



University Senate

8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121-4499
Telephone: 314-516-6769
Fax: 314-516-6769
E-mail: senate@umsl.edu

(Minutes to be considered for approval at the Senate meeting on April 27, 1999, 3:15 p.m.)

**SENATE MINUTES
UM-ST. LOUIS
March 16, 1999
3:15 p.m. 78 J. C. Penney**

Dr. Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi, Senate Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. Minutes from the previous meeting (held February 16, 1999) were approved as submitted.

Report from the Senate Chair -- Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi

Dr. Zarucchi reported the results of the elections that took place at the 2:30 p.m. Senate meeting for the 1999-2000 Senate: Senate Chair, Jeanne Zarucchi; Senate Secretary, Carol Kohfeld; Committee on Committees Chair, Fred Willman. Dr. Zarucchi reminded Senate members that elections for 1999-2000 Senate committee members would take place on April 27, 2:30 p.m. for 1999-2000 Senate members.

Dr. Zarucchi announced that the campus referendum on "Voting Rights of Non-Regular Faculty" was approved by a majority of the campus faculty and has been forwarded to the Board of Curators. Dr. Zarucchi said that the issue could possibly be on the Board of Curators May Agenda.

Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Touhill
(See Attached)

Report from the Faculty Council Presiding Officer -- Dennis Judd
(See Attached)

Dr. Ratcliff said that presently the Faculty Council has proportionate representation from all departments and that if the Faculty Council is brought into the Senate then department representation may become unbalanced.

Dr. Judd replied that the Faculty Council has recommended that a Conference Committee be formed, but has not gone on record as favoring any particular solution or reform. Dr. Judd said that if the Conference Committee recommends that the Faculty Council become a part of the Senate, then he assumes that the Conference Committee would also suggest changes regarding how Faculty Senators are elected.

Mr. Stegeman said that unbalanced department representation could be balanced by the election of committee members. Dr. Judd agreed and said that one suggestion made at the Faculty Council meeting was to have some Faculty Senators elected at large while most members be elected as they are now to the Faculty Council, representing particular units.

Dr. Burkholder said that it is time to look at the governance structure and he supports creating a committee that will consider different options. Dr. Judd said that in 1984 there was a proposal for substantial reforms that went nowhere.

A student senator asked about the procedures for bylaw changes regarding the structure of the Senate and Faculty Council. Dr. Judd said that it would be up to the Conference Committee to propose changes in the structure of the Faculty Council and the representation or election of Senators. Dr. Judd said that changes in faculty governance could be simply changed by a majority of a quorum of the faculty in one of its two meetings each year (a quorum is defined as one-tenth of the faculty).

Dr. Judd introduced a motion that the Senate select five members to a Conference Committee for the purpose of making recommendations for reform of campus governance. This motion was seconded. Dr. Martinich made an amendment to the motion that the five members be faculty members elected at large from the Senate. This amendment was seconded. Dr. Harris asked if the Conference Committee would be an ad hoc committee. Dr. Ratcliff said that this is not a Senate Committee but a committee to which the Senate is sending representatives. Dr. Martinich agreed that the elected members would be representatives, and would continue their representation until the committee concluded. After much discussion regarding the amendment to the motion, the amendment carried.

Dr. Zarucchi called a vote on the motion to elect five faculty members to be elected at large from the Senate to serve on a Conference Committee; it passed by voice vote. Dr. Zarucchi asked that those who were interested in serving on the Conference Committee contact her or Dr. Judd. If more than five faculty senators were interested, an election would take place.

After much discussion regarding the election of the five faculty senators, a motion was brought to the floor that the election of representatives would be restricted to faculty senators. This motion did not carry; voting would be at large for the full Senate.

Report from the IFC Representative -- Paul Roth

(See Attached)

Dr. Rochester said that AP (Advance Placement) courses are widely accepted throughout the United States as courses offered in high schools and can count for satisfying college credit requirements. Dr. Rochester asked if the dual credit courses Dr. Roth was referring to in his report included AP courses. Dr. Roth said that the dual credit courses were a different species than the AP courses, and in some cases they are being taught by anyone, anywhere and they don't have to be tied to the campus, and this is hurting us.

