



University Senate

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

(Minutes to be considered for approval at the Senate meeting on January 19, 1999, 3:00 p.m.)

**SENATE MINUTES
UM-ST. LOUIS
December 8, 1998
3:00 p.m. 126 J. C. Penney**

Dr. Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi, Senate Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. Minutes from the previous meeting (held November 3, 1998) were approved as submitted.

Report from the Senate Chair -- Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi

Vice Chancellor Nelson has informed Dr. Zarucchi and Dr. Judd of his plan to appoint a task force on General Education. This is primarily in response to a request from the North Central Association. Dr. Nelson has assured Dr. Zarucchi and Dr. Judd that this is to be a part of an overall campus self-evaluation and that the task force will have no pre-assigned objective. Dr. Nelson has also stated that if the task force makes any recommendations, they will be submitted to the Senate for review.

Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Touhill

(See Attached)

Dr. Cohen addressed the Chancellor, stating that she prided herself on being a part of a public university that is very sensitive to the diversity of its constituents. Dr. Cohen said that she worries that campus decorations are very symbolic at the Christmas holiday, and thinks there are very tasteful and festive ways to celebrate many holidays all at once on the campus. Dr. Cohen worries that we are moving in one symbolic direction.

Dr. Touhill thanked Dr. Cohen and said that it was her understanding that different holiday symbols, including a menorah, would be put on display. Dr. Sherman said that she had put up a small menorah display in the lobby near the Bookstore. Dr. Touhill said that she would look into this matter.

Report from the Faculty Council Presiding Officer -- Dennis Judd

(See Attached)

Report from Intercampus Faculty Council -- Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi

Dr. Zarucchi reported that the IFC met in Columbia on November 20th. The principal action item was the approval of Revised Grievance Procedures for Faculty, which has been a subject of discussion in the IFC and on each campus. The Revised Procedures were approved unanimously by the IFC members and have been forwarded to the University General Counsel's office for their review. The Revised Grievance Procedures will then be submitted to the Board of Curators who must vote their approval.

Dr. Cottone asked if there was any comment or question about Promotion and Tenure Procedures at the IFC meeting. Dr. Zarucchi said no, that it had not been a discussion item. Dr. Zarucchi said that the Chairperson of the MU Faculty Council, which is the equivalent to our Senate, did notify the IFC that the UM-Columbia Faculty Council has just revised their Tenure Procedures. Dr. Zarucchi has requested a copy of that document and will forward it to Dr. Cottone for distribution to the ATP Committee. Dr. Zarucchi said that the Columbia Faculty Council has worked on their Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the past year and it may be some time before the final copy is complete.

Dr. Connett asked if there was any discussion at the IFC meeting about the impact of the lack of knowledge regarding the Tenure Procedures and the changes made by Dr. Nelson and the ATP Committee. Dr. Connett asked who is supposed to address this issue. Dr. Zarucchi answered that the Senate Executive Committee has recommended that the ATP Committee would be the most appropriate. Dr. Connett realizes that we are going to implement the Board's policy, but his question is, how could policy change and we not be informed. Dr. Connett said that there is a gap between the great labor we have on these procedures and the actuality. Dr. Zarucchi said that this point has been raised in Executive Committee discussion and it was pointed out that there is a difference between the historical reconstruction of how information got lost in the past versus what do we do now.

Dr. Korr said that what one President can do another President can undo. He said that the real question for the IFC would be to approach the current President and try to get the executive order rescinded, or at least to modify it in a way that is more acceptable to what the faculty generally thinks is a more professional way of doing business. Dr. Cottone said that Mel George revised the executive order as one of his last acts in his interim presidency, so two presidents were involved with this document. Dr. Cottone reported that Dr. Lehmkuhle said the document is as binding as curator policy. Dr. Cottone said that if the document were changed it would go to the IFC. Dr. Korr said that he didn't think there should be an "if" there. Dr. Zarucchi said that she, Dr. Madeo and Dr. Roth, the IFC representatives, have discussed whether or not this is the appropriate time to bring anything forward to the IFC, and they decided that it would not be productive to bring the issue forward without a proposal to substitute. Dr. Zarucchi said that when this campus comes forth with approval of a substitute policy or specific language to amend the existing policy, then the IFC representatives would be happy to bring it forward. Dr. Zarucchi said that as an IFC representative, she invited discussion on this, and given that the ATP Committee has indicated its willingness to accept this responsibility, that will be the direction to go. And if that revised document entails an amendment of the President's Executive Order, then it will go to the IFC.

