

## PROPOSED FACULTY MANUAL AMENDMENTS (SPRING 2023)

### **FINAL TEXT**

To Be Presented to the Faculty Senate on January 17, 2023  
for Approval on February 21, 2023

**TO:** SLU Faculty

**FROM:** Miriam Joseph – Chair, Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on *The Faculty Manual*

**DATE:** January 17, 2023

**SUBJ:** Truly final text of proposed *Faculty Manual* amendments (Spring 2023)

On February 15, 2022, I presented nine amendments (two with sub-parts) proposed by the Joint Faculty Senate/Provost Committee on *The Faculty Manual* to the Faculty Senate. Following the Senate meeting, Senate President Terry Tomazic emailed a message to all faculty inviting their feedback via two open fora and a Qualtrics form.

The open fora were held on February 28<sup>th</sup> and March 1<sup>st</sup>. In addition to *Manual* Committee members, there was one attendee at the first session, and ten at the second (two of whom also contributed to Qualtrics). The Qualtrics form, which remained open until 5:00pm on Friday, March 11<sup>th</sup>, received responses from 12 unique respondents (assuming each of the anonymous submissions came from different people). Five respondents identified themselves. Email messages were received from three people; one replicated the signed Qualtrics feedback the person submitted, while the other two made comments unrelated to the proposed amendments.

Between the open fora and Qualtrics, a maximum of no more than 21 unique individuals provided feedback to the *Manual* Committee on the amendments proposed at the February 15<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting—clearly a tiny percentage of SLU's full-time St. Louis faculty. Nonetheless, the Committee was pleased to receive many positive responses to the proposed amendments, including some with substantive suggestions for clarification or other improvement. While all feedback was not supportive, even many of the negative responses contained substantive points.

The members of the *Faculty Manual* Committee thank all of you who contributed feedback. All comments were closely read and thoroughly considered, and some edits were made.

Sec. IV of *The Faculty Manual* requires that amendments be approved by the Provost and President, as well as the Senate. Both Provost Mike Lewis and President Fred Pestello have advised me of their support. Should the Faculty Senate also approve these final amendments at its February 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, the SLU Board of Trustees will be asked to adopt them at the Board's February 2023 meeting, and they will go into effect on that date. The revised *Manual* (2023) will then be accessible from the [Manual web page](#).

For reference purposes, you will find the text of the amendments originally proposed on February 15, 2022 at [https://www.slu.edu/provost/policies/faculty-manual/draft\\_proposed-fm-amendments\\_spring-2022\\_2-15-22.pdf](https://www.slu.edu/provost/policies/faculty-manual/draft_proposed-fm-amendments_spring-2022_2-15-22.pdf)

The final version of the proposed amendments (as of 1/17/23), i.e., those the Senate will vote on, appears in two forms following this message: (1) amendment text showing edits; and (2) clean version of final amendment text.

UPDATE (January 17, 2023): Amendment #1 was the subject of continued debate at Faculty Senate meetings through into January 17, 2023. At that time, I presented yet another revision following *Faculty Manual* Committee and Provost review—the final revision of the proposed amendment—based on Qualtrics feedback received subsequent to the December 13, 2022 Senate meeting. This latest request for feedback yielded five related substantive comments: two in support of the text presented at the December Senate meeting, and three others—two of which addressed the same topic. The *Manual* Committee reviewed these comments and made additional changes to the text which were reviewed and approved by the Provost. This is the text that appears below in ITEM #1. Following the January 17<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting, I will seek the President’s approval of all the proposed amendments. Assuming he does approve them, the Senate will vote on the proposed amendments as a package at its February 21, 2023 meeting.

**ITEM #1 – REVISED (1/17/23)**

**REVISED /FINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

DEAN: Sec. III.B.1. (p. 9) → Regular Appointments (see fifth full paragraph on p .9)

2021 FACULTY MANUAL	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT
<p>Each faculty member will be appointed to a specific Department or comparable academic unit, subject to its prior advice and consent. <b>For appointments of deans with tenure (except in the School of Medicine), the search committee will solicit the advice and consent of the department or comparable academic unit prior to that committee’s submission of the department’s feedback and the search committee’s own <del>its</del> recommendations to the Provost and its notification of the finalists. When that process of advice and consent results in a department’s determination that tenure is supported, that recommendation must also include the <del>determination</del> recommendation of the appropriate faculty rank. The search committee will take the department’s recommendations under advisement in making its own recommendations to the Provost, who will make the hiring decision.</b> The titles of record of faculty members...</p>	<p>Each faculty member will be appointed to a specific Department or comparable academic unit, subject to its prior advice and consent. For appointments of deans with tenure (except in the School of Medicine), the search committee will solicit the advice and consent of the department or comparable academic unit prior to that committee’s submission of the department’s feedback and the search committee’s own recommendations to the Provost and its notification of the finalists. When that process of advice and consent results in a department’s determination that tenure is supported, that recommendation must also include the recommendation of the appropriate faculty rank. The search committee will take the department’s recommendations under advisement in making its own recommendations to the Provost, who will make the hiring decision. The titles of record of faculty members...</p>

**EXPLANATION:**

Deans usually—though not always—are given faculty appointments in a particular college/school/department (as applicable) upon hire. This amendment allows for an opportunity for all faculty in potentially affected academic units to have input into the faculty appointment part of the process, and for that input to be shared with the Provost, who will make the hiring decision. The Manual Committee has advised the Provost that a detailed procedure for the hiring of deans, including their appointment as faculty, be developed and made publicly available on the Provost’s website. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** It's been determined that the stricken text in the original proposed amendment is an artifact of early drafting by the *Manual* Committee that was inadvertently retained. In fact, that text does not appear in the 2021 *Manual* or in any of its prior editions; the Committee apologizes for the confusion. The amendment is unchanged otherwise. In response to contentions that the proposed amendment eliminates faculty rights expressed in the *Manual* provision about the hiring of faculty (Sec. III.B.1.), that section addresses the hiring of faculty by faculty, and not the hiring of a dean, which is a distinct and separate process, in which the appointment of the dean is primary and the appointment of the dean to the faculty is secondary. **JANUARY 17, 2023 UPDATE:** The proposed amendment was revised to incorporate feedback received about the text presented at the December 2022 Senate meeting. This is the final text of the amendment that the Senate will vote on at its February 21, 2023 meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM #2A – NO REVISIONS**

