, 2000, in LRC Auditorium A at the HSC campus, starting at 3:30pm. John Slosar is working with the Shared Governance Task Force to identify and bring in speakers. Dr. Mary Burgan, General Secretary of the AAUP, is confirmed.
- Slosar announced that completion of the FAFSA financial aid form is no longer required for employees requesting tuition remission for themselves or family members.
• First-time employee contributors to TIAA-CREF have had no input as to the investment direction of the university's contribution made on their behalf prior to the point they became vested; those contributions automatically went into the conservative TIAA traditional fund. The administration has agreed to remove this restriction beginning July 1, 2000, giving employees full discretion from the very start.
• Kathy Hagedorn, Vice President for Human Resource Management, is investigating SLU participation in a Fachex-like scholarship program called Tuition Exchange Program, which involves about 450 institutions nationwide. Arrangements are not final yet, but SLU may join the program next year.
• Parking and card services announced additional reciprocal parking privileges.
• Thomas Moberg, Vice President of ITS and CIO, informed John Slosar that recent network problems can be attributed to students downloading MP3 music files from the Napster site. This activity peaked at 1500 downloads per hour and was using 50-70% of the university's bandwidth. Moberg has contacted SGA President Jay Perry to discuss an education program for students. ITS will try to avoid draconian measures in dealing with this problem.

SPRING 2000 FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS

John Slosar presented a slate of nominees for consideration by the Senate, and sought additional nominations from the floor. No additional nominations were made; nominations were closed and seconded as presented:

President-Elect: Randy Sprague (Medicine)
Secretary: Miriam Joseph (Libraries)
Executive Committee: Faye Abram (Social Service), Barbara Beck (Public Service), Toby Benis (A&S), Daphne Demello (Medicine), and Marjorie Sawicki (Allied Health)

Continuing Executive Committee members are Andy Lonigro (Medicine) and Fred Wolinsky (Public Health).

Candidate statements will be distributed in March; elections will be held during the April 18, 2000, Senate meeting. Randy Sprague will be asked to attend the April meeting to discuss his vision for the Senate.

REPORT ON THE SHARED GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE -- Dr. Dan Hoft, Faculty Senate Representative  [See Attachment A]

This task force was an outcome of the April 1999 "peace agreement" with the administration. Its charge was to examine both the structure and process of shared governance at the university. The Faculty Senate representatives are Dr. Dan Hoft (Medicine) and Fr. John Kavanaugh (A&S); other faculty serve on the task force as well.
John Slosar expressed concern that a report may be on the fast-track without sufficient input from significant university constituencies; the only solicitation for input came in the form of an email message from Dr. Jim Gilsinan, task force chair. He would like the task force to meet with the Senate Executive Committee.

Dan Hoft echoed Slosar's concern about the speed with which the task force's work was to be done. The task force has met 5-6 times. The members inventoried the shared governance mechanisms at the university, talked about what shared governance is, and solicited input via email from the SLU community (getting only 51 responses).

Hoft stated that ensuring an adequate bi-directional flow of information seemed to be the key to shared governance. The main issues discussed by the task force, and reflected in the email responses, are:
1. Individuals should have input in decisions directly affecting them.
2. Administrators need some effective means of seeking input.
3. At present, there's at least a perception of unilateral decision making without appropriate input.
4. Designated constituent bodies may not be adequately representative of their constituents.

The task force's planned responses:
1. Meet with major constituency groups.
2. Have a Web-based town hall meeting demonstration.
3. Workshop jointly sponsored by the Faculty Senate; have speakers representing perspectives of both the professoriate and administration.

Questioned about successful models of shared governance, Hoft noted that several models had been reviewed but that he hadn't found them particularly instructive. In response to another question, he said that the task force does sense that different levels of consulting needs to occur with different constituencies. Rick Breslin recommended the Association of Governing Boards as a resource for shared governance models. He further stated that the Senate should push for greater input on the budget because the budget determines universities priorities. Discussion pertaining to faculty involvement in budgeting at the school level indicated that such involvement is minor, at best, in most schools and colleges. Further discussion indicated that detailed disclosure of budget and finances at the school level also is minimal.