Dr. Zarucchi asked if there were any objections to an amended Agenda to include Curriculum and Instruction. No objections were made. Dr. Zarucchi said that the Curriculum and Instruction Committee report would be added after the Bylaws and Rules Committee report.

Report from ATP -- Rocco Cottone

(See Attached)

Dr. Peck asked if there is any discussion anywhere about how communications may have improved since 1992 so that if a new executive order is signed today we know about it in somewhat less than six years' time. Dr. Cottone said that there was a failure here, he wasn't sure if it was the system, but the Nursing tenure document had reference to the policy and that was how they found it. The question is, how did it get there, and Dr. Cottone said that is a question he would like to raise with Dean Durham and Dr. McSweeney. Dr. Cottone said the fact is, somehow they got information on

that executive order, assuming that the executive order was communicated to the campus through the Academic Affairs office. We might ask Dr. Nelson to do a search to see where there is a breakdown so it does not happen again, now the question is how do we deal with it. Dr. Peck asked how do we know the communication process is improved so it doesn't happen again. Dr. Martinich said that either the Chancellor or the IFC Representatives or both need to prevent this problem, and he asked that there be a clear procedure established that an executive order or board action that has any input on Academic Affairs be given to the Chancellor of each campus, to distribute it to all faculty. Dr. Connett asked Dr. Cottone whom he saw as actually making policy on tenure, is it the Board, the President, or the Chancellor. Dr. Cottone answered that this is curator policy, and that an executive order could be implemented as equivalent to curator policy. Dr. Touhill confirmed this fact. Dr. Connett asked if there was faculty input. Dr. Cottone said again that he could not answer regarding the history of the document. Dr. Connett asked who could. Dr. Cottone said probably Dr. Lehmkuhle, and we will ask him.

Dr. Cottone said that his concerns were present and future, and the ATP Committee will need to make wise decisions this year that will stand. Dr. Cottone asked for feedback regarding changes that faculty would want, at any level, for procedures or policy. Dr. Judd asked if there was any thought to a hearing. Dr. Cottone said that the Committee would have a busy year not only going forward with deliberations on candidates but also allowing time for rebuttals. Dr. Cottone said that the ATP Committee has also promised the Deans that if there is a disagreement with a decision that the Committee will invite them to be present on the case. Dr. Cottone said that if they have time for a hearing he would be comfortable doing so, and that he would take it to the Committee to make this decision based on time, but in the meantime he would appreciate written comments to present to the ATP Committee.

In response to Dr. Connett's question, Dr. Zarucchi commented that in the event of a conflict between System policy and Campus policy that System policy overrides, that is very clear. Also, according to our Rules and Regulations there is a definition of educational policy whereby faculty are given the authority to develop and implement educational policy together with appropriate administrative officers. Dr. Zarucchi said that there are policies that are system wide, and there are other more specific campus procedures for implementing said policies, and that the campus procedures are expected to be more detailed.

Dr. Connett said that no issue is closer to the heart of what the American university is than tenure. Dr. Connett said that he did not hear any indication that there was faculty input in a major change in a faculty rule, and he felt that if tenure changes at the whim of an exiting president without any faculty input, we are in a very dangerous situation, and we need to do something about that.