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC RANK AND TENURE: Sec. II.E. (p. 8)**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p>The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (UCART) considers and recommends to the Provost nominations for promotion and the awarding of tenure. It also <del>reviews all new appointments to the faculty as provided in Sec. III.B.1,</del> reviews <del>the College, School, or Library</del> <b>new and revised evaluation processes and standards for promotion and tenure at all academic levels to ascertain that they are consistent with this <i>Manual</i> and University policy and practice, for making such appointments as provided in Sec. III.E.3 and</b> recommends changes to the Provost, and performs the other duties assigned to it in Sec. III.E. The Chairperson of the University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure is a tenured Professor appointed by the Provost for a three-year term, renewable once, from a list of at least three names recommended by the Faculty</p>	<p>The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure (UCART) considers and recommends to the Provost nominations for promotion and the awarding of tenure. It also reviews new and revised evaluation processes and standards for promotion and tenure at all academic levels to ascertain that they are consistent with this <i>Manual</i> and University policy and practice, recommends changes to the Provost, and performs the other duties assigned to it in Sec. III.E. The Chairperson of the University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure is a tenured Professor appointed by the Provost for a three-year term, renewable once, from a list of at least three names recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The chair votes on matters before the Committee only in the case of tie votes. Re-appointment as chair is made by the Provost on the</p>

<p>Senate Executive Committee. The chair votes on matters before the Committee only in the case of tie votes. Re-appointment as chair is made by the Provost on the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, following the Provost's consultation with current UCART members. The Chair may be removed by the Provost only for good cause shown. The members of the Committee are ordinarily tenured Professors. The Committee is composed of one member of the faculty of each College or freestanding School and of the University Libraries. Each member shall be elected by the Faculty Assembly or equivalent group. Members serve three-year terms, renewable once. If a member is completing an unfilled term for some reason, that term will not count toward the member's full terms.</p>	<p>recommendation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, following the Provost's consultation with current UCART members. The Chair may be removed by the Provost only for good cause shown. The members of the Committee are ordinarily tenured Professors. The Committee is composed of one member of the faculty of each College or freestanding School and of the University Libraries. Each member shall be elected by the Faculty Assembly or equivalent group. Members serve three-year terms, renewable once. If a member is completing an unfilled term for some reason, that term will not count toward the member's full terms.</p>
---	--

**ITEM #2B – NO REVISIONS**

**COLLEGE, SCHOOL, AND LIBRARY EVALUATION STANDARDS: Sec. III.E.3. (p.17)**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p><b>Department, College, School, and Library Evaluation Processes and Standards</b></p> <p><del>The College, School, or Library Rank and Tenure Committee, or comparable faculty committee, will evaluate applications for advancement and tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F. However, the appropriate Dean or comparable administrator and the College, School, or Library Faculty Assembly or equivalent group</del> <b>Department, College, School, and Library evaluation processes and standards are developed at the local level by the Department, if applicable, and the Faculty Assembly or equivalent group, in consultation with their Dean or comparable administrator that has approval authority. While these standards must align with the norms delineated in Sec. III.F. of this Manual, the Dean and academic unit(s) may establish more specific standards; relative weightings to be applied to teaching, student advising, research and scholarly activities, and University and</b></p>	<p><b>Department, College, School, and Library Evaluation Processes and Standards</b></p> <p>Department, College, School, and Library evaluation processes and standards are developed at the local level by the Department, if applicable, and the Faculty Assembly or equivalent group, in consultation with their Dean or comparable administrator, that has approval authority. While these standards must align with the norms delineated in Sec. III.F. of this <i>Manual</i>, the Dean and academic unit(s) may establish more specific standards; relative weightings to be applied to teaching, student advising, research and scholarly activities, University and community service, and health care; and</p>

community service, **and health care**; and interpretations of the norms for the specific circumstances of that College, School, or Library, or for a Department within that College, School, or Library.

~~The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure reviews new or revised standards, relative weightings, and interpretations to ascertain that they are consistent with this Manual, and makes recommendations to the Provost. New and revised processes and standards are submitted to the UCART for review, with UCART recommendations for modification submitted to the Provost. The Provost reviews the UCART recommendations and determines whether to approve the submissions fully or conditionally, pending modification, following the process description linked from the Promotion and Tenure Resources page on the Provost's website. When a~~ Approved by the Provost, these processes, standards, relative weightings, and interpretations promotion and tenure documents are made available on the Provost's website. ~~on the Web site of the College, School, or Library, and they will be used to gauge the merit of applications for advancement. University evaluators must utilize these standards, relative weightings, and interpretations until they are changed.~~ All participants in the promotion and tenure review process must utilize the approved standards pertinent to the applicant.

~~Evaluations by the~~ The Department, College, School, or Library Rank and Tenure Committee, or comparable faculty committee, will gauge the merit of applications for advancement and/or tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F. as well as the approved local standards pertinent to each applicant. Their evaluations are based on documents prepared by the applicant and presented with the application, along with pertinent recommendations submitted by the Department Chairperson or comparable administrator (if applicable), ~~by~~ colleagues, and ~~by~~ students, and other information presented to the committee. Evaluators may solicit additional information necessary to make an informed decision.

interpretations of the norms for the specific circumstances of that College, School, or Library, or for a Department within that College, School, or Library.

