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 February 22, 2000, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

PRESIDENT'S UPDATE BY JOHN SLOSAR:

- Summarized 1999-2000 as an exciting year in terms of Senate organization and accomplishments within the university, e.g.,
  - Participation in the President’s Coordinating Council (PCC)
  - Faculty participation in many projects, including SLU 2000
  - Other examples of shared governance, e.g., SLU policy on alcohol and substance abuse; joint faculty-administration committee working on revision of faculty grievance process; Faculty Manual revision; faculty representation on the SLU Budget Advisory Committee.
- Slosar noted that faculty representatives are needed for the Card Access Committee, Metrolink Grand Station Redesign Committee, and Great Issues Committee. Interested persons should contact him.
- Slosar reported on the Stillwater Group’s April 17th presentation to the PCC and deans on Phase I of its assessment and diagnosis of administrative systems at the university, i.e., reengineering. Stillwater, a consulting group that specializes in higher education, was retained to conduct a diagnostic evaluation of the university’s administrative processes. The project was designed to identify strengths and weaknesses in the university’s administrative processes and services, evaluation user satisfaction with administrative services, and assess the universities readiness and need to undertake a process improvement initiative.
Stillwater’s general findings:

- Widespread agreement across the university about the need for visible process and service improvements in the university’s administrative processes, yet considerable skepticism exists about the central administration’s willingness and ability to promote change.
- University has a distinctly bureaucratic management model in which decision making is relatively centralized, and multiple layers of approval often are required to process seemingly routine transactions.
- While growing, the resources available to support the information technology needs of administrative departments appear to be insufficient.
- The university has taken steps to streamline procurement, human resources, and student services. Other process improvement initiatives have been delayed or scaled back due to insufficient information technology support.

Stillwater recommended to Fr. Biondi that it move to Phase II, with contingencies, in which it will train an interdisciplinary team to look at process improvement problems starting with human resources, financial management, and research administration services. Slosar stated that he doesn’t think there is a need for full-scale faculty participation in administrative processes, which would be very time consuming. Instead, he recommends that faculty insist on limited participation where this touches upon the academic roles of the faculty (e.g., equipment procurement). He plans to negotiate with Fr. Biondi regarding faculty input and reporting. Slosar noted that the expected outcome is expedited administrative processes. Slosar will monitor Stillwater through its PCC reports. He’s got a copy of the Stillwater report that faculty may view; he also will check to see if it can be posted on the Web.

- Effective July 1, 2000, first-time employee contributors to TIAA-CREF will be able to target the investment direction of the university’s contribution made on their behalf prior to the point they became vested; currently, those contributions automatically go into the conservative TIAA traditional fund. The Senate’s Compensation and Fringe Benefits Committee worked to effect this change.
- The PCC approved SLU’s participation in a Fachex-like scholarship program called Tuition Exchange Program, which involves about 450 institutions nationwide, on a limited basis (five people) for 2000-2001.
- The Faculty Senate kickoff dinner is tentatively scheduled for Friday, September 8, 2000. Senate committee meetings will precede the meal.
- Miriam Joseph distributed a list of senators [Attachment A], identifying those whose terms are over. She asked that any errors in the list and the names of new senators be reported to her or Slosar by July 1st.

**SPRING 2000 FACULTY SENATE ELECTIONS**

Randy Sprague (Medicine) and Miriam Joseph (Libraries), were elected President-Elect and Secretary, respectively, by acclamation. Nominees for two seats on the Executive Committee were Faye Abram (Social Service), Barbara Beck (Public Service), Toby Benis (A&S), Daphne Demello (Medicine), and Marjorie Sawicki (Allied Health). Election Results: Benis and Demello won the seats. They will be joined by continuing Executive Committee members Andy Lonigro (Medicine) and Fred Wolinsky (Public Health).
REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE – Ellen Carnaghan (A&S), Chairperson
[See Attachment B]

Ellen Carnaghan reviewed the Academic Affairs Committee's (AAC) proposed survey, explaining the rationale for the individual questions, e.g.,

Q1-3  To help analyze data
Q4  Asking opinion of the number of credit hours for an ideal core. The choice of 0 credit hours is the option for no core at all.
Q5  Directed toward the idea of standard core across the university. It raises questions of faculty governance and school control of its own core.

