The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m.

Minutes

Minutes from the two previous meetings (October 15 and November 12, 2002) were approved as submitted.

Report from the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction – Professor David Ganz

The Senate approved changes in degree requirements to B.S. Programs in Mechanical, Electrical, and Civil Engineering. It was noted that the Bulletin copy will have to be revised to bring the program into compliance with the new general education requirements.

Proposed changes in degree requirements offered by the Department of Physics and Astronomy were referred back to the department to make the changes that were noted on the Senate floor. Dr. Lawrence Barton pointed out the incorrect statement concerning general education requirements (i.e., “Any of the following courses may be used to satisfy the physical science requirement,” lists only Physics courses.), and the Senate requested the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction to develop common language concerning general education requirements so that it can be listed in the catalog in one place to cover all undergraduate degrees. Dr. William Connett questioned if students can take the Mathematical Statistics course in place of the Psychological Statistics course listed in the program. Dr. Feldman said he would check into this and report back.

The Senate approved the creation of a new certificate program, called the Post M.S.N. Nurse Practitioner Certificate, and a new 2+3 program in Political Science.

The Senate then considered the attached policy regarding final examinations. The policy pertains to an in-class final exam only. A take-home exam would be unaffected by this policy. Dr. Timothy Farmer
noted, however, that in keeping with the spirit of the policy, take-home exams should not be due during the intensive study period. A motion to commit the proposal back to the Committee failed 16 to 9. Dr. Joseph Martinich proposed that the following language be inserted in the last paragraph before the final sentence: “Requests based on multiple examinations on the same day or conflicts with religious practices must be submitted to the faculty member within two weeks of the start of the semester.” Dr. James Breauigh spoke against the Martinich amendment, and Dr. James Richards noted that the policy is intended for group exams only – not for individual exams in music. Dr. William Connett moved to commit the policy back to committee, and the motion was approved with some dissent.

2004-05 Academic Calendar

Professor Ganz reported that the guidelines developed by the Intercampus Faculty Council concerning academic calendars are generally applicable. Vice President Lehmkuhle informed Professor Ganz that he would not accept a 14-week calendar. Professor Ganz noted that the starting date (August 18) is early, but the calendar is no longer than past schedules. The end-date is December 18, a week before Christmas. The value of intensive study days was questioned. Dr. William Connett commented that math students have to go back over their old lessons and, often, “an Epiphany occurs.” Dr. Paul Roth, citing child care difficulties for faculty with children in elementary and secondary schools, suggested that we sacrifice intensive study days this year and review the issue for next year. At the close of the discussion, the proposed academic calendar for 2004-05 was approved by the Senate with some dissent.

Professor Ganz called the Senate’s attention to course additions, deletions, and changes which were adopted by the Committee.

At the conclusion of his report, the final report to be presented by Professor Ganz before his December 31 retirement, Professor Ganz was enthusiastically applauded.

Report from the Chairperson – Dr. Van Reidhead

The Senate thanked Professor Ganz again, and the Chair led the Senate in observing a moment of silence to mark the passing of Professor Emeritus Sioma Kagan. Today, the Chair noted, will be the last time that professors William Connett, David Ganz, Donald Phares, Herman Smith and Chancellor Blanche Touhill will meet as senators. Senators were reminded of the reception planned to honor these individuals. The Chair
reported the partial results of a mid-term election. Professor Cezary Janikow will represent Mathematics and Computer Science, Professor Chikako Usui will represent Sociology, and Professor Anne Winkler will represent Economics. These individuals will begin their term on January 1, 2003. We don’t yet know who will replace Chancellor Touhill on the Senate, the Chair reported. The Chancellor was roundly applauded.

Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill

The Chancellor said she has enjoyed her 37 years as teacher, researcher, and administrator at UM-St. Louis. She thanked senators for their support and hard work.

Since 1980, Chancellor Touhill noted, each campus of UM has been given approximately the same percent of state dollars. UM-St. Louis enrolls 29 percent of the students in the System but only receives 12 percent of the state appropriation. UM-St. Louis has 23 percent of the System’s FTE. The Chancellor joined her predecessors in the position in arguing that UM-St. Louis has received an inadequate level of funding. In October 2001, the Chancellor and President Pacheco testified before a committee studying funding inequities. President Pacheco stated that both UM-St. Louis and UMC needed additional funding. The committee issued a report in February 2002 that concluded that gross funding inequities existed among some of the 4-year colleges and universities in Missouri and suggested that Missouri create a new formula that would distribute state funding more closely aligned to FTE enrollment. This marked the first time in the Chancellor’s recollection that a legislative body documented that gross funding inequities existed and recommended a formula that would benefit UM-St. Louis as well as some other public higher education institutions in the state. The committee was dissolved just as they were turning in their report. Last week, CBHE issued its own report, which said, “The UM System appears to receive adequate state funding; however, the CBHE analysis of individual campuses indicates that UM-St. Louis may not receive an adequate share of state funding from the UM Board of Curators.” CBHE approved that report unanimously. CBHE will be forwarding its resolution to the state legislators and to President Pacheco. Chancellor Touhill expressed hope that this issue can be resolved in the near future.

At the close of her report, Chancellor Touhill was warmly applauded by the Faculty Senate. The Chair extended thanks also to Vice Chancellor Krueger, Deputy to the Chancellor Driemeier, former Senate Chair Lawrence Barton, and Assistant to the Chancellor Betty Van Uum.
Report from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – Vice Chancellor Jerry Durham.

