September 19, 2000


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 April 18, 2000, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

PRESIDENT'S UPDATE BY JOHN SLOSAR:

- Announced that the Executive Committee (EC) met over the summer with the chairs of the Academic Affairs, Compensation and Fringe Benefits, and Faculty Development Committees to discuss overlapping areas of concern. The outcome was the formation of the Joint Task Force on the Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators, to be composed of two representatives from each of these standing Senate committees. The task force will review the ways in which faculty are evaluated across the university (e.g., formality, objectivity, fairness of processes) and whether administrators are evaluated (e.g., how often, faculty role in process).
- Reported on proposed university calendar revisions, notably the administration's interest in modifying the Spring 2002 semester schedule to both start and end earlier. Following input from the faculty representatives to the University Calendar Committee and the EC, the dates will remain unchanged. Possible future changes will be discussed by both faculty and the Council of Academic Deans and Directors (CADD).
- Reviewed the Executive Committee’s summer 2000 actions:
  - Reiterated position concerning importance of search committees in the appointment of high-level administrators, stated in a Fall 1999 memo to Fr. Biondi, in a new memo following announcement of Dean Frances Horvath's (AHP) resignation. Through discussions with the provost, the EC learned that it was the AHP faculty's wish to appoint an interim dean so the EC stated that it would defer to the AHP faculty on this matter.
  - Responded to Fr. Biondi's request for advice on the appointment of a new chair of the department of Internal Medicine without a national search. Slosar noted that the Faculty Manual does not require a search at that level and then read the text of a memo sent to Fr. Biondi on August 16, 2000:

At its meeting today, the EC of the Faculty Senate adopted the following position:
In consideration of the unique and dire fiscal circumstances currently facing the University Medical Group, and their implications for the university at large, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate accepts the proposal of Fr. Biondi to appoint, without the benefit of a national search, a chair for the Department of Internal Medicine for a three-year term, with the clear understanding and commitment that this and all current and future department chairs within the university are subject to mandatory three-year reviews prior to reappointment in accordance with the contractual provisions specified in II.C.3.b. of the 1994 Faculty Manual of Saint Louis University.

Slosar received a memo dated August 22, 2000, in reply from Fr. Biondi; this memo will be forwarded to the new Joint Task Force on Evaluation:

I appreciated the counsel of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee concerning the appointment of the chair of the Department of Internal Medicine. As you know, the Faculty Manual does not require that a search process be conducted for the appointment of a departmental chair. You also know that Dean Monteleone ordinarily does conduct a search for departmental chairs, even though she is well within her authority under the Manual to appoint a chair after consultation with the faculty of the department. Thus the position you describe in your letter as attaching to the appointment of the chair without search are advisory only. The Faculty Manual provides that the term for a chair is ordinarily three years, but that terms in the health sciences may be longer. This reflects some of the special circumstances of the departments in the health sciences and especially in the School of Medicine. Finally, I do accept wholeheartedly your recommendation that all department chairs be subject to review every three years. I also believe that this review should include faculty review of the performance of the chair.

In response to comments from the floor, Slosar noted that searches were not always practical or reasonable (e.g., in small departments where no additional positions will be added), but that the Senate should push for searches whenever possible. He also reviewed Fr. Biondi's response to the EC's Fall 1999 memo, i.e., Fr. Biondi said he generally agreed with the EC's position regarding the value of national searches, but would not bind himself or his successors to such a commitment because searches were not appropriate in all situations.

Reported that the EC recently took the position that it would no longer nominate faculty to be selected by administration for service on university committees but would, instead, designate the faculty representatives. Slosar sent the following memo, dated September 15, to Fr. Biondi:

We would like to take a modest step forward in implementing shared governance at Saint Louis University by changing the manner in which faculty are appointed to university committees. Currently the Faculty Senate is asked to nominate faculty who are supposed to represent the faculty and the president’s office makes the final selection of the faculty representatives. If the faculty serving on these committees are to truly represent the faculty, they should be selected by the faculty and not require the approval of the administration. Quite frankly it is a bit of an insult to have to go through such a procedure and it gives the impression that the faculty are not to be trusted in selecting their own representatives.
We believe that the Faculty Senate should designate its own representatives. It is in our best interest to select the very best persons to represent the faculty. Further, we are not unwilling to consult with the administration when we do not have one or more persons who we think are well suited for the task at hand. We believe that this policy should apply to all committee positions to be filled through the Faculty Senate, with the exception of the chairship of the University Rank and Tenure Committee where we think the present practice of nominations from the senate and consultation with the Provost is most appropriate.