Report from Assessment of Educational Outcomes -- Helene Sherman

Dr. Sherman announced that the Senate Committee on Assessment of Educational Outcomes has been asked by the Counseling Service to distribute an approved Survey on Student Expectation and Satisfaction. This survey is one component of the campus assessment program mandated by CBHE. Dr. Biegen from Counseling Services explained the survey and answered questions.

(See Attached)

Dr. Biegen said that, as an incentive, students who participate would be put into some type of lottery. Dr. Biegen said that UM-St. Louis has the opportunity to include ten customized questions, questions that are not included in the national survey. Dr. Biegen said that she could be reached at 516-5711 for questions, or suggestions for the ten customized questions.

Dr. Munson asked if students would be required to include their Social Security number, which is a unique identifier. Dr. Beigen said that students would be given that option, but it would not be required. She said the students would be told the Social Security number will be used to do follow-up research on students that fit a particular profile to see whether they were actually students that were retained at the institution or students that dropped out.

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

Report from Bylaws and Rules -- William Long

The drafted Bylaw change (December Senate Agenda attachment) originated from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Non-Regulars in the Senate, chaired by Dr. Larson. The committee disbanded during this past summer after working through Spring 1998. The ad hoc committee recommendations were sent to the Bylaws and Rules Committee to gather facts and to perfect the language. Dr. Long said the Bylaws and Rules Committee is still working on the language of the Bylaw Amendment change through e-mail conference.

Dr. Long said that approximately 20% of the teaching staff are academic non-regular, many having extremely important positions including one that will be a dean within the next month. The academic non-regular faculty are the single element of the university that has no representation in the Senate at present.

Dr. Burkholder asked the Chair of the ad hoc committee, Dr. Larson, to discuss briefly the nature of the recommendation and the rationale. Dr. Larson said that the Senate voted in Spring 1998 to constitute an ad hoc committee to reexamine the position on non-regulars in the Senate. Traditionally non-regulars have not held any position in the Senate, and the ad hoc committee assumed that its mission was to find a way for non-regular faculty to have full voting rights and membership on committees.

In Spring 1997 the College of Arts and Sciences voted to include non-regular teaching faculty within the College on all elected College committees and to give them voting rights. In a sense it seemed appropriate to bring this forward to the Senate, since the College has the largest number of non-regulars of any unit on campus. The ad hoc committee began meeting late spring, and decided to redefine the term faculty, because at that time the committee thought this was possible (but has since been told by Dr. Long it is not). The committee decided to modify the definition to include all those in units who teach classes and hold full-time positions. The academic title that such individuals hold varied from unit to unit. The individual titles listed in the draft include colleagues who have worked along side ranked faculty, sometimes for up to 20 years or more, teaching the same classes, contributing to the intellectual climate of the campus, and serving those departments.

Dr. Judd said that this is the rationale but asked if there is a problem. Dr. Zarucchi answered that the problem is the lack of representation of non-regular faculty on the Senate. Dr. Judd asked how this issue came up, was this expressed by a non-regular faculty member. In Spring 1998, Dr. McSweeney made a motion to find a way to include the non-regulars in the Senate. Dr. Judd asked if non-regular faculty supported this change. Dr. McSweeney answered that in the College of Nursing, non-regulars were relying on regular faculty to express their concerns to the Senate. Dr. McSweeney said that non-regular faculty make up a substantial majority of the unit and have no right

to participation on Senate committees. Dr. Ratcliff said that there is also an equity issue where we have students, staff and administrators serving on the Senate and Senate committees and a significant body of faculty who have no voting rights.