After much discussion regarding the supervision and transfer process of dual credits courses, Dr. Roth commented that he was making a point of who is teaching the courses and how that impacts us and the people we are going to be able to enroll, not the merit of the courses. Dr. Roth said that there is a community college initiative that is fed by certain factors based on what we are already doing and the impact that it is having on us. Dr. Wendell Smith said that the dual enrollment program instruction is given by high school faculty who are adjunct to UMSL, and they go through a very rigorous approval at each department or level. Dr. Smith said that we have a faculty liaison who works with each of the participating high schools in planning the curriculum and it is the same curriculum on campus.

Dr. Cottone asked if there was any discussion at the IFC meeting regarding the merits of the ATP Resolution. Dr. Roth said that President Pacheco's response was that there is a risk associated with a request to reopen the tenure issue. Dr. Connett said that the resolution was a minimal motion, not to change what had been done but to make others aware that there had been a decision made without faculty involvement. Dr. Connett said that the resolution did not ask to reopen the issue. Dr. Roth said the resolution led to a discussion that went beyond the resolution itself. Dr. Connett asked if the administration was aware that there had been no discussion about the changes to tenure.

Dr. Roth said that President Pacheco feels that a discussion would draw attention to the issue of tenure and had indicated that in the past the Board of Curators wanted to examine this issue, and he would not like to have it touched. Dr. Cottone asked if President Pacheco is fearful that they would do something like Columbia did in the past, in terms of negative impact on current policy. Dr. Roth said that the discussion would be to either eliminate tenure or to have some sort of system of post tenure review. Dr. Korr said that it was difficult to believe that enough of the Curators are predisposed and want to raise issues of changing tenure and post-tenure review, and if they want to do it they're going to do it on their own and not wait for the President to give them the notion. Dr. Korr said that the best way to deal with this is to have the arguments ready for them and not wait for them to make the first move.

Dr. Korr said that he got a sense that the current President has been scarred someplace else and doesn't want to get involved in an issue with the faculty on one side and the curators on the other. If this is the case the IFC should remind him that this is what he was hired to do. Dr. Korr said that secondly this is much too important an issue and asked that IFC representatives bring a working document to the IFC.

Dr. Roth said that it is his impression that the President does not want to pick a fight. He said he would bring forward to the IFC anything that came forward from the Senate. Dr. Roth said that his sole point was if the tenure regulations become a live topic there are risks and the Senate should go into this with their eyes open.

Dr. Zarucchi said that by bringing the resolution forward, it caught the attention of the other IFC Representatives and President Pacheco. She said that President Pacheco appeared to be very concerned with consulting the faculty as an operating principle. If the purpose of the resolution was to get an apology from President Pacheco regarding past President George Russell it will not happen. If the purpose of the resolution was to call the President's attention to the fact that faculty were not consulted and are not happy about it, she believed that has been accomplished.

Dr. Roth said that the tenure rule is more an issue for our campus than Columbia, since UMSL and UMKC were out of compliance and not aware of the changes to tenure.

Report from the SGA President -- Jim Avery
(See Attached)

Report from Budget and Planning -- Chancellor Touhill
(See Attached)

Dr. Tierney asked about yearly salary adjustments. Chancellor Touhill replied that she has not heard an official response from President Pacheco, and that the 2% state budget increase, mentioned in the IFC report, does not translate into a 2% salary increase.

Dr. Judd said that he made a motion that passed unanimously in the Budget and Planning Committee, to vote against money for the Sue Shear Institute. The reason is that this money should go to our own campus Institute for Women's and Gender Studies.

Report from Committee on Committees -- Gail Ratcliff

This report will be postponed until the April meeting.