Carnaghan noted that the committee aims to do correlations between questions. She said that the committee is planning for a Web-based survey format and believes that all full-time faculty should have the opportunity to participate; those who do not teach undergraduates would respond based upon their expectations of the background that undergraduates should bring to their graduate programs. Carnaghan stated that the committee’s hope is to shift debate on the core in a direction that would be endorsed by most faculty, and that further referenda likely will be needed.

Carnaghan responded to numerous questions and comments. It was moved and approved that the survey be conducted under the Senate's auspices in early fall. The Academic Affairs Committee may make minor modifications based upon feedback received. Contact Carnaghan at carnagep@slu.edu.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE – Claudia Campbell (PH) [See Attachment C]

Campbell based her presentation on a recent progress report presented by Rob Altholz, Vice President--Business and Finance. She noted that the committee was formed too late to address this year's budget process, so it decided to focus on recommendations for the future. It prepared and examined a preliminary concept statement--Preliminary Goals, Objectives, Methodologies of an Optimum Budget Process--to help identify the components of an "ideal" system. Campbell requested feedback from senators on the statement; email her at campbecr@slu.edu. Thus far, the committee has looked at one alternative budgeting process and set other short and longer term goals.

The committee's first task was to review the SLU budgeting process to see how it works in the context of the projected goals and objectives. The consensus was that the current process has been around forever and works OK.

- It provides resources to academic and administrative units based on (a) prior year budget, plus a percentage increase for compensation and general expenses, and (b) a small amount of new or enhanced program funding as determined by the Provost and EVP.
- It is a system that does not have an implicit institutional discipline for determining which schools and programs will grow, be sustained, be reduced, and/or phased out.
The committee has begun to examine other university's systems to see if these other models would:

- Make a difference in what we do,
- Provide incentives for positive financial performance,
- Provide significant resources that can be intelligently allocated to achieve SLU strategic goals (academic, student life, and research), and
- Fully allocate university administrative costs to resources generation units (e.g., schools, residence halls, athletics) while allowing such "consumer" units to influence the nature and cost of such administrative requisite.

The committee reviewed the University of Southern California Model, which she termed a fairly radical approach that SLU would be unlikely to adopt fully but which has some interesting aspects, i.e.,

- Revenues are recorded in the teaching school vs the school in which the student is registered. 20% of all school unrestricted revenue is placed in a President/Provost strategic allocation fund.
- Each school pays all of its direct expenses. Deans have full authority with respect to salaries of faculty and staff and are not tied to percentage increases or pay grades.
- Each school is charged for university overhead. Heads of overhead units make presentations to deans in which they describe what they do, will do, and what it will cost to do it. There's some negotiation, but the head of the overhead units have final decision-making authority with regard to their budgets.
- Each school is charged for deferred maintenance based on square footage and age of facilities. The decision as to what deferred maintenance projects will occur is determined centrally.
- Undergraduate schools are charged for financial aid as a straight percentage of their recorded revenues at the "discount rate." Existing school financial aid is a direct charge to the school over and above the discount rate.
- All central, non-academic revenues (e.g., unrestricted endowment income, investment income on cash balances) are used by the provost to make strategic investments based upon proposals submitted by deans.
- Year-end positive bottom lines for schools are retained by the schools to be used for strategic investments over a five-year period.
- Year-end negative bottom lines are to be repaid to the university over a five-year period.

Campbell stressed that the committee plans to look at 5-7 other schools that will provide some alternative models (e.g., Washington University, Vanderbilt, Emory, Tulane, Boston, Georgetown, Stanford, University of Chicago), examine their models, and then come back to SLU stakeholders, including the Senate, for feedback.

Rick Breslin asked if there would be an opportunity for faculty to help shape the budget with regard to the priorities they think are most important. Campbell stated that one of the committee's goals is to have the budget better communicated so that it will be understood why funds are allocated/spent the way they are. John Slosar clarified that Breslin was speaking to objectives and priorities for the next budgeting cycle while Campbell was addressing the process. Campbell said the committee felt it had to examine the process first because the process, as it stands, doesn't enable faculty input since it's centralized. Breslin reiterated his concern that specific faculty priorities be identified for inclusion in the process, i.e., a restricted list of items that would drive the process.
It was suggested that Altholz make a presentation to the Senate before the committee's recommendations go to the president and Board of Trustees (in December 2000). Breslin noted that since the committee was not helping to shape the budget for 2001-2002, another year would pass when faculty will not have significant input into the budget priorities. Slosar summarized that the committee was addressing the budgeting process but Breslin was articulating the need for faculty input in budget prioritization on a more urgent basis. Following further discussion, it was moved and seconded that the Faculty Senate create a task force to make recommendations on budget priorities for the formulation of the budget for FY 2001-2002. The motion was approved. Slosar said the Executive Committee would take up this matter at its next meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Copies of summary annual reports from the Faculty Senate’s standing committees (with the exception of Compensation and Fringe Benefits, which has another meeting scheduled), were distributed. All reports will be posted on the Web.