I would like to be able to announce this change in practice in very positive terms as a joint decision of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the administration which was made in the spirit of shared governance. I look forward to receiving your response on this very important issue.

Slosar reported that Fr. Biondi expressed a willingness to meet with the EC to discuss this matter. Rick Breslin moved that the Senate as a whole support and affirm the articulated EC position, i.e., that the faculty designate its representatives to university committees. The motion was seconded; it passed unanimously by voice vote.

- Slosar reported that the report of the Shared Governance Task Force, chaired by Jim Gilsinan, was presented to the President's Coordinating Council (PCC) in August. Given the poor response to the task force's email solicitation for input, Fr. Biondi was inclined to shelve the report. However, he agreed to distribute it via the Web as part of his October message. The Senate Governance Committee and other Senate committees will examine and respond to the report.

- The Fall Faculty Assembly is scheduled for October 24th in the St. Louis Room in Busch Memorial Center. Fr. Biondi has been invited to share his vision for the university's future.

- Committee Reports
  - Academic Affairs -- Slosar reminded senators of the committee's Web-based survey on the core curriculum and relayed the committee's request that faculty post comments on the associated bulletin board to spark discussion.
  - Great Issues Committee -- Faculty representatives are needed for this SGA committee; interested persons should contact Slosar.
  - Senate standing committee vacancies -- Slosar asked senators to consider serving or identifying faculty from their respective schools to fill these slots:
    - Affirmative Action: A&S; B&A
    - Compensation & Fringe Benefits: Law
    - Faculty Development: Law
    - Governance: Law
  - Governance Committee -- Kathryn Kuhn (A&S) is the new chair, replacing Jack Stretch (Soc Serv) who resigned from the committee as well as from his position on the subcommittee on the Faculty Manual revision. Slosar read a letter from Stretch regarding the work of the subcommittee as well as a progress report. A more complete report should be available at the November Senate meeting. The new Manual subcommittee will consist of Kuhn, Slosar, and continuing member Andy Lonigro (Medicine). Slosar expressed his personal thanks, and that of the Senate, to Stretch for
his work on both the Governance Committee and the *Faculty Manual*.

Kuhn reported that the committee's major task is the revision of the Manual. She also said that the Governance Committee would oversee the revision of the Senate's constitution and bylaws. Miriam Joseph, Senate executive secretary, will chair an ad hoc committee of senators to review these documents and propose changes. Interested senators should contact Kuhn or Joseph.

Communications Task Force -- Tom Dahms (chair) reviewed the task force's purpose, its purpose, and contacts. He reported that there now is a link to the Faculty Senate's Web site on the SLU newspage, just under the link to Fr. Biondi's message. In the near future, the newspage also will include links to a message from the Senate president as well as news items. Joseph outlined the features of the proposed electronic communications structure, referring to her memo dated September 13, 2000, "Forthcoming Senate Electronic Communications Structure," [see Attachment A] which had been emailed to all senators. She focused discussion on the proposed all-faculty bulletin board, and requested resolution of the question whether the bulletin board should be "open" and unpassworded (high convenience) or private and passworded (low convenience). A lively discussion ensued regarding the potential uses and abuses of the bulletin board as well as attendant privacy concerns. The private, passworded bulletin board option was adopted following a show-of-hands vote.

**ITS UPDATE -- Bruce Vieweg, Assistant Vice President for Application Services**

**ITS Factoids**

- During August 2000, an average of 60,000 email messages were processes each day
- Over the 4 days of Welcome Week, the Support Center received more than 3,000 calls for technical assistance
- This summer 878,000 feet, or 166 miles, of inside cable were installed in SLU classroom buildings and residence halls
- The new Cook Hall in the School of Business contains more than 51 miles of interior cable
- This summer an additional 278 network installations were made for new resident students
- 95 Level II and 16 Level III classroom technology installations were launched in just over a year
- During the past year, SLU purchases 30,800,000 sheets of copy paper--considering 247 working days, SLU used approximately 25 cases per day
- In FY00 Biomedical Communications processed 33,760 feed of color slide film this past year
- The Kodak copier in the print shop produced 4,695,295 copies over the past year
- In FY00 BMC processed 10,197 items of AV equipment
- 140 new VHS and DVD video titles were added to the IMC collection
- In FY00 BMC produced 544 video duplications

**ITS Factoids -- WebCT**

- Spring Semester, 2000, there were 275 courses supporting 14,5000 students seats
- Fall Semester, 2000, there are approximately 370 courses, serving nearly 20,000 student seats, taught by 150 faculty members
Updates