Hoft identified the budget planning process as a concern to take back to the task force. Slosar added:
- Faculty involvement in meaningful decision-making regarding the university budget as well as the school budgets. He noted that he is the only faculty member with input to the President's Coordinating Council, and that is by virtue of his role as Senate president.
- Some schools and colleges have faculty assemblies that cannot meet unless the dean calls the meeting and sets the agenda. This model is preferred by some schools, but not all.
- In a recent meeting with the Executive Committee, Fr. Biondi stated his belief that there are too many committees across the university. Slosar expressed concern that this may signal a retreat from shared governance.
Breslin suggested that if there isn't a budget committee with faculty input at the outset, it might be useful to have a priorities committee that would solicit faculty input regarding this aspect of the budget process. Slosar noted that there is a university budget advisory committee that focuses on the budget process. The Faculty Senate representative is Claudia Campbell (Public Health). Slosar will ask Campbell to give a report at the April Senate meeting and to provide feedback regarding the suggestion of a priorities committee. Hoft replied that constituting another committee may not be as feasible as using existing committees. Mark Houston concurred, noting that the establishment of more committees can be counterproductive for faculty.

Hoft noted that comments and ideas may be sent to him at hoftdf@slu.edu or to the task force at sharegov@slu.edu.

**REPORT OF THE SENATE TASK FORCE ON COMMUNICATION -- Tom Dahms (Medicine), Chairperson** [See Attachment B]

Tom Dahms reviewed the charge: "Create organisms, modalities, and media for communicating effectively the business of the Senate to both the faculty and other appropriate constituents" and the goals:

- Improve representation of faculty constituencies by their respective elected Faculty Senators.
- Increase visibility of Senate activities throughout the SLU community, but particularly among faculty.
- Ensure appropriate attribution for Senate successes.
- Identify ways and means of informing a widespread SLU faculty of Senate activities and soliciting faculty input in a systematic and timely fashion.

The means by which these goals may be accomplished were identified:

- Expand use of email and other electronic information communication systems: Create school bulletin boards and listservs, create an all-faculty listserv, create and authorize access to school and university faculty distribution lists, ensure that off-campus faculty can participate in these communication systems, conduct voting electronically, create a link to the Senate Web site from the SLU Newspage. The task force will meet with Tom Moberg on March 1st to address these issues, among others.
- Need for communication from the Senate to other people: President's monthly message, add link to the Senate's home page from the SLU home page, revive the quarterly *News and Notes* which would include a reflective summary from the president, include a Senate activity box in the *University News*.
- Need for communication back to the Senate: Regular reports to the Senate by Senate representatives to the Board of Trustees (as well as Senate communication to board members via, for example, *News and Notes*).
- Need for communication from the Senate back to the faculty: Encourage all schools and department to include a report from the Senate in their faculty meetings, Executive Committee produces a "hot topics" list to help senators inform their colleagues at school meetings.

Dahms invited senators to send additional suggestions or comments to any task force member.
Larry Figgs, Faculty Senate representative to the Board of Trustees Subcommittee on Science and Technology, questioned how informative a report he'd be able to give the Senate given the limited view he gains from a short meeting held only a few times per year. Rick Breslin said that board members pay a lot of attention to what faculty say and do, and faculty should participate as full members. He recommended that faculty serve multiyear terms to give them more opportunity to participate and for continuity. Breslin also noted that the Senate does not get to appoint representatives; rather it nominates several faculty for the board committees and the administration makes the selection. Judy Medoff echoed Figgs's comments but also said that service on board subcommittees was an opportunity for faculty to express their views, even if those views weren't always appreciated.

John Slosar reiterated that the Senate sends nominees to the administration, which then chooses the representatives it finds acceptable, and that this practice extends beyond the Board subcommittees to all university committees. He asked Dan Hoft to note this as a concern regarding shared governance.

In summary, Dahms said that the task force would ascertain from Moberg what electronic communication options were available. Slosar said that he felt that a monthly message and a quarterly newsletter were redundant; he was open to one or the other--and that a link from the SLU Newspage would be desirable for a monthly message.

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE -- Joya Uraizee (A&S), Acting Chairperson  [See Attachments C and D]

Joya Uraizee reviewed the Academic Affairs Committee's (AAC) response to the draft models for a revised university core curriculum presented by the University Hearing Committee. The AAC believes that extensive faculty input is desirable, but the practical reality is that it would be impossible to get agreement from everyone on a particular core model. It wants to ascertain whether the faculty feel that a change is needed at all, let alone the actual content of the core (e.g., how many hours, how they are allocated), and gain a sense of how the university will go about modifying the drafts into a version that might gain approval. Therefore, the AAC recommended that the discussion of whether or not the core should be revised be informed by the will of the faculty, and that the faculty be polled to achieve a sense of support for change.