NEW BUSINESS

John Slosar thanked the outgoing Executive Committee members for their service this past year.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Miriam E. Joseph
Executive Secretary
FACULTY SENATE -- SENATOR ELECTIONS NEEDED!

Elections for new senators were to have been held by March 31, 2000, per the Senate bylaws. Please be sure to hold elections for new senators by July 1, 2000; send their names to M. Joseph at josephme@slu.edu as soon as possible thereafter.

School of Allied Health Professions (AHP)  [3 seats]

OUTGOING:
Marjorie A. Sawicki, M.S., R.D.  [00]

CONTINUING:
Diane S. Barnes, M.S., OTR/L  [01]

College of Arts & Sciences (A&S)  [7 seats]

OUTGOING:
Harold A. Dieck, Ph.D.  [00]
Wynne W. Moskop, Ph.D.  [00]
Joya Uraizee, Ph.D.  [00]

CONTINUING:
Teresa H. Johnson, Ph.D.  [01]
Frank H. Gilner, Ph.D.  [01]
Toby Ruth Benis, Ph.D.  [02]
Steven G. Harris, Ph.D.  [02]

College of Business & Administration (B&A)  [4 seats]

OUTGOING:
John N. Kissinger, Ph.D.  [00]

CONTINUING:
Brett A. Boyle, Ph.D.  [01]
Reuven Levary, Ph.D.  [01]
Mark B. Houston, Ph.D.  [02]

School of Law (Law)  [3 seats]

OUTGOING:
Dennis J. Tuchler, J.D.  [00]

CONTINUING:
Stephen C. Thaman, J.D., Dr.iur.  [01]
John Griesbach, J.D.  [02]

University Libraries (Libraries)  [3 seats]

OUTGOING:
None--Elections Completed

CONTINUING:
Jeannette E. Pierce, M.S.L.I.S.  [01]
Jean M. Parker, M.A., M.L.S.  [02]
Patricia McNary  [03]

School of Medicine (Medicine)  [14 seats]

OUTGOING:
Joseph J. Baldassare, Ph.D.  [00]
Michael Green, Ph.D.  [00]
Richard C. Barry, M.D.  [00]
Thomas E. Dahms, Ph.D.  [00]

CONTINUING:
Andrew J. Lonigro, M.D.  [01]
Irene T. Schulze, Ph.D.  [01]
Alan B. Silverberg, M.D.  [01]
John A. Stith, M.D.  [01]
Robert B. Belshe, M.D.  [02]
Gary J. Peterson, M.D.  [02]
Robert J. Blaskiewicz, M.D.  [02]
Daphne E. Demello, M.D.  [02]
Robert J. Fallon, M.D.  [02]
Peggy A. Szwabo, Ph.D.  [02]
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School of Nursing (Nursing)  [3 seats]
OUTGOING:  CONTINUING:
Janice C. DeMasters, Ph.D., C.S.  [00]  Dorothy C. James, Ph.D.  [01]
                                                Nina K. Westhus, Ph.D.  [02]

Parks College of Engineering and Aviation (Parks)  [4 seats]
OUTGOING:  CONTINUING:
Ian Redmount, Ph.D.  [00]  Stephen G. Magoc  [01]
Huliyir Mallikarjuna, Ph.D.  [01]  David Manor, Ph.D.  [00]

School of Public Health (PH)  [3 seats]
OUTGOING:  CONTINUING:
Roger D. Lewis, Ph.D.  [00]  Larry W. Figgs, Ph.D., M.B.A.  [01]
                                                Fredric Wolinsky, Ph.D.  [01]

College of Public Service (PS)  [3 seats]
OUTGOING:  CONTINUING:
Michael P. Grady, Ph.D.  [00]  Barbara R. Beck, M.A., CCC-A  [01]
                                                Richard D. Breslin, Ph.D.  [02]