Dr. Martinich said that his concern is that this may cause a dilution of representation of regular faculty and this is a serious issue. Dr. Martinich said that if 10 or 15 non-regular faculty were elected in place of regular faculty that the regular faculty could become the minority. Dr. Martinich said that he would like to see 10 or 15 seats allocated to non-regular faculty and have them elected by non-regular faculty. He said that one of the problems we have now is, there is no guarantee that the non-regular faculty will become elected, therefore they would still not be represented, or at the other extreme, 25 could be elected. Dr. Martinich said that instead of letting the Senate get bigger and bigger he would like the seats to be taken from the students. He asked how many student Senators were present. Three out of twenty-five student Senators were counted. Dr. Martinich said that he has done surveys on this matter and rarely do we have more than 4 or 5 attending after the first of the year. Given the problem with quorum in the past and the problem with election of students in the past, some years we have not even had 25 student candidates. Dr. Martinich thought we should recognize that we have 5 or 10 students who are committed, and essentially we have 22 seats empty. He said that non-regulars should hold 10 or 15 of those seats.

Dr. Larson said that she was extremely reluctant to see this very important resolution fail because of involving it with reducing the number of student Senators, which may be a very controversial issue. The ad hoc committee considered the possibility of providing the non-regulars with their own constituency, which would increase the number of seats on the Senate, but the committee decided that it was not in the spirit of the body of the Senate to separate the non-regular teaching faculty from the regular teaching faculty, and the issue will sort itself during the election.

Dr. Balbes said that there is a person in his department who teaches five courses a year with the title Specialist and he would like this category to be included. Dr. Wartzok asked to include Research Professors. Dr. Sage asked to include Museum Professors. Dr. Zarucchi said the Bylaws and Rules Committee should be contacted to include other titles. Dr. Zarucchi pointed out that this is a first reading and the language is not state of the art. Dr. Kohfeld suggested that the document refer to comparable titles or similar types of titles instead of listing them all. Dr. Long, as an Optometrist not as the Chair of the Bylaws Committee, addressed Dr. Judd's question. In the smaller units, it is a real problem because the school is required to have representatives on many committees, and there are so few regular faculty. Dr. Wilking said that many students cannot attend Senate meetings because they work in the afternoon. He knows one student who was very active on the Student Affairs Committee. Dr. Ratcliff commented that the number of non-regular faculty elected to the Senate would probably be no more than two or three, but that their contribution to committees would be more significant in the long run.

Report from Curriculum and Instruction -- Dave Ganz

Dr. Ganz explained that since the last Curriculum and Instruction Committee meeting it was learned that the Academic Calendar would be on the Board of Curators January Agenda. The Academic Calendar for 2000-2001 (December Senate Agenda attachment) is a draft for the December Senate meeting and will be an action item for the January Senate meeting. The Board of Curators January meeting will follow the January Senate meeting by just a few days, so the Academic Calendar will go forward to the Board of Curators for inclusion but can be pulled from their Agenda if the Senate does not approve it.

Dr. Ganz said that in 1996 the IFC approved guidelines for the calendars for the 4 campuses of the University of Missouri. This calendar is prepared in compliance with those guidelines. The IFC guidelines will override any campus concerns in terms of specific dates. Dr. Zarucchi said that at the IFC meeting it was reported that the 4 campuses have agreed to a coordinated calendar but not an identical calendar.

Dr. Ganz said that each academic unit has received copies of a working paper from the Curriculum and Instruction Committee dealing with the Y and excused grade issue. He has received numerous replies from the School of Education and School of Nursing but nothing from Arts and Sciences. Dr. Ratcliff and Dr. Larson disagreed with Dr. Ganz's comment about not receiving replies from Arts and Sciences. Dr. Ganz corrected his statement by adding he had not heard from the "College" but he had received comments from "people" in the college. Dr. Ganz said that the Committee hoped to bring this issue to the Senate in early 1999, and requested that all responses be in by the end of this semester.