In summary, the AAC wants to focus on the issue of polling the faculty about their feelings regarding the need for change in the core. Recommendations for implementation:
1. Limit voting to full-time faculty who teach undergraduates.
2. Require multiple referenda, i.e., one to ask opinions about the preferred size of the core and another to seek responses to the specific proposed models (using some form of preference voting if there are more than two models).
3. Tally referendum results by school as well as for the university as a whole to identify variant opinions across the schools.

Uraizee noted that while a referendum may not resolve the issue of a new core, it may allow a more informed discussion of the core based upon greater faculty input.
Steve Harris stated that the AAC's response to the Hearing Committee presupposed some things and reflected a misunderstanding of the Hearing Committee's intent in disseminating the various core proposals. He said that the models were not intended to be options from which choices would be made. Rather, they were intended to be positions to elicit responses from the faculty as to, for example, which parts of which models were preferred. Thus the AAC's second implementation recommendation contradicted the intent of the Hearing Committee. Harris observed that the AAC's call for a first referendum on the size of the core presupposes that there ought to be a university-wide core and that the Hearing Committee itself offered a rationale for college-level cores as an alternative to a university-wide core. He also noted that the Faculty Council of the College of Arts & Sciences is opposed to being told by another body what its own college core should be. Harris would like to elicit from the faculty their likes and dislikes about each of the proposals, including the proposal that there be no university core but only a rationale.

Judy Medoff stated that she likes the idea of soliciting input from all faculty, but that the choices must be presented in a coherent way. Harris reiterated that no poll should be phrased to presuppose that there should be a university core. Uraizee requested input on the models suggested by the Hearing Committee because that appears to be what is on the table. She suggested, however, that the questions could be rephrased to suggest that there are no presuppositions. Slosar asked who would conduct this poll; Uraizee responded that that hasn't been determined and that the AAC is open to suggestions.

Medoff suggested that the AAC solicit additional input on its recommendations, modify them, and bring them back to the Senate for further discussion; Harris concurred. Harold Dieck noted that the first question to ask is whether there should be a university-wide core. If the response is "no," then the other questions are moot.

Further discussion: Rick Breslin asked whether the question of a core is being viewed solely from the faculty perspective or if the student perspective also is being considered; he said the core needs to change. Uraizee said that current efforts have focused on engaging the faculty, but that student input could be solicited at a later time. Kathryn Kuhn noted the importance of making clear that opposition to a university-wide core does not imply endorsement of the existing core.

Slosar summarized that there appears to be a positive vote on the proposed motion, encouraging the AAC to see that such a referendum takes place and to take into account the various views expressed at today and those sure to be expressed in the near future.

Harris inquired whether the motion directs the AAC to come back to the Senate before implementing a referendum. Uraizee said the committee would do so. Slosar, however, noted potential logistics issues, i.e., the March meeting is a faculty assembly and the final Senate meeting of the semester is on April 18th. To attempt to hold to a realistic time line, he recommended that the revised recommendations be posted on the Senate Web site with provisions for input.

Motion: Have the Academic Affairs Committee move forward with the idea of a referendum as to the question of whether there should be university-wide core, the number of hours it should contain, and, eventually, what the preferred models would be.

The motion passed on a voice vote.
REPORT OF THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AND REQUEST FOR ACTION ON ONE RESOLUTION -- Roger Lewis (Public Health), Co-Chairperson  [See Attachment E]

Roger Lewis presented a revised resolution on faculty and administrator evaluations based upon comments received at the December 7, 1999, Senate meeting and via email. He noted that the vote would be on the resolution and not on the accompanying recommendations.

Resolution II: The Faculty Senate recommends that the university vigorously enforce an annual faculty review based on documented criteria developed in each school. These evaluations should serve as the primary means for determination of compensation. 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 offered a friendly amendment, i.e., These evaluations should serve as a primary means..., noting that faculty compensation determination may be affected by other factors such as SLU 2000 funds and raises for promotion in rank.

John Griesbach sought and received confirmation that the proposed resolution did not add anything to the Faculty Manual. Lewis said, however, that the resolution urges the implementation of the Manual. Judy Medoff noted inconsistencies with the ways in which evaluations have been conducted around the university.

Lewis asked that the recommendations be expressed to the administration on behalf of the committee.