School of Social Service (SS)  [2 seats]
OUTGOING:  CONTINUING:
None  Marla Berg-Weger, Ph.D.  [01]
                                                John C. Goeke, D.S.W.  [02]

Executive Committee
OUTGOING:  CONTINUING:
Kathryn E. Kuhn, Ph.D.  [00 on EC]  John A. Slosar, Ph.D.,¹ President
Judith Medoff, Ph.D.  [00 on EC]  Miriam Joseph, M.L.S.,² Secretary
Lyn S. Amine, Past-President [99-00]*  Andrew J. Lonigro, M.D.³  [01 on EC]
                                                Fredric Wolinsky, Ph.D.³  [01 on EC]
                                                Randy Sprague, Ph.D. Pres-Elect³  [00-04 on EC]

¹President's term is two years (1999-2001) followed by one year Past-President term.
²Elected by acclamation; will serve as Secretary from 2000-2001.
³These Executive Committee members also are elected senators from their schools.
⁴Elected by acclamation; will serve as President from 2001-2003.
Referendum on the Saint Louis University Core Curriculum

A core curriculum is an integral component of a Saint Louis University undergraduate education. Currently, each college or school sets its own undergraduate core requirements within an unofficial university template from which it is not possible to vary too far. Whether there should be a University-wide Core and what such a Core would be are sources of heated debate (see, for example, the Hearing Committee report). Until now, most of that debate has occurred within small groups that may not accurately represent the will of the whole faculty.

In an effort to more accurately assess faculty opinions about whether there should be a University-wide Core and what the preferred size and shape of a University-wide core would be, the Faculty Senate of Saint Louis University asks you to answer the following questions. All full-time faculty members are eligible to participate.

All answers are confidential. Only aggregate results and anonymous comments will be made public. Results will be tallied for the faculty as a whole as well as for sub-categories such as school or department. Please respond by...

1. For purposes of analyzing the results, please identify the school or college of your primary appointment:
   a. School of Allied Health Professions
   b. College of Arts and Sciences
   c. School of Business and Administration
   d. School of Law
   e. Graduate School
   f. School of Medicine
   g. School of Nursing
   h. Parks College of Engineering and Aviation
   i. College of Philosophy and Letters
   j. School for Professional Studies
   k. School of Public Health
   l. College of Public Service
   m. School of Social Service
   n. Libraries

2. Your department (enter in text box):

3. Which best reflects your appointment?
   a. I teach primarily (or exclusively) undergraduate students.
   b. I teach primarily (or exclusively) graduate students.
   c. I teach significant numbers of both undergraduate and graduate students.
   d. Mine is not a teaching position.

4. In your opinion, approximately how many credit hours should a University-wide core include?
   0 (or no Core) 15 30 45 60 more than 72
   3 18 33 48 63
   6 21 36 51 66
   9 24 39 54 69
   12 27 42 57 72

5. Assuming that the core was the number of hours you answered in question 4, which statement better reflects your view?
   a. The core should be nearly uniform across all undergraduate schools or colleges.
   b. Each undergraduate school or college should develop its own core as appropriate for its own purposes.
   c. Each department should be free to alter core requirements for its own students.
   d. Part of the core should be uniform across all undergraduate schools or colleges, but up to half of the courses may vary between schools, colleges, or departments.
   e. Other. Please specify
What would be your second choice?

a. The core should be nearly uniform across all undergraduate schools or colleges.
b. Each undergraduate school or college should develop its own core as appropriate for its own purposes.
c. Each department should be free to alter core requirements for its own students.
d. Part of the core should be uniform across all undergraduate schools or colleges, but up to half of the courses may vary between schools, colleges, or departments.
e. Other. Please specify

6. Which statement better reflects your view?

a. Courses in a University-wide core curriculum should fall primarily within the humanistic tradition (Philosophy, Theology, History, Literature, Fine Arts, Modern Language).
b. Courses in a University-wide core curriculum should cover a variety of approaches to knowledge with some degree of balance between humanistic, scientific, and social scientific approaches.
c. Courses in a University-wide core curriculum should be primarily interdisciplinary and designed specifically for the core.
d. Courses in a University-wide core curriculum should be focused on particular skills rather than organized around specific disciplines.
e. Other. Please specify.

