



University Senate

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

UNIVERSITY SENATE UM-St. Louis

Agenda

The Senate will meet at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 14, 1999, in 222 J.C. Penney.

- I. Approval of Minutes from April 27, 1999, meeting
- II. Report from the Senate Chair -- Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi
Draft CBHE Committee Revision of General Education Requirements
Board of Curators Meeting
- III. Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill
Class Visitation Policy (Attachment-1)
- IV. Report from the Faculty Council Presiding Officer -- Dennis Judd
- V. Report from Intercampus Faculty Council -- Joseph Martinich
- VI. Report from Student Government Association -- Darwin Butler
- VII. Report from Ad Hoc Committee:
 - A. Campus Governance Committee -- Mark Burkholder
Conference Committee on Governance Draft (Attachment-2)
- VIII. Reports from Standing Committees:
 - A. Curriculum & Instruction -- David Ganz
"W" Grade Proposal (Action Item-Attachment-3)
 - B. Physical Facilities and General Services -- William Connett
Faculty Parking (Attachment-4)
 - C. Budget and Planning -- Chancellor Touhill
 - D. Committee on Committees -- Fred Willman
Ballot for Committee Replacement (Action Item)
 - E. Executive Committee -- Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi
Senate Committee Chairmanship
- IX. Other Business



June 25, 1999

To: Dennis Judd
Jeanne Zarucchi
From: Jack Nelson *J. Nelson*
Subject: Class Visitation Policy

I have been working with the deans on a policy concerning class visitation. A draft of such a policy is attached. The deans and I would appreciate comments and suggestions both from the University Senate and from the Faculty Council.

The deans and I would like to encourage faculty members to routinely visit each other's classes, on a voluntary and mutually agreeable basis. We think new faculty will benefit from witnessing how experienced faculty handle their classes, and that even experienced faculty can improve their teaching by witnessing how others teach as well as by having other faculty observe them.

We would also like to encourage classroom visitation as part of annual reviews, and especially as part of three year reviews and reviews for tenure and promotion. We require high quality teaching for tenure and promotion and one part of the evaluation of teaching should, we think, involve class visitation (and visitation on more than one occasion). The attached draft policy does not mandate any of this, but it does make it clear that class visitation for the above purposes is permitted and appropriate.

The attached draft also makes explicit what is already implicit, that those responsible for assuring high quality instruction have a right to visit classes when substantive concerns have been raised about the quality of instruction being provided in those classes.

We expect to have a class visitation policy in place before the end of the fall 1999 semester and would, again, welcome comments and suggestions from both of your groups.

Thank you.

c: Members, Council of Deans

Academic Affairs
June 25, 1999

DRAFT 3

Class Visitation Policy

Although the relationship between an instructor and her or his class is a very special one, most instructors are proud of their performance in the classroom and welcome visits by colleagues, as opportunities to share successful strategies with others and to receive helpful feedback from colleagues, and as part of what should be an ongoing peer review of teaching. Such visits, arranged in advance and agreed to by both parties, are appropriate when an instructor wishes to improve her or his teaching by observing the teaching of a colleague and when an instructor wishes a colleague to observe her or his teaching and give advice as to how it might be improved.

Class visitation is also appropriate as part of the normal annual review process, as part of review for tenure and/or promotion, and whenever substantive concerns have been raised about the nature of the learning experience. Deans, department chairs, and others with responsibility for assuring a high level of instruction or for evaluating the performance of faculty members have a right to visit faculty members' classes.

In most cases, those wishing to observe an instructor should inform that instructor that they wish to do so and agree on a date for the visit, or a range of dates within which one or more visits will occur. When substantive concerns have been raised about an instructor's performance a chair, dean, or designee thereof may visit a class without any advance notification.

9-7-99

1

DRAFT

Conference Committee on Governance

A NEW SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE FOR UM-ST. LOUIS

INTRODUCTION:

In April 1999, the Senate and Faculty Council created a Conference Committee to examine campus governance and, following consultation with other faculty, recommend changes that would improve governance through strengthened faculty participation.

Members of the Conference Committee are: Nasser Arshadi, Mark Burkholder (chair), Joyce Corey, Tim McBride, Lois Pierce, Gail Ratcliff, Steve Spaner, and Lana Stein.