Discussion followed regarding the need to mention that the evaluation process begins with self-evaluation, the existence of criteria in some schools and not in others, and concern over whether the formation of operational rules places faculty in a position to be regulated.

The proposed motion, modified by friendly amendment, passed by majority vote:
Revised Resolution II: The Faculty Senate recommends that the university vigorously enforce an annual faculty review based on documented criteria developed in each school. These evaluations should serve as a primary means for determination of compensation. 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.

Slosar will convey the resolution to the provost as having been endorsed by the Senate, and the recommendations will be conveyed as the thinking of the Faculty Development Committee.

NEW BUSINESS -- None

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

Respectfully submitted,
Miriam E. Joseph
Executive Secretary
Shared Governance Task Force
Dr. Dan Hoft
2/22/00

Key:

Ensuring adequate bi-directional flow of information.

Issues Identified by Committee & E-mail Responders:

1) Individuals should have input in decisions directly affecting them.
2) Administrators need effective means of seeking input.
3) Perception of unilateral decision making without appropriate input.
4) Designated constituent bodies may not be adequately representative.

Planned Responses:

1) Meetings with major constituency groups.
2) Web-based town hall demonstration.
3) Workshop jointly sponsored by Faculty Senate.
4) Final report to President.

Sharegov@slu.edu is the correct email address for comments/ideas for our committee.

Comments Discussed During Faculty Senate Discussion:

1) Assoc. of Gov. Boards as a resource for models of SG
2) Faculty need more input into budgetary processes.
3) Discuss #2 with Claudia Campbell from Budget Advisory Committee.
4) Executive Committee of Faculty Senate should meet with SGTF.
5) Faculty should be able to select representatives, not just nominate.
Goals:
* Improve representation of faculty constituencies by their respective elected Faculty Senators.  
* Increase visibility of Senate activities throughout the SLU community, but particularly among faculty.  
* Ensure appropriate attribution for Senate successes (e.g., Senate committee work spurred the increases in university retirement contributions, but administrative announcements about these increases rarely acknowledge that fact).  
* Identify ways and means of informing a widespread SLU faculty of Senate activities and soliciting faculty input in an systematic and timely fashion.  
* In collaboration with Dr. Thomas Moberg, VP and CIO, identify a permanent ITS liaison who could provide technical guidance and support for Senate electronic communication initiatives (e.g., what's possible, setting it up, maintaining it).

Means:
1. Senate President prepares a monthly "Faculty Senate President's Message" to be linked from the SLU Newspaper (http://www.slu.edu/newspage.html), just under the link to Fr. Biondi's monthly message.  
This message should identify and discuss critical issues, and Senate direction concerning them.  Each message should also include a prominent link to the Senate's Home Page; links to specific pages within the Senate's Web site should be included where pertinent.  
[Questions: (a) What are the University's guidelines regarding use and availability of the Newspaper? All faculty at SLU are not aware of it. (b) Who has authority to authorize a permanent link such as that suggested?]

2. Add a link to the Faculty Senate Web site from the SLU home page.  
[Note: Who has authority to authorize this link?]

3. Revive a quarterly Senate newsletter ("News and Notes" was the title of the publication begun about 10 years ago).  Include in it a "reflective summary" from the Senate President that reviews accomplishments, etc., from the previous quarter.  This newsletter could be distributed in hard copy and/or posted on the Web site.  Copies should be sent to all members of the Board of Trustees.  
[Note: The Senate needs a way of informing the Board of Trustees as a whole.  A newsletter could accomplish that purpose (there is precedent; Fr. Biondi approved the sending of "News and Notes" to members of the BoT Academic Affairs subcommittee).  An alternative is a regular report distributed to the Board by Fr. Biondi--preferably one prepared by the Senate President.]

4. Since faculty read the University News and it is published weekly during the fall and spring semesters, request that the University News provide free space in each issue for a brief "Faculty Senate Notices" feature that would include information such as meeting schedules.  This feature, perhaps in a box format, would appear in the same place in the paper in each edition.  

