The meeting was called to order promptly at 3 p.m. by Senate Chair Paul Speck.

Minutes

Two sets of minutes were approved as submitted:

- Joint meeting of University Assembly/Faculty Senate on November 9, 2004
- Meeting of the Faculty Senate on December 7, 2004

Report from the Chairperson – Dr. Paul Speck

The Chair reported that together with the Chancellor, the Senate leadership will organize activities to follow-up on the discussions about teaching and research that took place with President Floyd last fall. This is part of the ongoing discourse about UMSL’s mission for the next 10-20 years, and it should help focus us for the next meeting with the President, scheduled for March or April.

Chair Speck announced that the University Assembly’s Budget and Planning Committee is planning to meet annually to review our progress in meeting the goals set forth in the University’s Action Plan. The meeting for this year will be set soon.

The Senate will piggyback on an event scheduled by the office of Dr. Margaret Cohen that will address institutional change, shared governance, and the role of urban public research universities. The speaker and facilitator of this event, the former President of the University of Portland, will be on campus February 17-18. More information will be forthcoming.

In December, Drs. Rocco Cottone, Van Reidhead, Lawrence Barton, and the Chair met with a subcommittee of the Chancellor’s Council and local legislators who are in leadership positions in Jefferson City. This was a follow-up to a similar meeting that took place last May of faculty members, St. Louis corporate leaders, and area legislators. The purpose of the December meeting was to clarify for the new Republican leadership the importance of obtaining additional funding adjustments for UMSL. Chair Speck reported that the meeting was candid and that all parties clearly want to work together to achieve our common goal.
Concerning the Wellness Center proposal, the Chair reported that he met with student leaders and worked out a schedule that permits relevant Assembly committees (i.e., Student Affairs; Recruitment, Admissions, Retention, and Student Financial Aid; Physical Facilities, Space, and General Services; and the Senate/Assembly Steering Committee) to consider and provide input. Comments from these committees will go forward to the Budget and Planning Committee and then on to the full Assembly for discussion in April. The Wellness Center, the Chair stressed, is a student initiative.

Report from the Chancellor – Chancellor Thomas George

The Chancellor reported that he attended the Governor’s inauguration a week ago. The event was held outdoors, and it was very cold, but it provided a great opportunity for networking. Chancellor George has had several occasions to be with the Governor since that time, and the Governor says that education is a priority for his Administration. The Chancellor said he is working to broaden the Governor’s focus to include higher education, not just K-12.

The evaluation of administrators is under way. The System has hired a consultant, Sherry Tucker, who led the vice presidents and chancellors through the process of analyzing their progress on eight short-term and long-term goals and on certain competency skills. Chancellor George described this effort as assessing one’s worth to the institution. It will move down to vice chancellors, provosts, and deans next. On this campus the System evaluations will work in tandem with those of the University Assembly Committee on Administrator Evaluations. UMSL is the only campus moving forward on the System effort to date.

Chancellor George reported that we have hired Eva Klein, a consultant from Washington, D.C., to lead us in the process of interviewing approximately 50 faculty members and others regarding the research technology park. Information sessions will be held in advance to give interviewees a sense of what is going on. Betty Van Uum and Dick Shepard will work on this.

Ray Wagner, a senior administrator at Enterprise, chairs the newly-created Public Policy Committee on the Chancellor’s Council. The Committee will head up the effort on behalf of the Council to get further adjustments to our budget. The Committee’s next meeting will include Chancellor George, President Floyd, and others. Last year, this effort was led by Warner Baxter, Vice President at Ameren UE Corporation, who is currently President of the Council.

Chancellor George reported that Mr. Baxter and Ms. Cindy Brinkley, President of SBC-Mo., will attend a hearing sponsored by the Senate Appropriations Committee to represent our interests. He noted that the RCGA has us at the forefront for more funds.

The Chancellor mentioned that President Floyd is keeping a close eye on UMKC until its interim chancellor is in place. The Kansas City campus was the most vocal against our getting an equity adjustment.
At the close of the Chancellor’s report, he was asked by Dr. William Long about the impact on our relations with the curators and legislators of the downtrend in our enrollment. The Chancellor pointed out that we had only a 1 percent decrease in our student credit hours for fall and that the four campuses of UM were closely clustered. Chancellor George observed that the curators and legislators tend to take a broad view and that, over time, we expect our enrollments to rise.