The Committee has sought to develop a proposal that will provide effective, well-functioning campus governance by adhering to the principle of faculty centrality in the governance structure. Thus the Committee intentionally has proposed a smaller governance structure that involves two bodies, each providing reasonable and equitable faculty representation. The academic body will be known as the Faculty Senate. An extension of the Faculty Senate will be created to deal with the broader issues of the campus and will include important campus constituencies. This body will be known as the University Council. This proposed governance structure enables a single group of faculty representatives to consider and debate issues directly related to faculty as outlined in the *Collected Rules & Regulations*.

"The faculty of the University of Missouri-St. Louis, together with appropriate administrative officers, shall bear responsibility for recommending and implementing educational policy, particularly in areas of curriculum, degree requirements, methods of instruction, research, requirements for admission, student affairs, and faculty status. The Faculty may make recommendations to the Chancellor concerning general policy matters affecting the University. Where appropriate, the Faculty may delegate its responsibility to separate schools, colleges, or such other parallel units as may be created from time to time, to the Faculty Council [Senate in the proposal], and to the Senate [University Council in the proposal] within the University of Missouri-St. Louis."¹

The heart of the proposal is the creation of a Faculty Senate comprised of (a) a representative from each academic department or parallel unit (area, division, unit), (b) a smaller group of representatives (1/3 the size of the first group) elected for their College or School as a whole by the faculties of the College of Arts and Sciences and Schools of Business, Education, Nursing, and Optometry, and (c) three specified administrative officers. Given current numbers of

¹*Collected Rules & Regulations*, 300.040.A.2

faculty and administrative divisions, for 1999-2000, the Faculty Senate would have 40 faculty with voice and vote and three administrators with voice only. The Faculty Senate will deal with faculty issues and the governance responsibilities set forth in the *Collected Rules and Regulations*. It is envisioned that this body would meet monthly throughout the academic year.

The members of Faculty Senate would form the core of a larger University Council which would also include students, staff, and additional administrators. For 1999-2000, the University Council would have 60 members. The Council will deal with issues affecting the campus that go beyond the purview of the faculty. It is envisioned that this body would meet twice each semester.

The Conference Committee employed the following principles in developing the proposal.

1. Strengthen faculty governance.
2. Reduce fractionalization of the faculty as currently occurs with two representative bodies, so that faculty voices are heard through one organization with power to make important decisions.
3. Reduce the size of the governance body to make it more effective and to lessen the governance workload placed on faculty.
4. Reduce the number of committees and make them report to the appropriate governance body.
5. Reform the way representation is handled in the Senate, so that Senators are elected by their constituencies (units), and places are proportionally allocated.
6. Maintain the presence of administrators in both bodies to ensure communication between faculty and administration.
7. Maintain the current proportion of student representation in the larger body.

OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSED GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE BASED ON EXISTING ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND FACULTY SIZE²

1. Faculty Senate [43].
 - i. Voting representatives [total 40] of the full-time regular and non-regular faculty
 - (1) one elected by each department or parallel unit³ of the College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business and School of Education; one elected by the School of Nursing; one elected by the School of

²Numbers in brackets indicate composition of the governance bodies based on 1999-2000 administrative divisions and full-time regular and non-regular faculty size.

³Area, division, or unit depending on the School.