5. Require summary reports of committee activity from all Senate committee chairs as well as from Senate appointees to non-Senate University committees, including the Board of Trustees subcommittees.  
Guidelines for these reports and timelines (which may vary depending upon the task of the committee and meeting frequency) will need to be established.  These summaries will be posted on the Senate Web site with links from the "Committees" page (which will be restructured to provide access to information on the individual committees).  Links to this information will be incorporated into the Senate president's monthly messages.
6. Encourage committee chairs/representatives who wish to bring committee business to the Senate for discussion, to prepare relevant materials for electronic distribution no less that 10 calendar days prior to the meeting to permit Senators adequate time to review the material. [MJ note: There may be things we'd rather not make available on a public Web site until they are approved by a Senate vote. I can think of two ways we might easily share this info among Senators and Senate committee members/appointees, yet keep it private—with #1 probably being the preferred way. (1) Set up a Senate bulletin board that permits attachments (as WebCT does). (2) Load the materials on a non-publicized Senate Web site page and inform Senators of their availability via a brief email message. A Web page could be created on the Senate site that isn't linked from the home page where we could post info that we don't want to share widely just yet. It wouldn't be password protected, but there'd be no obvious direct path to it either. A link to the page would be embedded in the email notification message sent to senators.]

7. Explore setting up a Senate listserv and bulletin board to facilitate discussion among Senators and Senate committee members/appointees. A Senate email distribution list has been established by ITS; access is authorized only for the Senate President and Executive Secretary at this time. Guidelines for access and use must be determined for each medium.

8. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee prepares a regularly published list of "hot topics" for senators to take back to their school faculty assemblies and department faculty meetings. The intent of the list is to guide Senators in soliciting broader faculty input on significant current issues in a timely way; however, discussion need not be limited to the items on this list.

9. Encourage the schools to incorporate time into the meetings of their faculty governing bodies (e.g., councils) and faculty assemblies (i.e., all-faculty meetings) to receive updates of Faculty Senate activities from their Senate representatives and, as appropriate, discuss and provide input relevant to critical issues. The Senate President to request that CADD members facilitate the regular inclusion of Senate business on their schools' meeting agenda.

10. Encourage the departments to incorporate time into their faculty meetings to discuss and provide input relevant to critical Senate issues.

11. Explore setting up school-specific faculty email distribution lists, listservs, and bulletin boards to facilitate discussion and the solicitation of input on school and Senate issues. Guidelines for access and use must be determined for each medium and might vary from one school to another.
To: The Faculty Senate  
From: the Academic Affairs Committee  
Re: Recommendation for a referendum on the proposed new University Core Curriculum  
Date: February 10, 2000  

Rationale:  
Recently, several draft models for a revised University core curriculum were sent via email to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Committee read the drafts and sent a response to the Hearing Committee. In our discussion of the models, we realized that it was not just the content and size of the proposed cores that needed examination, but also the question of how the university would go about modifying the drafts into a version that a majority of the faculty would approve of. It seems obvious that any discussion of the core raises many issues on which consensus seems difficult to achieve. We believe that as in the past, discussions of the size and content of the core might lead to deadlock. While achieving consensus on the size and content of a new core seems difficult, it is not even clear whether faculty are more satisfied or more dissatisfied with the core as it is at present.

Recommendation:  
We assert that the discussion of whether or not the core should be revised should be informed by the will of the faculty. We recommend that the relevant faculty be polled, so that we will all be able to assess the degree of support for change.

Implementation:  
1) We suggest that voting be limited to full-time faculty who teach undergraduates since they have a vested interest in the undergraduate curriculum.  
2) We suggest that more than one referendum be required. The first will ask opinions about the preferred size of the core. The second will seek responses to the specific proposed models. If there are more than two models some form of preference voting should be in place to enable accurate measurement of choices.  
3) We suggest that results of the referendum be tallied by school as well as for the University as a whole in case opinions about the core vary significantly across schools.

Conclusion:  
While a referendum may not provide an instant solution to the idea of a new core, it may at least allow a discussion of the core to based on a more informed idea of what the faculty would like to see.
Transmission of the reports courtesy of Anton Brinckwirth, Language Learning Center, Department of Modern and Classical Languages. A. Daly, S.J.

To: All Faculty.

The University Hearing Committee has been drafting documents based on the comments received from the university community on the two reports which are the object of its work: The report of the First Year Task Force and the report of the Retention Management Committee. These comments were received by the Hearing Committee in the course of the long series of open hearings completed earlier this year.

Parts I and II of our draft were circulated in the Spring of 1999. Part I presented four recommendations on academic issues other than the core curriculum. Part II laid out one recommendation on a new student center.

Part III and IV are now sent to you (along with Parts I and II, for your convenience). Part III pertains to "Other Student Life Matters," and Part IV introduces five university core curriculum models. As was the case with Parts I and II, these are in draft form. The entire document is also on the web.