Dr. Teresa Thiel asked if diverting the funds from the transportation tax would affect higher education, in general, and us, in particular. The Chancellor said no one has done the calculations yet. We are, he said, waiting for the State of the State address.

**Report from the Provost** – Dr. Glen Cope

Provost Cope reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Evening College has met recently and will be submitting several reports in draft form next week. Some recommendations likely will be implemented this summer. When the document is finalized, it will be posted on the Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate websites.

Regarding summer operations, we have reverted to our policy from past summers. If enrollment goes up from last year, we will distribute profits among the units in proportion to what they generated. Provost Cope wants a committee to look into year-round operations, and she indicated she would work with the Faculty Senate to get faculty representation on the Committee.

Concerning the increase in scholarship funding, the Provost reported that 25 percent of the funding will be applied to **graduate** students. While some was used for transfer students coming here in January, most will be used for students entering in the fall. They will be adding to fellowships, increasing stipends, and recreating the Chancellor’s Graduate Scholar Fellowships. The aim is to beef things up so that more students get more dollars. More information should be available after the Graduate Council meets on Friday. Dr. Peggy Ellis is chairing the subcommittee of the Council that is looking into this, and Dean Judith Walker de Felix is a good conduit to the subcommittee.

Seventy-five percent of the additional aid will be assigned to **undergraduates**. One-third of that will be used to add to scholarships for freshmen, another portion will go toward new scholarships to be offered in the fall, and about half of the funding will be used for retaining continuing students. Much of the money will be given to those who are both meritorious and needy. The plan is to advise students between March 15 and April 1 what they can expect in costs and aid.

Provost Cope reported that Dr. David Crockett, a consultant with Noel Levitz who has 30 years of experience in dealing with advising and student retention, will be on campus February 1-2 to meet with a number of faculty and staff groups. He will examine the whole spectrum, i.e., from the time the students arrive through the time they graduate.
The Provost reported on student credit hours generated by faculty type for fall 2004:

**full-time regular** -- 25% of total undergraduate credit hours, 10% of total graduate/professional credit hours  
**full-time non-regular** – 31% of total undergraduate credit hours, 2% of total graduate/professional credit hours  
**part-time non-regular, adjuncts, GTAs** – 21% of total undergraduate credit hours, 1% of total graduate/professional credit hours  
**all others** (includes persons with administrative titles, for example) – 10% of total undergraduate credit hours, 1% of total graduate/professional credit hours

This information, beginning in 2001 and divided by unit, will be posted on the web. Dr. Louis Gerteis asked how these figures fit in the campus plan. Provost Cope noted that we are moving in the right direction. She noted the dip from 2001 to 2002, when VERIP began.

Chancellor George and Provost Cope updated attendees on the status of endowments and changes with respect to Pell Grants. Interest in training sessions for the Faculty Accomplishment System (FAS) was indicated.

Chair Speck reported that he is a member of a subcommittee of the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) that is looking into the faculty numbers issue, and that the Missouri Association of Faculty Senates (MAFS) is polling institutions in the state about their numbers of faculty by category as a way of shocking legislators into recognizing how teaching has changed. Fewer courses are being taught by full-time regulars, and some institutions are attempting to change part-time people to full-time non-regulars. This brings forward many questions. As an aside, the Chair reported that 44% of the sections taught at the University of Illinois at Champagne-Urbana are being taught by GTAs.

Dr. William Long moved that the agenda be modified so as to immediately take up proposed revisions to the Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion procedures, and the Chair complied.

**Report from the Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion** – Dr. Carol Peck

On behalf of the Committee, Dr. Peck reported that ATP has met once more since the time of the last Faculty Senate meeting and recommend **two general changes**:  
(1) Every reference to the “Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs” has been changed to “Provost.”  
Dr. Peck stressed that the Committee has not added to nor detracted from the duties of this position, and she noted the dual titles held by Dr. Cope.  
(2) At the request of the Graduate Dean, the requirement for a separate report from the Dean of the Graduate School has been omitted.