- Laboratory Computer Refresh Program 2000-2001 Academic Year
  - Need to develop consistent and published process for refresh program--this process will be developed in collaboration with Deans and the Provost
  - Combining multiple funding sources, including SLU2000, Danforth Grant, special Library funds, and Departmental Funds, a total of 801 computers will be refreshed this year

- Learning Spaces Network (LSN)
  - Is being designed to provide better technical support to faculty by removing technical barriers between faculty offices and classrooms
  - Mechanism to provide technical support for classroom-based computers that "no single entity" owns
  - Pilot project currently being implemented in selected classrooms and labs in the School of Professional Studies, Law School, Business School, School of Social Service
    - Test network is up and running and communicating to Des Peres Hall, Fitzgerald Hall, and Hopewell Building
  - Eventually LSN will provide electronic and technical support link for all "learning spaces" -- including faculty offices and classrooms
  - A Faculty Advisory Group will be developed

- Remote access expansion
  - Currently our access to SLUNet
    - 4 T1 lines (6M/bit per second capacity)
    - Inadequate to current demand
  - In addition, a bank of 200 modems is available
    - Inadequate to current demand

- Internet access
  - Expanded Internet access to 20 M/bit per second
    - Will be segmented
      - Residence halls will be provided a specific amount of bandwidth
      - Libraries will also be provided a specific amount of bandwidth
      - It is expected that nearly 15 M/bit per second of bandwidth will be available to the general University community

- Dial-in access
  - Modem pool will be expanded to 248 -- a 25% increase
    - Residence halls will not have access to the modem pool
    - No more than one access per user ID at a time
    - 2 hour limit
    - 48 modems will be designated for faculty use only (password protected)

- Support Center Procedures
  - Call 3-4000.
  - All "requests for technical assistance will be entered into Remedy and automatically tracked.
  - An e-mail note will be automatically sent to each individual who called the support center advising that a problem ticket has been opened.
  - If the problem isn't resolved within a specified period of time, an alert is sent to the campus coordinator.
  - If the problem remains unresolved, an alert is sent to the Manager of the Support Center.
When the problem is resolved, a follow-up e-mail will automatically be sent to the requester. It will include a brief three-item satisfaction questionnaire.

**ITS Performance Measurement**

What value does ITS bring to SLU? ITS is attempting to address this. A recent customer service survey focused on broad perceptions across the full range of ITS services to establish a baseline (subsequent surveys will focus on specific customer groups of ITS areas)

- Random sample of 500 faculty and staff
- Conducted electronically via the Web
- Findings:
  - Generally "good" service was indicated by 69% of respondents
  - Generally "poor" service was indicated by 18% of respondents
  - Faculty were, generally, less satisfied with services than staff (24% poor vs 15% poor by staff)

**Academic Computer Consultation Report -- Scott Siddall, Ph.D.**

**Strengths of academic computing program:**

- Organizational preparedness
  - Probably in the top quartile of colleges and universities
  - Confidence expressed in ITS leadership
  - Campus broadly supportive of recent changes in ITS
- Faculty and academic leadership generally enthused with the potential of technology
- Inventory of publicly accessible classroom and laboratory computers is impressive
- Strong institutional commitment to reorganize ITS with new staff and new positions was perhaps the most important strength
- Strengths seen in centralization of selected IT services

**Weaknesses and needs of academic computing program:**

- Much more needs to be done to keep pace with the increasing expectations and needs of students
- Need to better coordinate IT resources and policies among the various schools
- Campus network infrastructure is not adequate to anticipated need
- Internal ITS issues
  - Better coordination, cooperation and communication is necessary between ITS Academic Staff and ITS Infrastructure Staff
- Not possible for students and faculty to access their network files across campus
- Some computers in classrooms and laboratories need upgrading
- ITS communications to the SLU community are perceived to be inadequate
- Students highly critical of "WebStar" and the apparent lack of testing before deployment
- Must develop ways to increase the engagement of the faculty in IT planning activities
- Need more web-based services for our faculty
  - Advisement, faculty access to student transcripts, degree auditing
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Recommendations:
- Increase the engagement with faculty in planning for academic computing program
- Stabilize and enhance SLU’s network infrastructure
- Increase collaboration, cooperation, and communication across ITS infrastructure and academic groups
- Curricular innovations, including the use of technology, need to enter the promotion and tenure equation for faculty
- More direct assistance with technology for teaching physicians may be necessary

Miscellaneous:
- SLU becoming member of MORENET
- No intranet at SLU currently

NEW BUSINESS -- None

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Miriam E. Joseph
Executive Secretary
You may recall that the Senate formed a Communications Task Force last spring to work on improving communications within the Senate and between the Senate and faculty of the various schools, etc. The technical details are being finalized now and implementation should begin very shortly. This memo is intended to (a) summarize the new structure so that all of you have accurate information to share with faculty colleagues, and (b) solicit your input regarding the setup of one of the features (#5) of the structure. When this endeavor is ready to launch, ALL faculty will be sent a message explaining the structure and providing both operational and netiquette guidelines. Those of you who have volunteered to be discussion list contact persons for your schools soon will receive instructions to assist you in that role.