The Hearing Committee is seeking as wide a response as possible from our university community. All suggestions will be taken into account when we continue our deliberations for the purpose of writing our final report.

Please send us your comments on all four parts of our draft no later than February 15, 2000.

The members of the Hearing Committee join me in thanking you for your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Jean-Robert Leguey-Feilleux
Political Science Dept.
Shannon Hall

---------------------------------------------
IV. CORE CURRICULUM ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

After conducting campus-wide hearings on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Task Force on the First Year Experience and Retention Management Committee, the Hearing Committee issued a series of first-draft recommendations in the areas of "other academic issues," a new SLU Union, and "student life" to elicit feedback from all interested parties. On these recommendations, based on considerable input, the Committee reached unanimity. On the remaining issue of a university-wide core curriculum, it has not reached ready consensus. The Committee has decided to present various models or alternatives for consideration in order to elicit further input and stimulate fuller discussion by the University community. The following five alternatives, formulated by individual members of the Committee, do not necessarily reflect the positions of even those members. They range along a continuum, from a common rationale to a common Jesuit "core of the core" to a set of more fully articulated common curricula, as follows:

I. Rationale for Saint Louis University Core Curricula-- This articulates a set of principles for all colleges at Saint Louis University to employ in the development of their own core curricula. This alternative leaves it to the discretion of each college to develop its own set of core courses to reflect these principles.

II. Jesuit Tradition Core Curriculum-- This alternative establishes a university-wide core curriculum of 18 hours devoted singly to the Jesuit tradition.

III. Essential Core Curriculum I--This alternative calls for a liberal, Catholic core curriculum of 30-39 hours. It is based on the Task Force proposal, but divides the components into fields of knowledge.

IV. Essential Core Curriculum II--This alternative is also drawn from the Task Force proposal. It advocates a liberal, Catholic core curriculum of 36 to 39 hours organized by goals.

V. Flexible, Mission Based Core Curriculum--This alternative proposes a flexible core curriculum of 36 hours distributed among courses in values, knowledge, and skills.

I. Rationale for Saint Louis University Core Curricula

Introduction

This rationale is intended to express the educational ideals of Saint Louis University, and to guide schools and colleges in the establishment and/or modification of their core curricula. The different schools of the university have such widely varying circumstances that an attempt to identify a specific set of courses that applies to all schools may not be productive. It may, therefore, be more appropriate that the faculty of each individual school determine the curriculum for that school in accordance with such a rationale.
Rationale

Saint Louis University is characterized by the Jesuit style of education. This phrase means more than the presence, influence, and service of members of the Society of Jesus; it is a style of education which can be called "contextual." A contextual education relates learning to the total human context; thought and action, values and facts, and compassion and fulfillment, integrated in a living situation. Such an education must critically examine present conditions. With respect for, and an understanding of, past achievements and the most valuable aspects of tradition, the student can begin to understand the present and prepare for the future. An educated person should also use new and valuable strategies to approach the challenges of life with wisdom, confidence, and a sense of achievement.

The core embodies the following characteristics: a willingness to experiment; an orientation to human and religious values; openness to provisional answers; attention to the imaginative, artistic, and affective capacities of humankind; and an active relationship to faith. To encourage the development of these characteristics in the lives of our students, the faculties of the various schools and colleges of Saint Louis University have established their respective core requirements. These requirements provide the student with an opportunity to experience and grow within the boundaries of the humanities, natural sciences, and social and behavioral sciences. A person so educated can act intelligently and ethically in the contemporary world.

II. Jesuit Tradition ("Core of the Core") Curriculum

Introduction

This proposal calls on all colleges at Saint Louis University to adopt a single set of Jesuit tradition courses to serve as the one university-wide core curriculum common to all undergraduate students. In effect, this proposal lifts out the "core of the core" from the First Year Task Force core curriculum recommendation that deals with the Jesuit tradition, and leaves it to the discretion of each individual college to decide what other components to add to its own college-level core curriculum. The foundational principle of this alternative is that the one common university mission to all undergraduate students at Saint Louis University is to expose them to the essentials of the Jesuit tradition, and with this exposure, to develop in the students an understanding of, and an encouragement to live life in, the Ignatian spirit.

A special body composed primarily (but not exclusively) of faculty from the Theology and Philosophy Departments shall draw up and approve the courses that will constitute the Jesuit tradition core curriculum. As called for in the First Year Task Force Report, the body shall ensure that these courses are integrated in terms of fulfilling this mission.