Report from Computing -- Susan Sanchez

(See Attached)

Dr. Connett said that he did not like the idea of voting on the resolution and changing the existing policy until he knew how financial needs would be met. Dr. Sanchez said that the resolution does not propose to change the allocation of funds, it allows the individual departments, faculty or those with grants to allocate or choose between a desktop or laptop computer.

A motion was made to accept the resolution as a first reading. Dr. Martinich spoke against this motion and said that many faculty members have already thought about this issue. Dr. Ganz made a point of order and spoke in favor of the motion to accept the resolution as a first reading, since this resolution was not on the Agenda. Dr. Sanchez withdrew the resolution and changed it to a first reading.

Report from Curriculum and Instruction -- David Ganz

All Course Proposal action items (see agenda) were approved.

(See Attached)

Dr. Ganz said that the Academic Calendar for 2000-2001 was originally approved on January 19, 1999, and has been modified. Dr. Ganz said that the calendar reflects changes beginning with the start of the second semester. A voice vote was taken, and the calendar was approved.

(See Agenda Attachment-First Reading-To Abolish the EXC and Y Grades, and Create the Grade of W)

Dr. Martinich said that he will plan to have an alternative motion at the April Senate meeting to retain the existing policy regarding the EXC grade for weeks 5-16 and change the Y grade as a permanent entry but not turn to an F, and that the Y grade will not be included in the GPA, as it is now.

Dr. Feigenbaum said that she was very concerned about the proposal and by having a unilateral withdrawal the faculty does not have a chance to discuss face to face a situation with the student.

Dr. Sanchez spoke against the first reading outline. She said this policy would allow students within a group to leave without getting a failing grade, which leaves other students in the team in a terrible situation in terms of their grade. Dr. Sanchez said that the proposal removed any flexibility that the faculty has in enforcing the grade. Dr. Sanchez said that she preferred the system where the rules say unless a faculty member specifically states otherwise in their syllabus, you have only the first 4 weeks to drop the class.

Dr. Martinich said that what the proposal sees as inconsistency in current policy, he sees as flexibility. Dr. Martinich said that the proposal could have a negative impact on future projects, the University, and future students.

Dr. Ganz asked for a show of hands for the EXC grading policy for weeks 5-16. The consensus was to leave the existing policy in place for weeks 1-16. Dr. Ganz asked for a show of hands for Y becoming a permanent entry versus one that changes to an F. The consensus was to let the Y be a permanent grade, one that would not change to an F.

(See Agenda Attachment-First Reading-Last Day to Register for a Class)

Dr. Cohen said that this proposal sends a bad message to students, and she favors a policy that would make a student responsible after the first week.

Mr. Stegeman said that in his experience, it was useful to be able to enroll after the first day of classes. He said that some students initially registered for courses that have too heavy a time commitment and may need to reduce their hours.

Dr. Sanchez said that she would be in favor of a uniform policy, not a policy that would allow individual courses to specify. Dr. Larson asked what had prompted this proposal. Dr. Ganz said that the Curriculum and Instruction Committee thought that this proposal would put the burden on the student to seek out the faculty member and let the faculty member make an individual decision. Dr. Feigenbaum said the proposal would send a signal to students that they are not responsible for the work they have missed up to the point of enrollment. Dr. Grace spoke in favor of a uniform policy, and said that it should be up to the instructor to make a decision. Dr. Ganz said that the committee would reconsider its proposal in response to the discussion.

Dr. Connett called a quorum, and there being an insufficient number of Senators present, the Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Joyce Corey
Senate Secretary

Attachments:

- 1) Report from the Chancellor
- 2) Report from the Faculty Council Presiding Officer
- 3) Report from the IFC
- 4) Report from the Student Government Association President
- 5) Report from the Budget and Planning Committee
- 6) Report from the Computing Committee
- 7) Approved UM-St. Louis Academic Calendar for 2000-2001
(Pending Approval by the Board of Curators)

March 16, 1999

**Senate Remarks
By Chancellor Touhill**

Governor Mel Carnahan has appointed three new members to the Board of Curators. UM-St. Louis graduate Connie Silverstein was appointed to the board to represent the 2nd Congressional District. Connie received her bachelor's degree in political science here in 1976 and later earned a law degree from Washington University. Connie is the principal for banking services at Edward Jones.

