

Minutes

Faculty Council 1 May 2025

256 BSC at 3:30pm

Voting Participants: Jennifer Korte, André Zampaulo, Brian Downes, Jeffrey Bishop, Stephanie Tennill, Melinda McPherson, George Ndege, Rachel Greenwald Smith, Emily Hite, Grant Kaplan, Elizabeth Block, Brenda Kirchoff, Ruth Warner, Bukky Gbadegesin, Melissa Ochoa, Kim Powlishta, Silvana Siddali, Flannery Burke, Sarah Bauer, Elena Bray Speth, Ellen Carnaghan, Anneke Bart, Cathleen Fleck, Ruben Rosario-Rodriguez, Scott Ragland, Ben England

Non-Voting Participants: Robert Hughes, Brian Yothers, Maryse Jayasuriya, Dan Nickolai, Maximilian Lyon, Alaina Baker-Nigh, Julianne Rainbolt, Elodie Pozzi, Evelyn Meyer, Lori Baron, Daniel Smith, Stacey Harris, Terri Weaver, Jennifer Popiel, Gary Barker, Laurie Russell, Dan Kozlowski, Katrina Moore, Donna LaVoie

AGENDA

1. Welcome & Greetings
 - a. Welcome to the last meeting of the school year.
2. CAS Dean's Report (tentative CAS workload policy)
 - a. See [the slides](#) from André Zampaulo, and view the [proposed CAS policy](#).
 - b. The university workload policy v 3.0 was effective February 1, and we were charged with developing the CAS faculty workload policy 2.0. We met for 5.5 hours across four meetings.
 - c. See the linked slides above for highlights. The word typically is key and intentionally used throughout the policy, often in terms of workload assignments.
 - d. Workload units can vary by unit, discipline, and other factors. All units can articulate how their workload sits within the broader policies.
 - e. Question: What is the next step for this policy?
 1. It is being proposed the dean of CAS, who approves it or not, and then sends it to the provost. We would be the first college to have our own policy at SLU. Then, each department can have its own policy that is aligned with the college's one (which is itself aligned with the university one). The main area where our college policy differs from the university policy is in the realm of service.
 2. Question: How flexible is the policy in terms of teaching loads after some faculty are let go in the future? And directed studies in particular?
 1. Response from the dean: That is a short-term problem. Directed studies would not be good for students or us in the long-term. These

would need to be exceptions. If that issue presents itself regularly, we will need a separate solution. Departments can begin to account for that, but that will need to be addressed separately as well. It's a multi-factorial problem, not just workload. The workload policy assumes a 24-unit cap.

- f. Question: some of the units will not work with a standard 2-2 load with research intensive expectations.
 - 1. Response: One of our main goals was to include more options for service. But it is not an automatic three units of service; there is a range. You can advocate for yourself in conversations with your chair.
- g. Motion from the floor: the CAS faculty presents to the dean the CAS workload policy document.
 - 1. Motion seconded.
 - 2. Motion passes.
- 3. Provost Lewis Visits Faculty Council
 - a. [See the list of questions asked and answered](#). Broad remarks from the provost and responses to questions asked from the floor are both below.
 - b. The slides from the town hall are available on the [provost's website](#).
 - c. Question from the floor: we need to maintain a floor of high-quality research and teaching faculty. How are we preserving our ability to come back strong in the future? When the national picture changes?
 - 1. Response from the provost: taking out business loans costs money, even if we do not draw from them. Our credit rating is good, and that is an alternative for planning. But I do not want to share everything for which I'm advocating behind the scenes. We should do what we can to preserve our areas of excellence and to preserve our reputation.
 - d. Question from the floor: how is the university going to support or recognize faculty whose research is being disrupted due to the federal government?
 - 1. Response from the provost: I am open to a discussion about the appropriate steps. The manual allows for two years of extension. During Covid, there was flexibility for a third year. I support shared governance and am open to that discussion. We should also acknowledge that this might be a longer slog, perhaps if there are fewer opportunities for federal funding at all.
 - e. Question from the floor: What can we do to undergird faculty morale?
 - 1. Response from the provost: there are real opportunities to accept transfer students, so that is encouraging news to share. Anything you all can do to be part of the solution and to get involved will increase morale. I think it is

important to recognize the small victories and that the university has been through worse, so maybe we can keep surviving.