**Two additional changes were required by the legal office** to bring us into compliance with the Collected Rules and Regulations:  
(1) On page 11, number 2a has been added
directly from Executive Order 6A. When considering cases of promotion to full professor, associate professors with tenure are to be invited – not required – to provide comments, and 2b provides for the receipt and acceptance of the report. (2) On page 13, under g., Joint Appointments, our recent practice of accepting one recommendation jointly prepared by the participating units is changed back to our previous practice of requiring separate recommendations from the units involved and the inclusion of an explanation in the Ad Personam committee’s report as to the distribution of responsibilities between the units.

Turning now to specific changes discussed and recommended by ATP: (1) On the bottom of page 4, after “Because they may be biased, letters from former students, departmental colleagues, research collaborators, or former mentors should be used sparingly,” the following is proposed to be inserted: “…if at all, and under no circumstances should the number of such reviewers exceed the number of wholly independent external evaluators…” The phrase continues: “…when such letters are submitted, an explanation of the personal relationship should be included.” (2) On pages 7-8, concerning expedited reviews, under Full Professor with Tenure, the committee is inserting language requiring a rationale in the Dean’s letter of recommendation. Under Associate Professor with Tenure, ATP proposes striking the requirement that the recommendation be reviewed simultaneously and adding the provision that the letter should state the major strengths of the candidate. (3) On page 12, under d., ATP proposes the inclusion of a new paragraph: “The unit committee report must include a section listing reasons for the vote, including any negative votes or abstentions.” In response to a question received by ATP as to what happens if Unit Committee members want to submit additional statements, the ATP Committee proposes to add the following language: “Within one business day of the vote…” Unit Committee members may individually or collectively submit additional statements “…to the Unit Committee Coordinator and Unit Chair…” (4) On page 14, under The Dean of the School or College, ATP proposes that if the candidate selects Response Option (1), the response is addressed to the Chancellor and sent to the Provost and the ATP committee so that everyone knows what is said. (5) On page 15, Response Option (1) provides a copy for the Provost, again, so that everyone will know what is said. (6) On page 21, ATP proposes adding “XIII. Reasons cited for any negative votes or abstentions.” (7) On page 22, ATP recommends striking the separate line for the Unit Chair.

Dr. Louis Gerteis moved to strike all references in the document to a separate role of the Unit Chair. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi. Dr. Joseph Martinich requested clarification in the case of a Unit Chair who is opposed to the recommendation. Dr. Gerteis suggested that he/she can write a separate report, like anyone else. Dr. Teresa Thiel asked if it is the Committee’s intention to make the chair the same as anyone else, with no special powers. Dr. Gerteis said the Chair would function as a regular faculty member. Dr. Zarucchi supported Dr. Gerteis’s motion, stating that the Chair should have no special powers. Graduate School Dean Judith Walker de Felix pointed out that the Collected Rules and Regulations specify that a department chair’s role is to evaluate faculty, but Dr. Gerteis noted that this authority is included in the Ad Personam Committee’s report. Dr. Thiel felt that faculty chairs do
have better knowledge, but Dr. Zarucchi countered this by suggesting that the Chair should share such relevant knowledge with his/her colleagues.

The Chair surrendered the gavel to Secretary Peck so that he could raise a question. What happens, he asked, in a unit like Business Administration, which has no Unit Chair? Dr. Martinich responded by suggesting that they would just elect a Unit Coordinator. Dr. Speck inquired if this suggestion was made to ATP and discussed there. Dr. Peck said ATP agreed in principle but did not look at all specific references to the Unit Chair in the document. Secretary Peck returned the gavel to Chair Speck.

At the close of this discussion, the amendment proposed by Dr. Gerteis passed unanimously.

Dr. Zarucchi moved to provide for joint appointees that have appointments in more than one unit. Provost Cope clarified that faculty may have joint appointments in more than one department. One of the departments is designated as the primary home for administrative purposes. The amendment proposed by Dr. Zarucchi then was approved unanimously.

Dr. Martinich proposed to add to the bottom of page 7 the following language: “Both the ATP Committee and the Provost shall send separate letters with copies to the Dean.” Furthermore, he proposed the same language be added for Associate Professors. This motion was seconded by Dr. Gerteis. Dean Mark Burkholder was recognized by the Chair. He noted the length of the document and the importance that a quorum be present when it is considered. He suggested that ATP reconsider the whole process of expedited reviews.

There was a brief further discussion; however, lacking a quorum, the meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Peck
Senate Secretary

(minutes written by Ms. Joan M. Arban, Executive Assistant to the Assembly/Senate Chair)