Connie replaces Mary Gillespie. Mary was the first UM-St. Louis graduate to serve on the board and she did a good job during her six-year term for the System as a whole and for this campus in particular.

Mary James of Harrisonville was appointed from the 4th Congressional District to replace Adam Fischer. Ms. James is the human resources manager for Cass County Publishing. She earned a bachelor's degree in education at UMC.

Sean McGinnis of Springfield was appointed from the 7th Congressional District to replace Fred Hall. Mr. McGinnis is an attorney. He received his bachelor's degree from Drury College and law degree from UMC.

We are interviewing finalists for endowed professorships in public policy and transportation studies.

Several members of the administration traveled to Washington last week to meet with the Missouri congressional delegation and to explore funding possibilities for several large projects. While I believe the trip was worthwhile, this is a long-term effort, and we learned that we need to have a greater variety of proposals to put before our senators and representatives. I hope that by this time next year we will have eight to twelve such proposals.

This weekend more than 600 prospective students and their parents attended an Open House Sunday. The open house is an important tool for students making their fall choices for college and I want to thank all the faculty and staff members who represented their units.

We do anticipate that our fall enrollment will increase again. We also expect that the quality of incoming freshmen will continue to increase. More than 225 incoming freshmen with ACT scores of over 25 have been offered scholarships and more than half have already accepted. That is well ahead of our pace from last year.

March 16, 1999

Senate Remarks
By Chancellor Touhill

Page 2

Our recently completed Homecoming week was success, as more than 600 students and alumni attended events on and off campus. I want to thank the offices of Alumni Relations and Student Activities for their joint efforts in advancing greatly our efforts to make this a tradition which people look forward to each year.

More than \$150,000 has been pledged to the University in the last four weeks to support scholarship programs in five separate academic units.

1. Family and friends have contributed about \$10,000 to endow the Walters Scholarship in music.
2. An individual has contributed \$10,000 to endow a scholarship in optometry.
3. Two graduates have pledged \$60,000 to endowed three scholarships in the business school.
4. More than \$15,000 has been pledged to the nursing gala this spring, an event which raises funds for scholarships.
5. Several individuals and companies have pledged \$55,000 to underwrite the upcoming World Ecology Medal dinner . . . a fund-raising event for scholarships in biology.

I want to report that the Chancellor's Report to the Community has been scheduled for May 18 at the America's Center. I encourage you to use this event as a means to promote the university to external constituents.

Please call University Relations at 5442 if you have any questions about this important event.

PRESIDING OFFICERS REPORT TO THE SENATE

March 16, 1999

The Faculty Council met on March 11, 1999. The Council discussed three matters: Vice Chancellor Nelson's new policy regarding course proposals; the Chancellor's previous statements regarding her willingness to reach a backstopping agreement for the Performing Arts Center; and reform of campus governance.

1. The Faculty Council unanimously adopted a resolution regarding Vice Chancellor Nelson's recently announced policy on course proposals. Since the issue is explained in the resolution itself, I will simply read it:

WHEREAS on February 24 the Office of Academic Affairs issued a policy statement that it would "not take proposals for new courses to the Committee on Curricular [sic] and Instruction for approval unless they include a rationale for and a description of the course (one that goes beyond the catalog description), and a sample syllabus and bibliography;"

AND WHEREAS the Faculty Council notes that this policy statement is contrary to the faculty bylaws and that it is an infringement of the faculty prerogative to determine curriculum;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Faculty Council expresses its disapproval of the policy announced by Vice Chancellor Nelson and requests that the Office of Academic Affairs retract its statement.

(This resolution was sent to Jack Nelson on March 12.)