Dr. Ratcliff said that for the first two months of the academic year the calendar on the web showed the wrong dates for Spring Break. Dr. Ratcliff wanted to know who should be contacted for corrections. Dr. Zarucchi said that the coordinator of the master calendar on campus is Ms. Arban. Dr. Ganz said that he is not sure who actually uploaded the calendar. Dr. Ganz said that the one thing that our campus had to change on the calendar, in the last couple of years, is the date of the May commencement, and this was because of the availability of the Kiel Center. Dr. Ganz said that we have gone from a Sunday afternoon to Saturday evening for the May commencement. Dr. Ganz said to his knowledge there had been no other changes to the calendar. Dr. Ratcliff said that she had read a student letter in the Current complaining that Spring Break was scheduled so early and she believed that the student had gotten this information from the Web. A Senator said that she had received an apology and e-mail correction regarding the Spring Break error on the Web. Dr. Ratcliff said that the error was there for months before anyone changed it. Dr. Ganz stated that the IFC guidelines called for the Spring Break to be in the last full week of March.

Report from University Libraries -- Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi for Harold H. Harris

(See Attached)

Dr. Ratcliff commented that, even before the Depository was damaged, when items were requested they were coming from inter-library loan, not within 24 hours, and not from the Depository. Dr. Ratcliff said that she is very concerned about the whereabouts of the Depository items. Ms. Snell, Acting Director of Libraries, said that when a request is made, the library uses an algorithm method to determine the best source for borrowing. Dr. Ratcliff asked, if the Depository is not chosen, should a 24-hour turnaround be expected. Dr. Snell answered yes, and recent studies show problems in transportation to and from the campuses and from the mailroom to the library.

New Business

Dr. Tierney asked who is the author of the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Zarucchi answered the Office of Academic Affairs, and its first printing was prepared while Dr. Roosevelt Wright was Vice Chancellor. Dr. Tierney asked if the Faculty Handbook was in the process of revision. Dr. Nelson answered that the deadline for revising the Faculty Handbook is Fall 1999, but at this time it is not a top priority. Dr. Nelson said that the Faculty Handbook is posted on the Web, but that the same mistakes that are in the paper copy are on the Web. Dr. Tierney said that one item incorrect in the Faculty Handbook has to do with Student Dishonesty and the Senate is now on record as following

System Policy. Dr. Tierney said also finding another item, the Tenure Policy, incorrect in the Faculty Handbook makes one wonder what is next. Dr. Tierney asked that when the Faculty Handbook is revised, it be dated.

Executive Session

Presentations from the Honorary Awards Committee were distributed. Dr. Nelson explained that the presentations gave specifications of individuals being brought forward as potential recipients of Honorary Degrees. Dr. Nelson said that the individuals were nominated from a sub-committee of the Senate and do not require a Second, but are on the floor for action. Dr. Nelson read the names of the first two potential recipients. Dr. Long called for a quorum.

After the quorum was called, a count was taken, and there being an insufficient number of Senators present, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Joyce Corey
Senate Secretary

Attachments:

- 1) Report from the Chancellor
- 2) Report from the Faculty Council Presiding Officer
- 3) Report from the Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) Committee
- 4) Report from Dr. Sharon Biegen, Student Satisfaction Inventory
(Assessment of Education Outcomes Committee)
- 5) Report from the Budget and Planning Committee
- 6) Report from University Libraries Committee

December 8, 1998

**Chancellor's Report
for the University Senate**

I recently have met with several of the schools and colleges to discuss planning for the Performing Arts building, Systemwide strategic planning and several other related items. I will meet with the remaining schools and college during the winter semester.

The School of Education is in discussions with Harris-Stowe State College, whose aim is to make master's degrees in Education more accessible to Harris-Stowe graduates by offering some UM-St. Louis graduate courses on the Harris-Stowe campus. The first courses may be offered on that campus in the fall of 1999.

This week the Governor's Conference on Education is being held in Jefferson City in conjunction with meetings of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

Among the agenda items is the awarding of the Governor's Award for Excellence in Teaching. I am delighted to report that Dr. Bob Henson, who has taught physics here for 32 years, is among the awardees.

The CBHE has established a statewide committee to make recommendations concerning general education requirements. Dean Robert Bliss of the Honors College is representing UM-St. Louis on this committee. Our position is that it is essential that each four-year institution be allowed and encouraged to develop its own general education requirements, in recognition of the distinctive character of each four-year institution.