4. Colleague Letters for Dossiers (Brian Downes)

- a. At our previous meeting, Brian presented a proposal regarding removing colleague letters for dossiers. Feedback since then has been overwhelmingly positive.
- b. [See the handout for the proposed changes.](#)
- c. Question: if the department finds colleague letters useful, would they be accepted?
 - 1. No. It is not just possible for small departments to maintain an honest, anonymous vote. And we found that the colleague letters just do not add much to the dossier.
- d. Question: some departments may do peer review of teaching, while others do not. Why is this decision about colleague letters not left to the department?
 - 1. An official requirement would go away. There are many places in the policy where evidence of effectiveness can be included, perhaps in the appendix or as supplemental material. A formal letter on formal letterhead is what we are removing.
 - 2. Follow-up from the dean: it's a voting issue. Only the full professors can vote for an associate to become full. Ones who write colleague letters cannot vote because the letter itself is a vote. Then the vote of the remaining full professors becomes non-anonymous. We have also struggled finding enough bodies to fill committees because of this policy.
- e. Question: when would this policy go into effect?
 - 1. Response: if the FC and UCART approve this, then the college will implement this coming school year. Some departments may have to remove that language from their department documents. This means letters would not be needed for the '25-'26 school year.
- f. Comment: There are many ways to convey support beyond a colleague letter. There is broad support from the upper administration for this change. Chairs will be notified quickly if this process goes into effect so that people do not needlessly write letters.
- g. Comment: proxy voting by writing is problematic. The people who vote should have the benefit of the whole group deliberation on promotion. Those who have written letters are effectively voting in advance of that discussion and are absent from it.
- h. Motion (linked above) is on the floor. Motion passes.

----4:52pm---

5. CAS Committee Reports:

a. Faculty Advisory Committee

1. No report

b. Graduate Curriculum Committee

1. No report

c. Nominations Committee

1. We have about 25 open positions on various committees and for faculty council roles/officers. We have disseminated a self-nomination survey. There have been nine of those for which at least one person has self-nominated.
2. There will be an amended survey going out soon where you can also nominate others besides yourself. Then we will check with those people before they appear on the ballot.
3. Ballot can go out middle of next week (week of May 5), ideally.

d. Rank, Tenure, and Sabbatical Committee

1. No report. See above for colleague letter discussion.

e. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

1. [See motion.](#)
2. Motion is on the floor. Motion passes.

f. DEI Committee

1. No report.

6. University Committee Reports:

a. Faculty Senate

1. No report.

b. UUCC

1. No report.

c. UCART

1. No report.

d. GAAC

1. No report.

e. UAAC

1. A new policy on dual listings was approved; will head to GAAC for a vote. 4000-level courses can be dual listed with any course at the graduate level.
2. Revision to leave of absence policy was approved; will head to GAAC for a vote.
3. A new policy on undergraduate academic standing (previously probation; removes the word probation) was approved. Will now go to CADD.
4. A revision of the academic program review was approved and will now go to GAAC.
5. Off-campus enrollment policy revision was approved and will now go to CADD.

f. GEAR

1. The task force had a busy April. There were listening sessions for graduate deans, staff, chairs, coordinators, and students.
2. We are conducting surveys of both graduate faculty and students. April Trees has disseminated these via email. Due date is May 6 for graduate students and May 9 for faculty.

g. Academic Program Review Council

1. No report

h. Library Advisory Committee

1. No report

---DEANS DEPART AT 5:01PM---

7. New Business

a. Two issues came before the faculty senate governance committee.

1. First issue: SSM-hired doctors all count as faculty senators from the medical school. But according to the faculty manual, they do not fit the qualifications. Senators from SSM will have a motion saying they want to continue with full representation for one year while this issue is further discussed. FSEC wants to cut the number down to physicians hired by the university only. There are currently seventeen senators from the medical school, but if we limit it to just those hired by SLU, that number would be six.

1. Question: to what extent are the medical school faculty hired by SSM subject to and protected by the faculty manual?
 1. Response: they have composed a new faculty manual for the non-SLU medical faculty. It has pieces of the SLU faculty manual, but also has many original parts.
 2. We may want to consider the language in the faculty manual that seems to extend protections to those hired by affiliated institutions. This is going to be a main issue for the senate to discuss next school year.
 2. Second issue: Recognizing that town halls and committees with a small number of appointed faculty bypass regular institutional means for shared governance, the Governance Committee is trying to figure out ways to boost the role of the full voting Senate. We welcome ideas. This discussion can also connect with ways to enhance the relationship between our CAS senators and the Council.
- b. The SLU chapter of the AAUP will have one summer meeting ([see flyer](#)). You do not need to pay dues to attend these Zoom meetings. Meetings are capped at one hour.
 - c. This next academic year, we may want to consider ensuring that there is at least one representative from each college and university committee to provide updates at these faculty council meetings.

Adjourn at 5:28 pm