2. The Council continued its discussion of the Chancellor's statements that she would be willing to reach an agreement to backstop the Performing Arts Center, so that the campus would incur no reallocations and no current operating funds would be used to cover future operating losses related to the Center. Members of the Council are agreed that it is imperative that this agreement be put into writing. To achieve this purpose, the Council is issuing an invitation to the Chancellor to meet with it, and the Chancellor has agreed to do so.

3. The Council held a lively discussion about how to strengthen campus governance. I will make no attempt to reprise all of the issues raised in that discussion, but I would like to offer a brief summary.

For some time I have been aware – who could not be? – that there is a widespread dissatisfaction with the governance structure on our campus. We are the only one of the four campuses in the system to have a structure that splits governance between a University Senate and a Faculty Council. In my view – and on the basis of last Thursday's discussion, it is a view shared by most members of the Council – this

structure has caused major problems. First, it has led to a kind of "governance fatigue." There are 75 faculty Senators, and approximately 40 Council members. This means that about one of four faculty members on the campus serve on either one or both of these bodies. This requires an extraordinary level of commitment. A second effect of the divided structure is that the Council, which is the only representative body for faculty members, has generally been marginalized in campus governance. The Faculty Council has no actual powers; it can only recommend to the Senate. This has meant, I believe, that the Council has not been regarded seriously by the units who select representatives to the Council. Service on the Council has often been regarded as an unpleasant duty. It is time to repair this situation; it benefits no one.

It is imperative that faculty be effectively represented in the governance of the university. To that end, the Faculty Council discussed several alternatives. On one side, a proposal was put forth that the committees of the Senate that are composed strictly of faculty members be moved to the Council. Such a reform might strengthen both the Senate and the Council. Clearly, the Senate, as now constituted, represents all the major constituencies on campus – and yet its discussions often, or usually, revolve around issues of concern to the faculty primarily. Indeed I believe that most faculty representatives to the Senate think of it as a Faculty Senate, with a stray student or so in attendance and with administrators present to answer questions. It would greatly strengthen the Senate if it were made more clear that it does represent several constituencies. For this to be the case, all of its business should concern all of the constituencies that make it up.

On the other side, there was a discussion about simply dissolving the Faculty Council. The major objections to such an idea are compelling: The faculty needs a voice, it needs a body to represent it, and the campus needs a forum in which faculty members can hold discussions about issues of mutual concern.

An interesting middle-range proposal was put forth that the Council remain intact, but that it be brought into the Senate. Under such a reform, all faculty Senators would automatically become members of the Council, and the all-faculty Senate committees would presumably be placed within this new Faculty Council. This reform would allow the Senate to represent all its constituencies effectively, and yet the faculty would have the opportunity to meet separately.

The Faculty Council passed a motion instructing me to appoint five of its members to a Conference Committee, which would be charged with the task of making recommendations for substantial reforms in campus governance as soon as possible. We propose that the Senate also select five members to such a committee. This committee would report its recommendations to both the Senate and the Council.

I urge you to respond positively to the Council's recommendation. I would like to have at least some preliminary discussion today about these issues, if you wish.

Paul A. Roth
Report to UM-St. Louis Senate on IFC meeting of Feb. 19, 1999

The last IFC meeting was one of the more interesting of recent date.

Among the issues discussed were the following (not all being of equal interest or importance).

A question was brought up of whether or not emeritus status can be given to adjunct or non-regular faculty. There was general support for this, and clarification of the rules was to be sought.

There is a problem with the Winter semester start date for '00-'01. This is connected, inter alia, with the apparent desire (if not need) to have some rough coordination of calendars amongst the four campuses. The existence of some courses which are broadcast from one campus to the next seems to be driving this concern.

The issue was raised of whether there was any perception across the campuses and units that it is becoming more difficult to hire quality junior faculty, the widely reported PhD glut notwithstanding. This difficulty, in fact, turns out to be widely shared. For example, Rolla reports an inability to find sufficient faculty to fill vacancies. (Cite statistics) The President agrees that it is going to increasingly become an issue of how to attract and retain promising junior level and mid-career faculty members.