Vice Chancellor Nelson also is establishing a Task Force to review and recommend changes in our General Education requirements. The recommendations of this task force will go to appropriate Senate committees for review and action.

Candidates for the Dean of Arts and Sciences and for the Director of the Public Policy Research Centers have been visiting the campus over the last few weeks. We hope to complete both of these searches in the near future.

Last week search committees were finalized for three endowed professorships:

- The Mercantile Library Professorship in Transportation Studies
- The Jack Barringer III Professorship in Transportation Studies
- The Des Lee Professorship in African/African-American Studies

As Vice Chancellor Nelson announced at the last Senate meeting, we have initiated a process we hope will result in the appointment of several new Curators' and Distinguished Teaching Professors. Several nominations have been received to date. The closing date for nominations for this year is December 15 and I hope we will receive several more nominations.

Chancellor's Report
for the University Senate

Page 2

A November 15 open house for prospective students and their parents attracted more than 550 people. It was a very successful event and I want to thank those of you who participated on behalf of your departments.

Also, I want to report that the offices of admissions and financial aid have begun awarding scholarships for first-time freshmen for fall 1999. We have started awarding these scholarships earlier than in past years to help attract more top quality students to UM-St. Louis. Last year we established a record by enrolling 126 Curators scholars.

The Enrollment Management Task Force and the several sub-committees associated with the Task Force are working toward distribution of a draft Enrollment Plan sometime during the Winter 1999 semester.

The Task Force, co-chaired by vice chancellors Grace and Nelson, anticipates receiving reports from the sub-committees in late January. It also anticipates receiving a marketing plan from our consultants in January as well.

Last month more than 250 donors, students and faculty attended our annual Scholarship reception in the J.C. Penney Auditorium. I want to thank those faculty members who attended the event because this is a special time for our donors to meet with the students they are helping earn an education.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER, FACULTY COUNCIL

December 8, 1998

On November 13, 1998, Chancellor Blanche Touhill spoke before the Faculty Council about the proposed Performing Arts Center. About 65 people attended, and the discussion was very lively. I came away from the meeting pleased with the discussion. The Chancellor fielded a lot of questions, and faculty members had the opportunity to speak on every side of the issue, often forcefully. Despite the fact that this has been a controversial and even potentially divisive issue on our campus, the tone of the meeting was collegial and cordial. I want to thank the Chancellor and the faculty members who attended for their participation.

At its meeting of December 3, the Faculty Council continued the Performing Arts discussion. Once again the discussion was lively and collegial. At the end of the discussion the Faculty Council passed a resolution instructing me to ask the Chancellor for a written commitment to "backstop" the Performing Arts Center so that no funds from current operating budgets would be diverted to cover any operating losses that might be incurred. I plan to write the Chancellor a letter this week.

The members of the Council also expressed an interest in soliciting information about how departments would use the Performing Arts Center. The Council will hold a discussion about how to gather this information at its next meeting, in February.

At its December 3 meeting, the Council also discussed campus budget processes and priorities. Members of the Council asked me to convene a "virtual meeting" over the Council's listserve, so that people can share information. Pending the outcome of that electronic meeting and the follow-up discussion in February, an ad hoc Task Force on budget processes and priorities may be appointed.

Since the Council's meeting last week, three faculty members have mentioned problems they're having with campus mail. I also have experienced problems: in the political science department and also for the Urban Affairs Review, a large proportion of all mail received is addressed to other units. Obviously this means not only that some mistakes are being made, but that the mail is being mis-sorted a substantial proportion of the time; as a result, some mail delivery is surely delayed, perhaps significantly. Today I sent a message over the Council's listserve asking members of the Council to report on any problems they're having. I also called Vice Chancellor Nelson to alert him to the issue. I invite feedback about these problems, and I'm sure Vice Chancellor Nelson does as well.

UM-St. Louis Senate Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP) Committee.
Report to the Senate, December 8th, 1998.
Submitted by R. Rocco Cottone, Committee Chair.