New and revised processes and standards are submitted to the UCART for review, with UCART recommendations for modification submitted to the Provost. The Provost reviews the UCART recommendations and determines whether to approve the submissions fully or conditionally, pending modification, following the process description linked from the Promotion and Tenure Resources page on the Provost's website. Approved promotion and tenure documents are available on the Provost's website. All participants in the promotion and tenure review process must utilize the approved standards to the applicant.

The Department, College, School, or Library Rank and Tenure Committee, or comparable faculty committee, will gauge the merit of applications for advancement and/or tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F. as well as the approved local standards pertinent to each applicant. Their evaluations are based on documents prepared by the applicant and presented with the application, along with pertinent recommendations submitted by the Department Chairperson or comparable administrator (if applicable), colleagues, and students, and other information presented to the committee. Evaluators may solicit additional information necessary to make an informed decision.

**ITEM #2C – REVISED**

**REVISED/FINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

**TENURE-TRACK AND FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY: Sec. III.E.4. (p.17)**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p>The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure evaluates applications for advancement and tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F and the standards, relative weightings, and interpretations described in Sec. III.E.3. <b>that are pertinent to each applicant.</b> The evaluation is based primarily on the documents presented to the Committee. However, the Committee may solicit additional information that it deems necessary to make an informed decision. If the generation of income, including through grants and sponsored programs, is to be a condition for the awarding of tenure or promotion, that condition must be explicitly stated in a faculty member’s appointment papers, established through an existing practice or policy of which the faculty member has received prior notice, or explicitly specified as a Department, School, or College criterion. The Committee will normally complete its consideration of applications for advancement and tenure by March 15.</p>	<p>The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure evaluates applications for advancement and tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F and the standards, relative weightings, and interpretations described in Sec. III.E.3. that are pertinent to each applicant. If the generation of income, including through grants and sponsored programs, is to be a condition for the awarding of tenure or promotion, that condition must be explicitly stated in a faculty member’s appointment papers, established through an existing practice or policy of which the faculty member has received prior notice, or explicitly specified as a Department, School, or College criterion. The Committee will normally complete its consideration of applications for advancement and tenure by March 15.</p>

**EXPLANATION:**

The revision to this series of proposed amendments concerns only ITEM #2C, i.e., Sec. III.E.4: TT and Full-Time NTT Faculty. Further review confirms no redundancy with Sec. III.E.3. Sec. III.E.4. refers to the UCART, while Sec. III.E.3. refers to college-level P&T committees. Hence the previously stricken language is retained.

## ORIGINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION

### TENURE-TRACK AND FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY: Sec. III.E.4. (p.17)

2021 FACULTY MANUAL	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT
<p>The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure evaluates applications for advancement and tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F and the standards, relative weightings, and interpretations described in Sec. III.E.3. <b>that are pertinent to each applicant.</b> <del>The evaluation is based primarily on the documents presented to the Committee. However, the Committee may solicit additional information that it deems necessary to make an informed decision.</del> If the generation of income, including through grants and sponsored programs, is to be a condition for the awarding of tenure or promotion, that condition must be explicitly stated in a faculty member’s appointment papers, established through an existing practice or policy of which the faculty member has received prior notice, or explicitly specified as a Department, School, or College criterion. The Committee will normally complete its consideration of applications for advancement and tenure by March 15.</p>	<p>The University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure evaluates applications for advancement and tenure using the norms in Sec. III.F and the standards, relative weightings, and interpretations described in Sec. III.E.3. that are pertinent to each applicant. If the generation of income, including through grants and sponsored programs, is to be a condition for the awarding of tenure or promotion, that condition must be explicitly stated in a faculty member’s appointment papers, established through an existing practice or policy of which the faculty member has received prior notice, or explicitly specified as a Department, School, or College criterion. The Committee will normally complete its consideration of applications for advancement and tenure by March 15.</p>

#### EXPLANATION (Section references corrected):

The *Faculty Manual* Committee determined that, in addition to any updates/corrections, Sec. ~~III.D.1~~ **II.E.:** University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure, Sec. III.E.3.: College, School, and Library Evaluation Standards, and Sec. III.E.4.: Tenure-Track and Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty, would benefit from better alignment, less redundancy, and a clearer focus on the topics indicated by their section headings. That is: Who, at what level, establishes what standards. What is the approval process for these standards, how are they applied and by whom. Substantive changes reflected in Items 2A, 2B, and 2C:

- (1) Sec. ~~III.D.1~~ **II.E.:** UCART – (a) Eliminate “reviews all new appointments to the faculty as provided in Sec. III.B.1.” This is no longer applicable; the UCART hasn’t conducted this review in many years, if ever. (b) Add that UCART reviews processes as well as standards to more accurately reflect the Committee’s role. (c) States purpose for review of standards and practices.
- (2) Sec. III.E.3: Standards – (a) Add “Department” to acknowledge that in some units, there are also department-level committees. (b) As in Sec. III.D.1., add review of processes as well as standards. (c) Add approval authority of Dean in development of evaluation standards and

processes. (d) Add health care. (d) For location of approved P&T documents, substitute Provost’s website for the websites of “College, School, or Library.” Eventually, the Provost’s website will be the official location of these documents, and colleges/schools/library/ departments can link to them from their own respective websites.