(see attached)

After his report, Vice Chancellor Durham was asked by Dr. Joseph Martinich if the summer compensation reduction for faculty contradicts the Board’s previous decision to make cuts across the board for all employees if it becomes necessary. The Vice Chancellor indicated that it does not because summer teaching is considered as voluntary teaching. In response, Dr. Martinich referred to his appointment letter, which states that he will be paid 10 percent of his salary for each course taught during the summer. It further states that he could expect to teach three courses every two summers. Vice Chancellor Durham reported that his statistics across the UM System show a decline in regular faculty productivity in terms of student credit hours over the last decade. At the same time, regular faculty teaching has increased. Our average productivity on this campus aligns closely with the UM average. There was the sense at System meetings that we could do better.

On behalf of the College of Education Faculty Senators, Dr. Susan Kashubeck-West then presented the following resolution with the arguments listed in the attached.

Because of the limited consultation before adopting the new summer faculty compensation policy and the possible serious long-term effects of this new policy, we strongly object to any change in summer compensation without discussion of alternate solutions. Therefore, be it resolved by the Faculty Senate that an ad hoc committee on summer semester financial operations be established that explores, but is not limited to, issues of cost, cost savings, compensation, incentives, and budget for all summer endeavors on campus. The committee will be composed of at least one regular faculty member from each college. The committee will accept proposals from academic units on cost saving measures and faculty compensation policy. Further, the appropriate Vice Chancellors will provide information for the committee, which will report to the Senate by the February, 2003, meeting.

Dr. Paul Speck argued for the motion, saying students don’t sign up for courses; they sign up for programs, which go year-round. To the extent
that we don’t offer summer courses, these students will go elsewhere. If we are not a 12-month school, the professional schools, particularly, will be unable to compete.

Vice Chancellor Durham responded to a question by Dr. William Connett by noting that the formula will remain the same. The decision on salary is an administrative decision. There is no perfect solution for the summer session. The units should benefit because the instructional costs are lower. In addition the students will be paying a higher fee next summer, so there should be more income.

Following a brief further discussion, Dr. Patricia Simmons called the question. It was seconded and approved. The motion was then adopted unanimously by the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Paul Roth asked how many people are taking VERIP on this campus. Vice Chancellor Durham said that final decisions may not, in some cases, be known because the paperwork hasn’t yet come through. Dr. Timothy McBride reminded Vice Chancellor Durham that in 2004 regular faculty could be hired to fill vacancies. The Vice Chancellor said he is concerned about spending money before the financial picture is known. Dr. Paul Speck inquired if the issue of summer compensation was discussed in Budget and Planning. Vice Chancellor Durham said it was not, that the only possible outcome he could see would be a vote by the faculty not to endorse it.

It was moved to appoint the committee today. It was seconded. Mr. Hyter Alexander inquired if there were to be students on the committee. He was told no. Dr. Joseph Martinich spoke against the motion, suggesting instead that the Committee on Committees be assigned the task of appointing the committee. The motion was defeated by show of hands. Dr. Joseph Martinich moved that the Committee on Committees be given the task of forming this committee and that they search widely for the appropriate members. They are to report back to the Senate in January with the committee membership. The Committee on Committees will form the committee by December 20. The motion passed.

**Chancellor Search Committee** – Dr. Timothy McBride

(see attached)
Resolution on PeopleSoft

Dr. Lawrence Barton introduced Dr. James O’Brien from the Chemistry Department, who presented the following resolution (see attached report).

1. Delay the implementation of the PeopleSoft Grants Management System for Grant writing. In the interim, use the existing Grant Data form, generated using the current process, for entry of the financial details associated with attempts to gain an award.

2. Establish an Intercampus Faculty Council committee to review all aspects of PeopleSoft’s use in the grant writing process.

3. If the Administration insists on the use of the PeopleSoft Grants Management System during this review period, have them deal with submissions of the grant material into the PeopleSoft system. The only requirement of the Faculty should be to provide to the Research Office the currently used grant data form and the proposal in electronic format within a set time limit after the grant has been submitted.

4. Please don’t impose the PeopleSoft disaster in faculty who are trying to improve things for the University by securing external funding.

The motion was seconded by Dr. William Connett. Vice Chancellor Nasser Arshadi reported that the decision to use PeopleSoft was made at the System level, and that his office has tried to do its best to support our faculty. He said he doesn’t want to interfere with the incentive to go forward with external funding. Dr. Timothy McBride agreed with Dr. O’Brien, saying we are on the side of the Research Office. This will provide us with the ammunition to go to the System to say let’s delay the implementation. Dr. Lawrence Barton said that the best outcome would be getting an IFC committee to look into it. Dr. Murray asked how many applications are affected. Vice Chancellor Arshadi said Monday is the deadline by when we will be going live.

The question was called, seconded, and approved. The motion passed with some dissent.

Next, Dr. William Connett offered the following resolution for Senate adoption:
At the recent faculty meeting Vice Chancellor Durham called for The creation of a new college. This particular proposal, and all other such changes in the basic structure of the University shall be sent to the Faculty Senate, where the merits of such proposals can be fully debated by the duly elected representatives of the Faculty, before they are implemented. Part of this consideration would be a report from the Curriculum and Instruction Committee on the proposal’s academic soundness, a report from the Budget and Planning Committee about how the costs of the new enterprise will be paid, and the reports from any other relevant committees. At the conclusion of this debate, the Senate will vote its approval or disapproval.

The resolution was seconded by Dr. William Long. Vice Chancellor Durham called for a quorum. Determining that a quorum was present, the Chair called for a vote on the motion, which was then approved.

Completing the business at hand, the Senate adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Arban
Senate Executive Assistant