Another issue facing the UM system is an initiative by the community colleges to, in effect, take over all general education courses not taught physically on the campus of a four-year institution. This is fed by a number of sources, among them the Dual Credit program. (Our campus generates over 20,000 hours by this means.) The existence of such programs is taken to imply that college credit courses can be taught to anyone by (almost) anyone. Nothing of academic or pedagogical importance is attached to a course being offered on campus and by regular--terminal degree holding, tenure track--faculty.

The system generally, and this campus in particular, are thus caught between two political/institutional factors that seriously impact how we are going to function in the future. On the incoming side--students looking for general education courses--we have the community colleges who are extremely well-organized and ready to appropriate this function from us (and to a large extent already have). On the graduate end, we have CBHE, which remains steadfastly hostile to expanding the number of university programs.

Regarding the review of tenure rules, the President cautioned that opening tenure for discussion, even by putting out a new executive order in this regard, invites scrutiny by the Board of Curators which might prove quite unwanted. Need to decide if we want to take the risks associated with opening the door to Board intervention on this issue against the gains of "correcting" or undoing the changes wrought by former President Russell. IFC awaits guidance on this issue.

President had some modestly good news regarding the UM budget. He expected a flat budget for this year. the Governor has recommend a 2% increase. Other agencies, he pointed out to us, are being asked to give back 1% in the coming budget year. So we continue to be favored (relatively speaking, of course).

Paul A. Roth

Report to UM-St. Louis Senate on IFC meeting of Feb. 19, 1999

Page 2

| | UMSL | UMC | UMKC | UMR |
|--|------|-----|------|-----|
| Percent of faculty that is full time | | | | |
| Fall 1994 | 53% | 80% | 58% | 79% |
| Fall 1998 | 48% | 73% | 58% | 80% |
| Percent of faculty that is tenured or tenure track | | | | |
| Fall 1994 | 33% | 42% | 35% | 62% |
| Fall 1998 | 30% | 35% | 34% | 62% |
| Percent of regular faculty that are assistant professors | | | | |
| Fall 1994 | 32% | 27% | 20% | 24% |
| Fall 1998 | 19% | 22% | 20% | 21% |
| Number of assistant professors | | | | |
| Fall 1994 | 103 | 324 | 87 | 66 |
| Fall 1998 | 59 | 261 | 92 | 60 |
| Percent of faculty age 45 or older | | | | |
| Fall 1994 | 61% | 61% | 70% | 66% |
| Fall 1998 | 76% | 66% | 73% | 66% |
| Percent of faculty age 55 or older | | | | |
| Fall 1994 | 24% | 27% | 32% | 38% |
| Fall 1998 | 36% | 31% | 41% | 43% |

Senate Meeting Report: SGA

I. SGA Constitution

- A. A new SGA Constitution will be brought forward this Thursday at our next SGA meeting.
- B. This constitution will be brought forward by Ben Ash (comptroller), who authored this document.
- C. The new Constitution will be reviewed and changed at the April meeting, then a vote will take place by the SGA Assembly.
 - 1. a 2/3 vote is required for passage
 - 2. if passed the issue will be placed on the ballot with the April officer elections

II. SGA Elections

- A. Applications will be available this Thursday, please inform students in your classes about the open positions and voting dates.

III. Homecoming

- A. This year was the first year for Homecoming in February
- B. The week long events were very successful
 - 1. arresting day raised almost a thousand dollars for student scholarships
 - 2. the dance was very successful once again
- C. SGA thanks Ryan Metcalf, Robbyn Wahby, and the rest of the Homecoming committee which includes some administrators.