(3) Sec. III.E.4: TT and Full-Time NTT Faculty – Eliminate redundancy with Sec. III.E.3.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM #3 – NO REVISIONS**

**MEMBERS OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES: Sec. III.B.3. (p. 11)**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p><b>Faculty Affiliated with <del>Members of Academic</del> Centers and Institutes</b></p> <p><i>The Policy on Establishment and Continuation of Academic Centers and Institutes</i> defines an academic center or institute as “an organizational unit structured around a similar but more narrowly-defined set of scholarly and academic purposes than for which departments, schools, and colleges exist and involves more than one faculty member.” Academic centers exist at two levels: College and Department. Academic institutes exist at the University level. The policy details the distinctions among these levels.</p> <p><del>Centers and Institutes that have their own degree program(s) are considered to be comparable to Departments, and the policies governing their faculty members are the same as those that apply to Departments.</del></p> <p><del>A full-time faculty member primarily occupied with work in a Center or Institute that does not have its own degree program must have a primary appointment in a School, Department, Center, or Institute that does have its own degree program.</del> <b>Faculty hold an appointment (primary, secondary, joint, or any other appointment) in an academic unit (college/school/department), and not in an</b></p>	<p><b>Faculty Affiliated with Academic Centers and Institutes</b></p> <p><i>The Policy on Establishment and Continuation of Academic Centers and Institutes</i> defines an academic center or institute as “an organizational unit structured around a similar but more narrowly-defined set of scholarly and academic purposes than for which departments, schools, and colleges exist and involves more than one faculty member.” Academic centers exist at two levels: College and Department. Academic institutes exist at the University level. The policy details the distinctions among these levels.</p> <p>Faculty hold an appointment (primary, secondary, joint, or any other appointment) in an academic unit (college/ school, department), and not in an academic center or institute.</p>



**academic center or institute.**

**Faculty appointments** The primary appointment must be awarded using the procedures in Sec. III.B.1. ~~The primary appointment will be listed first in the title for such a faculty member, but the Center or Institute will also be given (e.g., Adjunct Associate Professor of History in the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies).~~

**Workload associated with faculty affiliation in academic centers or institutes is addressed in the academic unit of the faculty member's primary appointment.**

Faculty appointments must be awarded using the procedures in Sec. III.B.

Workload associated with faculty affiliation in academic centers or institutes is addressed in the academic unit of the faculty member's primary appointment.

**EXPLANATION:**

The revisions to this section of the *Manual* align it with the *Policy on the Establishment and Continuation of Academic Centers and Institutes*, incorporating text from that policy as applicable.

- (1) The provision about centers with degree programs being comparable to departments appears in Sec. II.C.1. of the *Manual* so eliminated here as redundant.
- (2) Faculty will not have primary appointments in future academic centers and institutes, but will affiliate with them—so won't have formal appointments in those entities, making the text about faculty titles and the reference to them as "members" unnecessary.
- (3) The proposed text re: workload comes from the *Faculty Workload Policy*; it is important to include here as a reminder that individual workload assignments are handled in the unit of a faculty member's primary appointment—and that's where center/institute participation should be reflected.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM #4 – NO REVISIONS**

**TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY: Sec. III.D.1. (p. 12 – Paragraph 2) → Service Beginning and Probationary Start Date**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
A faculty member who begins service during the course of an academic year will be considered to begin their probationary period for purposes of tenure at the beginning of the following academic year <b>if their first day of employment falls on or between January 1 and June 30. If their first day of employment falls on or between July 1 and December 31 of the academic year in which they are hired, their probationary period for purposes of tenure begins that year.</b>	A faculty member who begins service during the course of an academic year will be considered to begin their probationary period for purposes of tenure at the beginning of the following academic year if their first day of employment falls on or between January 1 and June 30. If their first day of employment falls on or between July 1 and December 31 of the academic year in which they are hired, their probationary period for purposes of tenure begins that year.

**EXPLANATION:**

Historically, the tenure clock of tenure-track faculty whose SLU employment began even just a few days after the start of an academic year did not begin ticking until the start of the next academic year. This was inequitable in that it often significantly increased the probationary period for some new faculty and not others. This amendment somewhat mitigates that timing issue.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM #5 – NO REVISIONS**

**ADVANCEMENT – APPLICATIONS: Sec. III.E.1 (p. 15) → (1) Acknowledgement of Department Committee and (2) Requirement of Acknowledgement of Early P&T Applications**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p>Application for advancement—whether for promotion, for tenure, or for both—is the responsibility of the faculty member. Applications for advancement should be submitted by the date specified by, and according to the procedures established by, the <b>Department</b>, College, School, or Library Rank and Tenure Committee or comparable faculty committee, in compliance with the schedule of the University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure. Early applications for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate they have met the standards of their department’s/college’s guidelines. <b>Applicants should acknowledge an early application in their cover letter/statement submitted in their dossier.</b></p>	<p>Application for advancement—whether for promotion, for tenure, or for both—is the responsibility of the faculty member. Applications for advancement should be submitted by the date specified by, and according to the procedures established by, the Department, College, School, or Library Rank and Tenure Committee or comparable faculty committee, in compliance with the schedule of the University Committee on Academic Rank and Tenure. Early applications for tenure and/or promotion must demonstrate they have met the standards of their department’s/college’s guidelines. Applicants should acknowledge an early application in their cover letter/statement submitted in their dossier.</p>

**EXPLANATION:**

- (1) Add “Department” as, in some colleges/schools, there are department P&T committees.
- (2) Add requirement that applicants submitting early P&T applications acknowledge that fact in their dossier cover letter and/or candidate statement to aid reviewers’ understanding of the applicant’s timeline and eligibility.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ITEM #6 – NO REVISIONS

**GENERAL NORMS FOR APPOINTMENT AND ADVANCEMENT: Sec. III.F.2. – Assistant Professor (p.19) → Time in Rank for Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor; (2) Sec. III.F.3.a – Associate Professor (p. 19); Sec. III.F.4.a – Professor (p.20) → Clarification of “early applications for promotion and/or tenure”**