The five components of the communications structure are described below. FYI, the label "academic units" refers to each of the groups having Senate representation, i.e., Allied Health Professions, Arts & Sciences, Business & Administration, Law, Libraries, Medicine, Nursing, Parks, Public Health, Public Service, and Social Service. Also, the term "faculty" includes all faculty covered by the Faculty Manual who are designated as having faculty appointments in the Human Resources (HR) database. This means that administrators who also hold faculty appointments (e.g., deans, Fr. Biondi) are included. Teaching assistants are excluded.

1. **Academic Unit Distribution Lists**
   **Purpose:** One-way messaging (i.e., no "reply" option) from current senators to faculty they represent. [9/18/00 revision: "Reply" to sender must be the active default. "Reply all" should not work because only authorized persons (senators) may send to entire list.]
   **Members of List:** Each list contains only faculty members for that unit.
   **Control of Subscribe/unsubscribe:** None; all faculty automatically included with no "unsubscribe" option. List contents based on current HR data.
   **Who Can Send to the List:** Only current senators for each unit can send messages. Messages can be sent only to faculty in the senators' respective units.

2. **Academic Unit Discussion Lists (Listservs)**
   **Purpose:** Host two-way discussion among faculty in the same school regarding topics on which the school’s senators want input to take back to the Senate as a whole.
   **Members of List:** Each list contains only faculty members for that unit. List to be updated by ITS semiannually based upon HR data. All faculty members will be subscribed automatically to start; individual faculty may choose to unsubscribe at any time.
   **Control of Subscribe/unsubscribe:** List contact person (one current senator from the unit) can manually subscribe/unsubscribe in response to faculty requests and position changes. Senate executive secretary will serve as backup contact person for all units.
   **Who Can Send to the List:** All faculty in the unit can send messages. Messages can be sent only to subscribed faculty in the senators' respective units.

3. **Discussion List (Listserv) for All Senators**
   **Purpose:** Host two-way discussion among current senators regarding Senate business. Since senators will be required to subscribe, the list will do double-duty as a Senate distribution list.
   **Members of List:** All senators automatically included with no "unsubscribe" option.
   **Control of Subscribe/unsubscribe:** List contact person is the Faculty Senate executive secretary.
   **Who Can Send to the List:** All current senators can send and receive messages.
4. **All-Faculty Distribution List**

**Purpose**: One-way messaging (i.e., no "reply" option) from Senate president and/or Senate executive secretary. [Note: This capability has been in place for a year already.] [9/18/00 revision: See revision per #1--"Reply" to sender is active; "Reply all" is **not** active.]

**Members of List**: All faculty across the academic units.

**Control of Subscribe/unsubscribe**: None; all faculty automatically included with no "unsubscribe" option. List contents based on current HR data.

**Who Can Send to the List**: Only Senate president and executive secretary.

5. **All-Faculty Bulletin Board (Threaded Discussion)**

***SENATOR INPUT REQUESTED Regarding the Setup of and Access to the Bulletin Board***

The Task Force's intent in setting up a bulletin board is to facilitate two-way discussion of senate/university issues for faculty across the university. [Note: Some topics (e.g., undergraduate core curricula) may lend themselves to different types of discussion on both the unit listservs and this bulletin board.] Ideally, the bulletin board was to be private (i.e., only faculty would be able to view and post messages) and unpassworded. The bulletin board software, however, dictates that a decision must be made regarding the merits of convenience vs. privacy.

Please consider the two scenarios below and email Senate secretary Miriam Joseph (josephme@slu.edu) with your comments by 5pm on Monday, September 18th. She will compile all comments received (with respondents identified) by that deadline and distribute the compilation in hard copy for consideration at the September 19th Senate meeting.

**Scenario #1 (High convenience; Low privacy)**: The bulletin board is completely open. That is, **anyone** (not just folks affiliated with SLU) can read and write messages after initial registration.

**Scenario #2 (High privacy; Low convenience)**: The bulletin board is completely private; its use is restricted to SLU faculty. Faculty must register (a one-time requirement), selecting a personal user name and a password. To enter the bulletin board subsequently, to read and/or post messages, faculty must enter their personal username, password, AND a Senate-designated forum password (which will have been distributed by the Senate secretary).