IV. Trip Report

- A. Unfortunately the trip to Rolla and Columbia was scheduled for today and will be rescheduled.
- B. The purpose of the trip is to investigate the uses of dual University Centers by both the Columbia and Rolla campuses.
 - 1. how the buildings are used and for what purposes
 - 2. how this relates directly to UM-St. Louis
- C. Another purpose of the trip is to document inconsistencies with fees that are charged within the various campuses.
 - 1. sporting event ticket prices for students should apply to all students of all four campuses
 - 2. parking ticket fees are varied greatly among the four campuses (i.e. Rolla, charges ten dollars for failure to display parking pass, UM-St. Louis charges twenty-five dollars).
 - 3. Law school application fees are forty dollars at Columbia and only twenty-five at Kansas City

V. Coaching & Director of University Center

- A. SGA is concerned that the President has not yet been asked to serve or appoint someone to participate in the selection of the new basketball coach for the men.
 - 1. This position is paid for with student athletic fees
 - 2. Therefore, there should be some one from SGA to serve on the selection committee
- B. When the new director of the University Center is selected, the SGA President should be allowed to make a recommendation on a student for that selection committee since that building is being erected with student money.

REPORT OF THE SENATE BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

March 16, 1999

The Budget and Planning Committee has met twice since the last Senate Meeting. At the February 18th meeting, the Committee was presented with information on the distribution of funds for years one and two of the Mission Enhancement initiative. Following this discussion, a motion was approved to eliminate the expenditure of funds for the Sue Shear Institute for Women in Public Life. Also at the February 18th meeting, Vice Chancellor Jack Nelson distributed information on the faculty teaching loads and this information will be fully discussed at a future meeting. Dr. Wendell Smith and Mr. Paul DeGregario gave a presentation to the Committee on the Residence Centers.

At the March 4th meeting, there were presentations on the Engineering program and the new Student Center. In addition, the Committee received preliminary information on the campus' FY2000 Budget Submission.

The next meeting of the Committee is Friday, March 19th at 12 Noon.

Senate Computing Committee Report

March 16, 1999

The Senate Computing Committee met in February and March to discuss various initiatives. Some SCC members also attended an open forum meeting on Intellectual Property Rights along with members of the Video and Instructional Technology and Library committees. Announcements follow.

1. The SCC has come to resolution on the Instructional Computing Enrichment initiative proposals and the second round of Faculty Desktop Enhancement proposals. Letters will be going out to applicants later in the week.
2. Campus Computing has been working on enhancements to the UMSL web pages. You may have noticed changes in the look of the directory page. A new "search engine" is also available, which allows people to search for keywords on web pages stored on jinx (not student pages). I encourage everyone to take this opportunity to check their pages and change or remove any that are out of date or non-functional.
3. We bring forward the following resolution for the Senate to consider. Justification is provided below.

RESOLUTION

The Senate of the University of Missouri - St. Louis recognizes the need for allowing laptop computers to be an option under the faculty and staff desktop programs. We recommend that the Chancellor authorize the Coordinator of Campus Computing, any other appropriate administrative representatives, and the Senate Computing Committee to develop guidelines and procedures for implementing this option by Fall 1999.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RESOLUTION

Laptops are very beneficial for many activities carried out by faculty and professional staff. They facilitate easy entry and exchange of information between faculty and research subjects for those whose work takes them out into the community on a regular basis, or those involved in partnerships with local or national institutions. The University's image is enhanced when faculty and staff give high-quality presentations at professional conferences and other off-campus sites as part of their duties (research, teaching, or outreach). Allowing faculty a single platform on which to develop and display research results and teaching materials will further increase the level and quality of these activities in a way which occasional access to a portable system (i.e., 'checking out' a laptop for a limited time) cannot. Laptops make it easier for faculty to continue scholarly activity, teaching, development, and daily communication with UM-St. Louis colleagues when they are out of town for short or extended periods of time.