2021 FACULTY MANUAL	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT
<p><b>2. Assistant Professor</b> Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor presupposes the qualifications for the rank of Instructor and the following qualifications in addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>a. A faculty member is expected to complete five years at the rank of Instructor before applying for promotion to Assistant Professor. Exceptions to this norm include authorized credit for previous faculty appointment(s) at comparable institutions, Provost-approved promotion and tenure guidelines of individual units, and early achievement of applicable standards.</b></li><li><b>b. <del>a</del>-Possession of the doctorate, or of the terminal degree ordinarily required for teaching and research in the faculty member's discipline. An exception may be made to this requirement, in rare and unusual circumstances, if all the following are demonstrated: the practical impossibility for the faculty member in question to obtain the doctorate or terminal degree; exceptional value in the educational program of the University; and a record of distinguished and recognized service in one of the professions.</b></li></ul> <p><i>Renumber subsequent paragraphs!</i></p>	<p><b>2. Assistant Professor</b> Appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor presupposes the qualifications for the rank of Instructor and the following qualifications in addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. A faculty member is expected to complete five years at the rank of Instructor before applying for promotion to Assistant Professor. Exceptions to this norm include authorized credit for previous faculty appointment(s) at comparable institutions, Provost-approved promotion and tenure guidelines of individual units, and early achievement of applicable standards.</li></ul>

### 3. Associate Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the granting of tenure presupposes the qualifications for ~~promotion to~~ the rank of Assistant Professor and the following qualifications in addition:

- a. A faculty member is expected to complete five years at the rank of Assistant Professor ~~in order to apply~~ **before applying** for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure. Exceptions to this norm include authorized credit for previous faculty appointment(s) at comparable institutions, Provost-approved promotion and tenure guidelines of individual units, and early ~~applications for promotion and/or tenure~~ **achievement of applicable standards.**

### 4. Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor presupposes the qualifications for the rank of Associate Professor and the following qualifications in addition:

- a. A faculty member is expected to complete five years at the rank of Associate Professor ~~in order to apply~~ **before applying** for promotion to Professor. Exceptions to this norm include authorized credit for previous faculty appointment(s) at comparable institutions, Provost-approved promotion and tenure guidelines of individual units, and early ~~applications for promotion and/or tenure~~ **achievement of applicable standards.**

### 3. Associate Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the granting of tenure presupposes the qualifications for the rank of Assistant Professor and the following qualifications in addition:

- a. A faculty member is expected to complete five years at the rank of Assistant Professor before applying for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure. Exceptions to this norm include authorized credit for previous faculty appointment(s) at comparable institutions, Provost-approved promotion and tenure guidelines of individual units, and early achievement of applicable standards.

### 4. Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor presupposes the qualifications for the rank of Associate Professor and the following qualifications in addition:

- a. A faculty member is expected to complete five years at the rank of Associate Professor before applying for promotion to Professor. Exceptions to this norm include authorized credit for previous faculty appointment(s) at comparable institutions, Provost-approved promotion and tenure guidelines of individual units, and early achievement of applicable standards.

#### **EXPLANATION:**

- (1) While the normal time in rank expected (five years) before applying for promotion and/or tenure is addressed elsewhere in the *Manual*, the absence of that statement in Sec. III.F.2. has caused confusion. The proposed text is modeled after analogous provisions in the subsequent text pertaining to Associate Professor and Professor.
- (2) Substitution of “before applying” for “in order to apply” makes clear that completion of five years is expected prior to application.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM 7 – REVISED**

**REVISED/FINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS: Sec. III.G. (p. 20) → Reference to University *Faculty Workload Policy***

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p>Teaching assignments, advising duties, and basic <b>expectations for research, and service, administration, and clinical work expectations for full-time</b> of a faculty members are established by <b>their the faculty member's</b> Department Chairperson or comparable administrator in accordance with College or School norms and subject to review by the appropriate Dean. <b>The University <i>Faculty Workload Policy</i>, applicable to all units ultimately reporting to the Provost except for SLU Madrid, defines the nature of faculty work, including its responsibilities and the distribution of those responsibilities in any academic term or year. It also outlines the process by which faculty workload assignments are made and approved.</b></p>	<p>Teaching assignments, advising duties, and basic expectations for research, service, administration, and clinical work of a faculty member are established by their Department Chairperson or comparable administrator in accordance with College or School norms and subject to review by the appropriate Dean. The University <i>Faculty Workload Policy</i>, applicable to all units ultimately reporting to the Provost except for SLU Madrid, defines the nature of faculty work, including its responsibilities and the distribution of those responsibilities in any academic term or year. It also outlines the process by which faculty workload assignments are made and approved.</p>

**EXPLANATION:**

The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate a general reference to the University *Faculty Workload Policy*. **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** The revised text of this amendment retains the substance of the existing *Manual* text because the originally proposed amendment did not explicitly identify the Chair's role in establishing faculty responsibilities other than teaching. The revised text also recognizes (as the *Policy* does) that administration and clinical work may be responsibilities of some faculty. This revision still omits the reference in the existing text to full-time faculty because the *Policy* covers all faculty, not solely those who are full-time. And originally proposed new text about the *Faculty Workload Policy* is also retained.

**ORIGINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

**RESPONSIBILITIES OF FACULTY MEMBERS: Sec. III.G. (p. 20) → Reference to University *Faculty Workload Policy***

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p><del>Teaching assignments, advising duties, and basic research and service expectations for full-time faculty members are established by the faculty member's Department Chairperson or comparable administrator in accordance with College or School norms and subject to review by the appropriate Dean.</del></p> <p><b>The University <i>Faculty Workload Policy</i> defines the nature of faculty work, including its responsibilities and the distribution of those responsibilities in any academic term or year. It also outlines the process by which faculty workload assignments are made and approved.</b></p>	<p>The University <i>Faculty Workload Policy</i> defines the nature of faculty work, including its responsibilities and the distribution of those responsibilities in any academic term or year. It also outlines the process by which faculty workload assignments are made and approved.</p>

**EXPLANATION:**  
The purpose of this amendment is to incorporate a general reference to the University *Faculty Workload Policy*. It substitutes the proposed text for the current introductory paragraph in Sec. III.G. This change does omit the reference in the existing text to full-time faculty; however, the policy covers all faculty, not only those who are full-time. The *Faculty Manual* Committee notes that the subsequent provisions of Sec. G. should be reviewed for possible revision as well as the addition of new sections on administration and clinical service to better align with the workload policy.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM #8A – REVISED**

**REVISED/FINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

The revision of the originally proposed amendment pertains only to the participation in grievance process training of an AAUP representative; it appears in bold CAPS. The remainder of the originally proposed amendment is retained.

**STANDING PANEL COMPOSITION and AD HOC JUDICIAL COMMITTEE PANEL ELIGIBILITY – SEC. III.I.7; p.40**

<b>Procedures for Termination [Paragraph 2]</b>	<b>Procedures for Termination</b>
<p>Within five (5) working days of such a request, an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee shall be constituted under the supervision of the Faculty Senate President.</p> <p><del>The <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee will be composed of three (3) voting members selected from a standing panel of ten (10) well-qualified, tenured faculty jointly selected by the Provost and the Faculty Senate President for staggered five-year terms.</del></p> <p>The Faculty Senate President and the Provost jointly select a standing panel of ten (10) faculty <del>well-qualified, tenured</del>, serving staggered five-year terms, from which three (3) voting members will be selected to form an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee.</p> <p><del>Panelists will receive appropriate training through workshops given by the University’s legal counsel and a representative of the AAUP subsequent to their appointment so that they will be prepared to serve as committee members when called upon.</del></p> <p>The Faculty Senate President selects the chairperson of the <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee from the members of the standing panel; the chairperson <del>The chairperson of the <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee will be chosen by the Faculty Senate President from the members of the standing panel and; the chair</del> may not be from the College, School, or Library in which the faculty member whose dismissal is sought resides.</p>	<p>Within five (5) working days of such a request, an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee shall be constituted under the supervision of the Faculty Senate President.</p> <p>The Faculty Senate President and the Provost jointly select a standing panel of ten (10) faculty, serving staggered five-year terms, from which three (3) voting members will be selected to form an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee.</p> <p>The Faculty Senate President selects the chairperson of the <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee from the members of the standing panel; the chairperson may not be from the College, School, or Library in which the faculty member whose dismissal is sought resides.</p>



~~The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.~~

The Faculty Senate President **randomly** selects the **other two** members of the Committee by lot ~~The remaining two members of the Committee will be chosen by lot from the panel by the Faculty Senate President~~ **from the remaining standing panel members** in the presence of both the President of the University or **his** ~~their~~ designee and the faculty member whose dismissal is sought or **their** ~~his/her~~ designee.

The faculty member has one preemptory challenge (which may be applied to the selection of any of the three panel members), as does the President of the University. ~~The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.~~

Any panelist selected must recuse **themselves** ~~him/herself~~ if that individual believes s/he cannot impartially fulfill **their** ~~his/her~~ duties as a committee member.

**The Office of the General Counsel, AND, WHEN REASONABLY AVAILABLE, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL AAUP will conduct appropriate training ABOUT ~~for~~ the hearing process ~~to~~ FOR the panelists.**

The Faculty Senate President randomly selects the other two members of the Committee by lot from the remaining standing panel members-in the presence of both the President of the University or their designee and the faculty member whose dismissal is sought or their designee.

The faculty member has one preemptory challenge (which may be applied to the selection of any of the three panel members), as does the President of the University. The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.

Any panelist selected must recuse themselves if that individual believes s/he cannot impartially fulfill their duties as a committee member.

The Office of the General Counsel and, when reasonably available, a representative of the national AAUP will conduct appropriate training about the hearing process for the panelists.

**EXPLANATION:**

In general, the wording of this section was revised to improve flow and clarity. There are two substantive changes:

(1) Elimination of requirement that members of the ten-person standing panel be “well-qualified, tenured” faculty. The tenure requirement severely restricts the pool from which these panel members may be chosen, significantly decreasing the opportunity to have a diverse panel (e.g., members who are female or underrepresented minorities). This is especially an issue in the School of Medicine, where the vast majority of faculty hold non-tenure track appointments and the tenured faculty are predominantly male. “Well-qualified” was eliminated as vague.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

(2) Participation of an AAUP representative in the panel’s procedural training is retained, with the qualification that this representative be from the national AAUP and that they be reasonably available, i.e., they need to be available, even via zoom or on short notice, at times during which the pertinent SLU committee members are available for training.

**ORIGINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

- Blue text appearing below solely reflects rewording or resequencing of current text for clarity and does not affect the substance of the provision.
- The 2021 *Faculty Manual* text below is displayed here in chunks (vs complete paragraphs) for clarity.

**STANDING PANEL COMPOSITION and AD HOC JUDICIAL COMMITTEE PANEL ELIGIBILITY – SEC. III.I.7; p.40**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p><b>Procedures for Termination</b> [Paragraph 2]</p> <p>Within five (5) working days of such a request, an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee shall be constituted under the supervision of the Faculty Senate President.</p> <p><del>The <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee will be composed of three (3) voting members selected from a standing panel of ten (10) well-qualified, tenured faculty jointly selected by the Provost and the Faculty Senate President for staggered five-year terms.</del></p>	<p><b>Procedures for Termination</b></p> <p>Within five (5) working days of such a request, an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee shall be constituted under the supervision of the Faculty Senate President.</p>

The Faculty Senate President and the Provost jointly select a standing panel of ten (10) faculty ~~well-qualified, tenured~~, serving staggered five-year terms, from which three (3) voting members will be selected to form an *ad hoc* Judicial Committee.