7. In my opinion, the bulk of classes in a University-wide core should be:

a. Specific courses required of all students. (For example, TH 100 or HS 111.)
b. Courses selected from lists of pre-approved courses. (An example would be the present Cultural Diversity requirement. An Arts and Sciences committee decides whether a given course will qualify.)
c. Courses which fall into certain categories. (For example, 6 hours in social science.)
d. Other. Please describe

8. Which statement better reflects your view?

a. I believe that a University-wide core should be a reflection of the views of the majority of University faculty, even if significant minorities are unhappy with the outcome.
b. I believe that the core of each school or college should reflect the views of the majority of faculty in that school.
c. I do not believe that faculty opinions should dictate the shape of the core.
d. Other. Please specify.

9. Keeping in mind your answer to question 4 on the number of academic hours to be included in a University-wide core, how would you divide those hours between the following disciplines?

a. I think there should not be a University-wide core.
b. I would organize the core by skills or by interdisciplinary courses, so I cannot answer this question.
c. Other. Please specify.
d. I would divide the hours in the following way: (If there are specific courses which you think should be required, enter them in the text box next to the appropriate category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities courses</th>
<th>number of hours</th>
<th>specific courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other humanities courses (Fine Arts, Literature, History, Foreign Language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Sciences and Mathematics courses</th>
<th>number of hours</th>
<th>specific courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (Astronomy, Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Physics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Science courses
Social Science courses (Anthropology, Communications, Communication Disorders, Economics, Education, Political Science, Psychology, Public Policy Studies, Social Work, Sociology and Criminal Justice)

Cultural Diversity
May serve “double-duty,” that is fulfill an additional requirement.

Other courses
Public speaking
Courses specific to an individual school (e.g. Accounting courses required for students in the Business School)
Courses not listed above. Please specify

10. Please enter any additional comments here.
General

- The Budget assures the financial soundness of the University
- The Budget is the document which, by identifying, funding and communicating what is important and what is expected, implements the mission and strategy of the University
- The Budget, and the process by which it is developed, should reflect and reinforce the University’s values and culture
- The Budget, and the process by which it is developed, should motivate and incent desired behavior, such as efficient use of resources, sustain and enhance revenue generation, pursuit of University mission, etc.
- The Budget must ultimately optimize the educational, social, recreational, career objectives of the University’s students consistent with the Jesuit mission and to the extent of its available financial resources.

The Process of Developing the Budget

- The Process should be perceived as “fair”
- The Process should elicit greater input from faculty, staff and students re: allocation of limited resources by using such means as suggestion boxes, surveys. To enhance budgetary decision making current key persons involved in the development of the budget, including Vice Presidents and Deans need to provide sufficient opportunity for faculty, staff, students and even relevant external parties (e.g. alumni, donors, employers) in their areas of responsibility to provide input regarding important budget variables such as new funding requests (operating and capital), reallocation of existing resources, new revenue opportunities, etc.
- The Process should elicit greater input from, and communication with, portions of University community where budget policy decisions affect them directly (e.g. parking rates, tuition remission, etc.)
- The Process should provide a means for evaluating effective and ineffective programs and enable process improvement, or program elimination, when necessary.
- The Process should incorporate the ability to do multi-year budgeting.
- Clear, comprehensive communication of the final approved budget (e.g. amount and sources of revenue; nature and amount of unit expenditures; the capital budget- equipment, renovations, new construction, property acquisitions)
- Clear communication of the process itself.
Allocation of Resources

- The Budget should be consistent with, and lead to the achievement of, University and School programmatic goals and objectives. To do this the process should create proper incentives for administrators, faculty and staff in all areas. Clear articulation, and consistency across the University, of the financial and programmatic responsibilities and authority of unit leaders (e.g. Deans, Directors, etc) is critical.

- Expenditure budgets should be linked to revenue and activity (volume) levels

- Deans should establish and articulate School funding priorities

- The budget should provide for the availability of significant annual increases or bonuses for faculty and staff demonstrating exemplary performance.

- Efficient allocation and use of resources

Budget Actualization

- The process of actualizing (implementing) the budget should give the unit above the control it needs to fulfill its duties and the unit itself the flexibility to carry out its mission. Sufficient autonomy and responsibility for budget preparation and actualization may motivate units more effectively than a centralized, inflexible process. (See 1st bullet point under “Allocation of Resources” above.)

- Contingencies built into the budget allow easy-to-implement budget adjustments during the year as a result of higher than (lower than) expected enrollments. (See 2nd bullet point under “Allocation of Resources” above.)