This report is a summary of activity of the Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion (ATP) Committee of the UM-St. Louis Senate.

Several concerns were raised on the Senate floor at the last Senate meeting subsequent to Dr. Nelson's revisions of the tenure and promotion procedures. Dr. Nelson's actions should be judged in the context of the activities of the ATP Committee this year.

At the outset of the academic year, the ATP Committee decided to reassert its charge – to reiterate its mandate – following concerns over the number of administrative reversals of decisions in the 1997-1998 academic year. The Committee sought information on several matters, including the role of the Academic Vice Chancellor, the role of the Graduate Dean, the nature of guiding documents, the relative weight of guiding documents, and clarification on procedures. At the outset, the Committee sought counsel from Mark Burkholder, the prior year's ATP Committee chair, Vice Chancellor Nelson, Chancellor Touhill, Graduate Dean Wartzok, and former Graduate Dean Jordan. In addition, all unit documents were requested, and university documents were reviewed. All unit deans, Dr. Wartzok, and Dr. Nelson were invited to attend a meeting with the intent of opening discussion on unit guiding documents and addressing procedural differences across units. The meeting was held on October 20th. In the process, it was discovered that the Faculty Handbook, which has been considered by many as a guiding document, is out-of-date and fails to reference the most recent System-wide policy. An "Executive Order" dated 1992, was discovered by its reference in the College of Nursing's unit document. With the help of Dr. Nelson, that document was obtained, examined, and evaluated against current UM-St. Louis policy and procedures. System-wide and campus differences were discovered, which led to Dr. Nelson's action to revise current campus procedures. Dr. Nelson brought his proposed procedural revisions to the ATP Committee the day of the last Senate meeting, and he incorporated several changes recommended by the committee. There was a sense of urgency to get revised guidelines distributed to the decisional units, so that this year's work could proceed on schedule. At that meeting, it was agreed that the procedures would stand for this academic year, and at the end of the year the ATP Committee would review all procedures and standards and make recommendations to the administration and to the Senate.

Already there have been concerns raised about Dr. Nelson's document. A department chair of associate professor rank complained that the procedures for promotion of individuals to the full professor rank did not direct an associate professor department chair to write a letter of support or non-support. System-wide procedures appear unclear on this matter. Obviously, there will be questions related to the Nelson document. But the intent is to standardize procedures as much as possible this year in order to ensure that wise and enduring decisions will be made. We are attempting to avoid reversals on procedural issues. Dr. Nelson's recommendations should be followed as closely as possible. However, any problems that arise should be communicated, preferably in writing, to the ATP Committee members.

Although there may be differences across unit documents regarding standards for promotion and tenure, there should not be differences across units in terms of procedures. The ATP Committee, by its actions, is attempting to ensure that there is uniformity of procedures. The ATP Committee has asked that the procedures be clearly communicated to the units making the decisions and to the candidates.

There are consequences for candidates for promotion and tenure deriving from an implementation of System-wide policy. On the positive side for the candidate, procedures are such that there is clear opportunity for candidates formally to refute or to rebut negative decisions anywhere in the decision process. A "no tenure" or "no promotion" decision will not stop the process at the level of the "no" vote. Papers will be forwarded. However, the System-wide policies describe unit documents as "minimum criteria" – the System-wide document raises the standard by focusing on excellence in teaching and scholarship.

Dec. 8, 1998, ATP Committee Report, p. 2.

The ATP Committee also has been concerned about the consequences of a "no tenure" vote on unit staffing. There were some comments in last year's documents related to the need to tenure a candidate for fear of a loss of a slot due to a "no tenure" decision. The Committee felt that a strong and clear statement needed to be made by the administration that a no tenure decision will result in timely replacement of positions. Dr. Nelson was formally requested to make such a statement, and Dr. Touhill expressed agreement with the need for a formal policy statement on this matter. Dr. Nelson has forwarded a draft statement to the ATP Committee, and it is presently under review by the Committee.