~~Panelists will receive appropriate training through workshops given by the University's legal counsel and a representative of the AAUP subsequent to their appointment so that they will be prepared to serve as committee members when called upon.~~

The Faculty Senate President selects the chairperson of the *ad hoc* Judicial Committee from the members of the standing panel; the chairperson ~~The chairperson of the *ad hoc* Judicial Committee will be chosen by the Faculty Senate President from the members of the standing panel and;~~ the chair may not be from the College, School, or Library in which the faculty member whose dismissal is sought resides.

~~The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.~~

The Faculty Senate President **randomly** selects the **other two** members of the Committee by lot ~~The remaining two members of the Committee will be chosen by lot from the panel by the Faculty Senate President~~ **from the remaining standing panel members** in the presence of both the President of the University or ~~his~~ **their** designee and the faculty member whose dismissal is sought or ~~their his/her~~ designee.

The faculty member has one preemptory challenge (which may be applied to the selection of any of the three panel members), as does the President of the University. ~~The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of~~

The Faculty Senate President and the Provost jointly select a standing panel of ten (10) faculty, serving staggered five-year terms, from which three (3) voting members will be selected to form an *ad hoc* Judicial Committee.

The Faculty Senate President selects the chairperson of the *ad hoc* Judicial Committee from the members of the standing panel; the chairperson may not be from the College, School, or Library in which the faculty member whose dismissal is sought resides.

The Faculty Senate President randomly selects the other two members of the Committee by lot from the remaining standing panel members-in the presence of both the President of the University or their designee and the faculty member whose dismissal is sought or their designee.

The faculty member has one preemptory challenge (which may be applied to the selection of any of the three panel members), as does the President of the University. The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of

the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.

Any panelist selected must recuse **themselves** ~~him/herself~~ if that individual believes s/he cannot impartially fulfill **their** ~~his/her~~ duties as a committee member.

**The Office of the General Counsel will conduct appropriate training for the hearing process to the panelists.**

the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.

Any panelist selected must recuse themselves if that individual believes s/he cannot impartially fulfill their duties as a committee member.

The Office of the General Counsel will conduct appropriate training for the hearing process to the panelists.

#### **EXPLANATION:**

In general, the wording of this section was revised to improve flow and clarity. There are two substantive changes:

- (1) Elimination of requirement that members of the ten-person standing panel be “well-qualified, tenured” faculty. The tenure requirement severely restricts the pool from which these panel members may be chosen, significantly decreasing the opportunity to have a diverse panel (e.g., members who are female or underrepresented minorities). This is especially an issue in the School of Medicine, where the vast majority of faculty hold non-tenure track appointments and the tenured faculty are predominantly male. “Well-qualified” was eliminated as vague.
- (2) Elimination of the requirement of the participation of an AAUP representative in the panel’s procedural training. AAUP participation is logistically difficult and has not been included for over a decade. SLU’s Office of General Counsel is very familiar with the procedures delineated in the *Manual* so has the necessary knowledge and experience to be able to explain all relevant procedures and respond to questions about them.

#### **ITEM #8B – REVISED**

#### **REVISED/FINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

*The revision of the originally proposed amendment pertains only to the participation in grievance process training of an AAUP representative; it appears in bold CAPS. The remainder of the originally proposed amendment is retained. In ITEM #8B below, only the excerpts pertinent to the revision are shown here; the explanation for the revision is the same as for ITEM #8A.*

**PROPOSED REVISION OF Sec. III.I.5. (2021 *Manual*, p.37, third full paragraph) TO REFLECT CHANGES MADE TO SEC. III.I.7; p.40 (Item #8B)**

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p>Nonrenewal of Contracts [Paragraph 4]</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p><del>Panelists will receive appropriate training through workshops given by the University's legal counsel and a representative of the AAUP subsequent to their appointment so that they will be prepared to serve as committee members when called upon. This training will be conducted every five years. In the interim, the University's legal counsel, together with a representative appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, will provide pertinent training on an as-needed basis.</del></p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The Office of the General Counsel, AND, WHEN REASONABLY AVAILABLE, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL AAUP will conduct appropriate training ABOUT <del>for</del> the hearing process <del>to</del> FOR the panelists.</p>	<p>Nonrenewal of Contracts</p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p>The Office of the General Counsel and, when reasonably available, a representative of the national AAUP will conduct appropriate training about the hearing process for the panelists.</p>

**ORIGINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

- Blue text appearing below solely reflects rewording or resequencing of current text for clarity and does not affect the substance of the provision.
- The 2021 *Faculty Manual* text below is displayed here in chunks (vs complete paragraphs) for clarity.

**PROPOSED REVISION OF Sec. III.I.5. (2021 Manual, p.37, third full paragraph) TO REFLECT CHANGES MADE TO SEC. III.I.7; p.40 (Item #8B)**