Courses

This core curriculum shall consist of 18 hours (six courses) distributed thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theology</th>
<th>Six hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Six hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other Jesuit tradition courses</td>
<td>Six hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>EIGHTEEN HOURS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* The "other Jesuit tradition courses" follow the spirit of the First Year Task Force in its efforts to introduce some choice in fulfilling core curricular requirements. Hence, in addition to the 12 hours of course drawn from Theology and Philosophy, students should have the benefit of courses in the Jesuit tradition drawn from other disciplines, such as a History course in The Jesuits in History, or a Political Science course in Social Justice, or an interdisciplinary course in The Ignatian Vision in Literature and Philosophy. In these choices, one of the two courses may be further courses in Theology and Philosophy, but the other must be taken from outside these two disciplines.

III. Essential Core Curriculum I

Introduction

This is a proposal for a 30-39* hours essential core curriculum that will be common to all students enrolled in an undergraduate degree program across all colleges at Saint Louis University. This core is spread over six fields of knowledge deemed essential for all students earning a baccalaureate degree through the pursuit of a liberal education in a Jesuit Catholic institution. All courses eligible for this core will require the approval of a university-wide curriculum body selected by the faculty.

Courses

I. The Jesuit Catholic tradition  Nine hours

Two of these courses must be taught in the disciplines of Theology and Philosophy. At the discretion of individual colleges and programs, the third course may be taught outside these two departments. This course must be approved by a university-wide curriculum body for its essential Jesuit tradition content.

II. The Humanities  Nine hours

These three courses must be taken from disciplines or programs in the Division of the Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences (other than courses that are counted for Field I above.)

III. Natural Sciences  Six hours

Two courses taken from the disciplines or programs (such as Environmental Studies) in the natural sciences.

IV. Social Sciences  Six hours

Two courses taken from the disciplines or programs in the social sciences. For purposes of a university-wide core curriculum, core social science courses must be taken from Communications, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology and Criminal Justice, or Social Work.
V. Skills  

Six hours*

All undergraduates at Saint Louis University must take a core course in English composition and higher mathematics. At the discretion of each of these departments, this requirement also may be fulfilled by either high scores on national achievement tests or equivalent examinations or exercises administered by the local departments. All colleges are encouraged to add skill requirements appropriate to the needs of their own curricula, such as in computer literacy, foreign language competency, and rhetoric.

VI. Diversity  

Three hours

The diversity requirement can be met by the current Arts and Sciences arrangement in that course approved for this requirement may also count for either Humanities or Social Sciences credit, depending on the originating department or program of the approved course. This requirement, then, in effect, can be double counted. The diversity requirement, however, cannot be fulfilled by a Jesuit tradition course.

TOTAL ESSENTIAL CORE CURRICULUM I  

30-39 HOURS*

* This range of nine hours (30-39 hours) arises from the possibility of testing out of skill requirements and double counting the diversity requirement.

** In extraordinary circumstances, colleges and individual programs may appeal for an exception to the overall hours in the Essential Core Curriculum on the grounds that the hours of this core will require students to go into a fifth year of classes to fulfill both the Essential Core and the mandated requirements for professionally accredited degrees. These reductions will be only approved on a proportionate basis. That is, none of the six fields of knowledge may be completely eliminated. Hence, if need be, the Jesuit tradition can be reduced by one course, along with similar reductions in the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. In the case of the Jesuit tradition, only the third non-Philosophy and Theology course may be eliminated. Under no circumstances, may the Jesuit tradition field be reduced to less than six hours.

IV. Essential Core Curriculum II  

Introduction

Like the Task Force's model, "This curriculum attempts to ensure that all students will have an opportunity to fulfill a set of common goals, while at the same time the special needs of each student are met through judicious choices of courses. The goals include: the understanding of Jesuit, Catholic values; experiencing several different ways of knowing that are reflected in the natural sciences, in the social sciences, and in those achievements of intellect an imagination that are the focus of the humanities and the arts; and developing a set of skills appropriate to each student in areas such as communication, critical thinking and quantitative skills." (For a fuller description of these goals, see the Task Force Report.) Unlike the Task Force model, this one does not consider it realistic to require that "all courses approved for the core, with the exception of certain skills courses, must fulfill two of the core curriculum goals"; so it does not consider it feasible to require as many courses for some of the goals. Without any double-goal courses, this revised model could be satisfied by 39 hours. With such courses, it could be satisfied with fewer than 39 hours. However, as in the Task Force model, the core curriculum would consist of at least twelve courses, comprising at least 36 hours. In view of their particular needs, individual schools could add to the following minimal, general requirements or make them more specific.
Courses