This is a pivotal year related to promotion and tenure procedures and policy. The ATP Committee is acting to ensure that procedures will be uniform, that standards will be implemented in a fair way, and that candidates will be given due process. Guiding documents will be examined and revised over the course of this year, and it is important that faculty members communicate their opinions to their representatives on the ATP Committee. The ATP Committee members are: Rocco Cottone, Chair; Susan Feigenbaum; John Hylton; Bobbie Lee; Silvia Madeo; Maryellen McSweeney; Carol Peck; Teresa Thiel; and Bruce Wilking.

Thank you.

STUDENT SATISFACTION INVENTORY

Presentation to Senate, 12/8/98

Sharon Biegen, Ph.D.
Division of Student Affairs

- DSA will be conducting a student satisfaction survey. This project has evolved out of DSA strategic planning efforts.
- Purposes:
 - Increase our understanding of our current student population
 - Contribute to institutional research
 - Aid in planning recruitment and retention efforts
 - Provide a baseline for future interventions
- Instrument:
 - Developed by Noel-Levitz, national consultants on enrollment management
 - Strengths:
 - a) assesses both satisfaction and importance of factors, and the gap between these (example of "parking")
 - b) allows for sub-group comparisons (e.g., by colleges/schools, departments)
 - c) allows for comparisons with comparable institutions nationally
- Administration:
 - We will need faculty assistance with administering the instrument.
 - We plan to sample classes proportional to our colleges and schools, as well as students' class level.
 - The instrument can be either administered in class or handed out in class and returned next class session. In-class administration takes about 25 minutes. Some faculty have said that they would be willing to administer it in class during the first class session of Winter semester.
- Good statistical reliability (.85 for importance and .84 for satisfaction) and validity (internal validity=.97 to .98; convergent validity=.71, $p < .0001$ with College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire.)

REPORT OF THE SENATE BUDGET AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

December 8, 1998

The Senate Budget and Planning Committee met on November 11th and 19th to discuss the following:

At the November 11th meeting, Vice Chancellor Jim Krueger gave a presentation to the Committee budgeted student hours.

At the November 19th meeting, the Committee discussed the following issues:

- 1) A review of the campus five-year plan, Enhancing the Mission.
- 2) The proposed "Institutional Development" campaign. This proposed campaign will be funded from a refund of cost cuts from FY98. The Committee recommended that the portion of the cuts from Scholarships be returned and that the remainder of these funds be spent on a "well-coordinated" institutional development campaign. Funds for this campaign have not been allocated, however, I plan to continue to consult with the Budget and Planning Committee as well as other faculty groups and the appropriate vice chancellors as we move forward in the development and implementation of this plan
- 3) Review of the systemwide Strategic Plan. The four Critical Success Factors of the plan will be: student success, program quality, research and scholarship and state needs. When available, President Pacheco plans to have a draft version of the document available on the Web in order to solicit faculty input. He intends to bring the plan to the Board of Curators in the spring 1999.

The next meeting of the Budget and Planning Committee will be Friday, December 11 at 4:00 p.m. in room 126 J.C. Penney.

University Senate Committee on Libraries
December 8, 1998
Harold H. Harris

Today's report is simply an item of information. Given the timing of Senate meetings, many of you will have heard already that the University of Missouri's Central Library Depository was damaged by high winds last month. This the facility that stores materials that do not need to be available for instantaneous access, but are too valuable to be discarded. Fortunately, none of the collections in the building was damaged, and repairs are now well under way. The roof of the building has been repaired, and a damaged wall has been replaced with a temporary one. A new replacement wall is being constructed. During this period of construction, the Depository is unable to fill requests for materials. However, since many of the items stored there were duplicated materials that are also in the four campus collections, and virtually all of the items are available through interlibrary loans, few patrons are being seriously inconvenienced. It is projected that the Depository will be back to full operation, providing one-day service to faculty and students by April or May, 1999.

Hal Harris