Currently, laptop systems are more costly than desktop systems, although the price differential is decreasing over time. It costs more to get the same features (hard disk size, computing speed, memory) for a laptop than for a desktop. Laptops cannot be repaired in house, and pose somewhat higher risks for theft or damage. Because of the price differential, some faculty (and administrative/professional staff covered by the University's staff desktop program) have purchased low-end laptops with their own funds or departmental resources to supplement their desktop systems. It is the view of the Senate Computing Committee that University resources are better used toward systems that comply with the (evolving) UM-System hardware standards for several reasons. First, faculty will make better use of the advances in technology if they are not limited by software tools that must run on inadequate, outdated systems in their homes or systems which do not run all software available on their campus machine. (Unless each faculty member purchases a system for their home and replaces this every four years, they quickly find their home computing power several generations behind current technology.) Second, the overall campus monies spent on computing will be less if faculty can purchase a single laptop system -- connected to the internet from a single port in their office or classroom while they are on campus, and connected to the internet via modems when they are at home or away at conferences or research sites -- instead of two redundant systems (one desktop, one laptop) and two internet ports in each office. Finally, adherence to the UM-system standards is expected to be imposed by the system for any computer purchases -- not just those through the faculty plan.

Concerns have been expressed about the potential misuse of laptops by faculty, namely, that faculty will not check e-mail or access university information from the web or other systems on a regular basis. Some have also speculated that faculty will keep their laptops at home and have no connection to the internet while on campus. The Senate Computing Committee believes these concerns are, in most cases, unfounded. Personal experience shows that student contact is increased, rather than decreased, if faculty begin using e-mail and the web to communicate with students outside of class. The access to high-speed lines currently bring many students and faculty to campus when they need to use the web extensively: this would not change if faculty had laptops rather than desktops. The SCC strongly believes that it is better to couple the privilege of receiving a laptop with the associated responsibilities the faculty member will assume than to prohibit laptops as an option. Since at the present time, the price differential would need to be supplied from departmental funds or grant monies, requiring the endorsement of the department/principal investigator seems to be a natural solution. Note that many faculty may still prefer desktop systems because of keyboard size, screen size, security, and cost issues.

In summary, there are numerous cases where a member of the UM-St. Louis faculty or administrative/professional staff would better advance the mission of the University if they had a laptop rather than a desktop system. The Senate Computing Committee understands that the decision to allow this option is one that must be made at the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor's level. We bring forward this resolution for the Senate to consider.

APPROVED BY THE SENATE ON 3-16-99

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-ST. LOUIS

ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 2000-2001

2000

August 21
September 2
September 5
November 21
November 27
December 6
December 7, 8
December 11
December 19

FIRST SEMESTER

Monday, classes begin 8 a.m.
Saturday, Labor Day holiday begins 3 p.m.
Tuesday, classes resume 8 a.m.
Tuesday, Thanksgiving holiday begins 11 p.m.
Monday, classes resume 8 a.m.
Wednesday, classes end 11 p.m.
Thursday/Friday, Intensive study days*
Monday, final examinations begin
Tuesday, first semester closes end of day

M 15
T 16
W 15
TH 14
F 14
74

2001

January 14

Sunday, mid-year commencement

SECOND SEMESTER

January 15
January 16
March 24
April 2
May 7
May 8, 9
May 10
May 17
May 19

Monday, Dr. Martin Luther King holiday
Tuesday, classes begin 8 a.m.
Saturday, spring recess begins 3 p.m.
Monday, classes resume 8 a.m.
Monday, classes end 11 p.m.
Tuesday/Wednesday, intensive study days*
Thursday, final examinations begin
Thursday, second semester closes end of day
Saturday, annual commencement

M 15
T 15
W 15
TH 15
F 15
75

*Intensive study days -- no classes held, no exams scheduled

SUMMER SESSION

May Intersession (4 weeks)

May 21
May 28
June 15

Monday, classes begin 8 a.m.
Monday, Memorial Day holiday
Friday, session closes end of day

Eight-Week Session

June 18
July 4
August 8, 9
August 9
August 12

Monday, classes begin 8 a.m.
Wednesday, Independence Day Holiday
Wednesday/Thursday, final examinations
Thursday, session closes end of day
Sunday, summer commencement