2021 FACULTY MANUAL	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT
<p><b>Nonrenewal of Contracts</b> [Paragraph 4]</p> <p>When a timely appeal is filed, the Professional Relations Committee reviews the case, interviews the principals involved, determines, normally within fifteen (15) working days, whether reasonable grounds exist for believing that the nonrenewal may be in violation of academic freedom, thus warranting the establishment of an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee to consider the matter, and notifies the President of the University, the Provost, the faculty member, and the President of the Faculty Senate in writing of the results of its review. If required, an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee shall be constituted within five (5) working days under the supervision of the Faculty Senate President. <del>The <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee will be composed of three (3) voting members selected from a standing panel of ten (10) well-qualified, tenured faculty jointly selected by the Provost and the Faculty Senate President for staggered five-year terms.</del></p> <p>The Faculty Senate President and the Provost jointly select a standing panel of ten (10) faculty <del>well-qualified, tenured</del>, serving staggered five-year terms, from which three (3) voting members will be selected to form an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee.</p> <p><del>Panelists will receive appropriate training through workshops given by the University's legal counsel and a representative of the AAUP subsequent to their appointment so that they will be prepared to serve as committee members when called upon. This training will be conducted every five years. In the interim, the University's legal counsel, together with a representative appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, will provide pertinent training on an as-needed basis.</del></p> <p>The Faculty Senate President selects the chairperson of the <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee from the members of the standing panel; the</p>	<p><b>Nonrenewal of Contracts</b></p> <p>When a timely appeal is filed, the Professional Relations Committee reviews the case, interviews the principals involved, determines, normally within fifteen (15) working days, whether reasonable grounds exist for believing that the nonrenewal may be in violation of academic freedom, thus warranting the establishment of an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee to consider the matter, and notifies the President of the University, the Provost, the faculty member, and the President of the Faculty Senate in writing of the results of its review. If required, an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee shall be constituted within five (5) working days under the supervision of the Faculty Senate President. The Faculty Senate President and the Provost jointly select a standing panel of ten (10) faculty, serving staggered five-year terms, from which three (3) voting members will be selected to form an <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee.</p> <p>The Faculty Senate President selects the chairperson of the <i>ad hoc</i> Judicial Committee from the members of the standing panel; the</p>

~~chairperson The chairperson of the *ad hoc* Judicial Committee will be chosen by the Faculty Senate President from the members of the standing panel and; the chair~~ may not be from the College, School, or Library in which the faculty member whose dismissal is sought resides.

~~The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days whenever possible.~~

The Faculty Senate President **randomly** selects the **other two** members of the Committee by lot ~~The remaining two members of the Committee will be chosen by lot from the panel by the Faculty Senate President~~ **from the remaining standing panel members** in the presence of both the President of the University or ~~his~~ **their** designee and the faculty member whose dismissal is sought or **their** ~~his/her~~ designee.

The faculty member has one preemptory challenge (which may be applied to the selection of any of the three panel members), as does the President of the University. ~~The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days~~ **whenever possible.**

Any panelist selected must recuse ~~themselves him/herself~~ if that individual believes s/he cannot impartially fulfill ~~their his/her~~ duties as a committee member.

**The Office of the General Counsel will conduct appropriate training for the hearing process to the panelists.**

chairperson may not be from the College, School, or Library in which the faculty member whose dismissal is sought resides.

The Faculty Senate President randomly selects the other two members of the Committee by lot from the remaining standing panel members-in the presence of both the President of the University or their designee and the faculty member whose dismissal is sought or their designee.

The faculty member has one preemptory challenge (which may be applied to the selection of any of the three panel members), as does the President of the University. The role of the chairperson is to direct and supervise the hearing process, participate in the deliberations of the Committee, and ensure, insofar as possible, that following the hearing, the Committee delivers a thoughtful, clearly articulated decision within ten (10) working days.

Any panelist selected must recuse themselves if that individual believes s/he cannot impartially fulfill their duties as a committee member.

The Office of the General Counsel will conduct appropriate training for the hearing process to the panelists.

**EXPLANATION:**

This section of the *Manual* is essentially identical to that addressed in Item #8A. The proposed text for Item #8B mirrors the changes proposed in Item #8A except for these two substantive changes:

- (1) Elimination of “whenever possible” regarding the expected timeline for an *ad hoc* committee’s decision. The words “whenever possible” do not appear in the *Manual* in the text addressed in Item #8A.
- (2) Elimination of the requirement that panel training occur every five years. This requirement does not appear in the *Manual* in the text addressed in Item #8A. Furthermore, training should be held whenever needed, and probably more often as the panel membership changes.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ITEM #9 – REVISED**

**REVISED/FINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

*The revision of ITEM #9 pertains only to the participation in grievance process training of an AAUP representative, to make analogous text referenced in ITEM #8A and #8B; it appears in bold CAPS.*

**PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Sec. III.I.10.a.4 (p.44) → Committee Training**

2021 FACULTY MANUAL	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT
<p>The members of the Committee should be trained to consider grievances through workshops given by the University's legal counsel and a representative of the AAUP.</p> <p><b>The Office of the General Counsel, AND, WHEN REASONABLY AVAILABLE, A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL AAUP will <del>provide</del> CONDUCT APPROPRIATE training about the grievance process <del>to</del> FOR the members of the Committee.</b></p>	<p>The Office of General Counsel and, when reasonably available, a representative of the national AAUP will conduct appropriate training about the grievance process for the members of the Committee.</p>



**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

As with ITEM #8A and #8B, participation of an AAUP representative in the Committee’s procedural training is retained, with the qualification that this representative be from the national AAUP and that they be reasonably available, i.e., they need to be available, even via zoom or on short notice, at times during which the pertinent SLU committee members are available for training.

**ORIGINAL PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPLANATION**

PROFESSIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE: Sec. III.I.10.a.4 (p.44) → Committee Training

<b>2021 FACULTY MANUAL</b>	<b>PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT</b>
<p><del>The members of the Committee should be trained to consider grievances through workshops given by the University's legal counsel and a representative of the AAUP.</del></p> <p><b>The Office of General Counsel will provide training about the grievance process to the members of the Committee.</b></p>	<p>The Office of General Counsel will provide training about the grievance process to the members of the Committee.</p>

**EXPLANATION:**

The proposed substitution is better worded and aligns with the proposed revisions of the provisions about training *Ad Hoc* Judicial Panel members.

\*\*\*\*\*

FINAL (1/17/23)

Note: Corrections made to p.1 text (2/15/23)