I. Jesuit, Catholic Tradition

   Theological Studies                      Six hours
   Philosophy                               Six hours

II. Liberal Education (Philosophy and Theology courses not applicable)

   Humanistic World                         Three hours
   Creativity                               Three hours
   Diversity                                Three hours
   Natural World                            Three hours
   Social World                             Three hours

III. Skills

   Composition                              Three hours
   Other Skills                              Nine hours

TOTAL ESSENTIAL CORE CURRICULUM II                  39 HOURS

V. Flexible, Mission Based Core Curriculum

   Introduction

   Saint Louis University has many different academic constituencies (Colleges, Schools, and Institutes) with diversified programs. A viable common core should be simple, flexible, and still fulfill the university's mission of providing a liberal, Catholic education in a Jesuit tradition. This alternative has all these features in that it is a "flexible, mission based core curriculum." This proposed university-wide core curriculum would provide an essential common component of education to all students in the university. The several academic constituencies, and their degree programs, that comprise undergraduate education at Saint Louis University, however, are encouraged to develop additional core curriculum courses at their own school levels that would augment the Values, Knowledge, and Skills which constitute this single, university core curriculum.
Courses

I. Values  
Nine hours

Three courses (nine hours) in the disciplines of Philosophy and Theology with a minimum of one course in each discipline.

II. Knowledge  
Eighteen hours

Six courses (eighteen hours) chosen from disciplines in the three divisions of the Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, as well as a Cultural Diversity course option taken within the Humanities or Social Sciences. A minimum of one course (three hours) should be taken in each division.

III. Skills  
Nine hours

Three courses (nine hours) chosen from the disciplines of English (communication skills) and Mathematics (analytical skills) with a minimum of one course (three hours) in each discipline.

TOTAL  
36 HOURS
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RE: Revised Recommendations of the Faculty Development Committee of the Faculty Senate

Dear Dr. Slosar:

We have revised our resolution on faculty and administrator evaluations based on comments from Senators at the December meeting. We acknowledge and support Father Biondi’s most recent statement in the January message to faculty about the requirement for a written performance evaluation to be personally reviewed between employee and supervisor, however, we feel that this attached resolution is needed to show Faculty Senate support for vigorous implementation of an evaluation that follows documented criteria. We also feel the continued need to systematize evaluations of administrators. We realize that several Schools within the university currently have annual written evaluation processes that follow documented criteria and we do not advocate “one-size” fits all approach to faculty evaluations. Please refer to page three of this memo for recommendations on improving faculty evaluations and involvement in administration evaluations. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution II: THE FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY VIGOROUSLY ENFORCE AN ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW BASED ON DOCUMENTED CRITERIA DEVELOPED IN EACH SCHOOL. THESE EVALUATIONS SHOULD SERVE AS THE PRIMARY MEANS FOR DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION. 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.
RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PERTAINING TO THE RESOLUTION ON FACULTY EVALUATIONS

The Committee’s unanimous recommendations for improving faculty evaluations and involvement in administration evaluations are:

A. The faculty manual states that faculty should have an annual review based on specific criteria. However, not all Schools within the University provide fair and equitable evaluations. Faculty evaluations should be more objective with clear criteria for faculty performance. Faculty evaluations should also be interactive, where weighting of specific criteria (such as teaching, advising, research, and service) could be negotiated within a School or within a Department. The reward system should be linked to an equitable evaluation of faculty. It should also be more uniform and consistent in all schools with the aim of truly improving faculty opportunities and performance.

B. The faculty manual states that faculty have the right to participate in the selection and evaluation of administrators, however, adequate systems have not been set up to ensure that this is done uniformly throughout the university. The Dean of each School should develop a system whereby faculty, as part of the responsibilities and privileges of shared governance, periodically evaluate the performance of each Departmental Chair and vote on the continuation of a person as Chair. The Academic Provost in conjunction with faculty should assess the performance of their Dean at specifically defined intervals. Faculty votes should then be solicited on the continuity of the Dean in that position.

C. Adequate institutional and benchmarking data should be made available for the faculty including but not limited to annual review evaluation methods, salary, and benefits.
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