- Optometry [total 30]
 - (2) one-third of the number of representatives in 1.i.(1) chosen as at large members by the College and Schools on the basis of their number of actual full-time regular and non-regular faculty as determined at the beginning of each fall semester with each specified school having a minimum of one at-large representative. [total 10]
 - (a) College of Arts and Sciences [6 at the present time]
 - (b) Schools of Business, Education, Nursing, and Optometry [1 each at the present time]
 - ii. *Ex officio* members with voice but not vote [3]
 - (1) Chancellor
 - (2) Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
 - (3) Graduate Dean
- 2. The University Council [72]
 - i. Voting members [total 60]
 - (1) The [43] members of the Faculty Senate
 - (2) The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (*ex officio*)
 - (3) The Dean of Continuing Education (*ex officio*)
 - (4) students, including the Student Government Association President (*ex officio*), equal to one-third of the Faculty members of the Council. [13]
 - (5) Two staff members, including the President of the Staff Association (*ex officio*)
 - ii. Members with voice but not vote [12]
 - (1) Vice Chancellors not already included [3]
 - (2) Deans of all Colleges and Schools (whether or not their faculties are represented) [8]
 - (3) Director of the Libraries [1]
- 3. Elections of faculty members to both the Faculty Senate and the University Council shall be conducted by mail ballot overseen by the Faculty Senate
 - i. The department and parallel unit representatives will be elected first
 - ii. Following the election of department and unit representatives, an election will be held in each College and School for its at-large representatives
 - (1) College faculty will vote for College representatives [6]
 - (2) School faculty will vote for representatives of their specific school [1 each; total of 4]
 - iii. Each newly established academic department/unit with at least five tenured or tenure-track faculty will receive representation elected by the unit as spelled out above in 1.i.(1),(2).

4. The Chair of the Faculty Senate will also serve as Chair of the University Council.
5. The following committees will be established and report to the Faculty Senate
 - a. Academic Advisory [to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs]
 - b. Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion
 - c. Assessment of Educational Outcomes
 - d. Bylaws and Rules
 - e. Curriculum and Instruction
 - f. Faculty Teaching and Service Awards
 - g. Research Committee (Fall and Winter Panels)
 - h. University Libraries
6. The following committees will be established and report to the University Council
 - a. Administrator Evaluation
 - b. Budget and Planning
 - c. Committee on Committees
 - d. Computing and Video Technology [combination of two existing Senate committees]
 - e. Executive Committee [combination of Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Council Steering Committee]
 - f. Physical Facilities and General Services
 - g. Recruitment, Admissions, Retention, and Student Financial Aid
 - h. Student Affairs and Publications
7. The following Committees will report to the Faculty as a whole
 - a. Grievances
 - b. Research Misconduct
8. The proposed composition, function, and charge of the Committees will be spelled out in the Conference Committee's final report. Note that the proposal calls for the elimination of the following committees
 - a. Academic Grievance Assistance Committee of the Faculty Council (to be replaced by a list of faculty willing to assist in grievances)
 - b. International Relations (Senate)
 - c. University Relations (Senate)

CURRENT AND PROPOSED COMPOSITION OF GOVERNANCE BODIES with % of voting members				
	Current Senate	Current Faculty Council	Proposed Faculty Senate	Proposed University Council
Faculty	76 ⁴ (63%)	44 ⁵ (100%)	40 with vote (100%)	40 voting (67%)
Administrators	19 (16%)	-	3 without vote	5 voting (8%); 12 non-voting
Staff	1 non-voting	-	-	2 voting (3%)
Students	25 (21%)	-	-	13 voting (22%)
Totals	120; 1 non-voting	44 voting	40 voting; 3 non-voting	60 voting; 12 non-voting

⁴Includes *ex officio*, the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Council.

⁵Includes *ex officio*, the Chair of the University Senate.

**Proposed Changes in the Grading System at UM - St. Louis
For Individuals Who Leave Courses in Which They are Officially Enrolled**

Recommendation: Both to abolish the "EXC" grade, and create the grade of "W".

The delayed ("DEL") grade would remain intact.

All time references are in the context of a regular semester.

During weeks 1, 2, 3 & 4 of a regular semester, an individual who *officially* leaves a course is defined as having "dropped" the course--no permissions are required and nothing appears on the student's permanent record card regarding the course which is dropped. A student may drop a course at the registration office, an academic advising office, using TRAIN (phone registration system) or STARUMSL (student computing labs). This is the existing policy which we support.

During weeks 5 through 12 of a regular semester, an individual who *officially* leaves a course is said to "withdraw." The individual's name is included on the official class roll and the name will appear on the grade sheet issued at the end of the semester. The date of withdrawal is noted on the grade sheet. Present policy results in a student being assigned either an "EXC" (excused) grade or a grade of "F." The "F" is calculated into the student's grade point average; the excused grade has no impact on one's grade point average. **We are recommending a change.** No permission would be required and a grade of "W" would automatically be assigned with the processing of the withdrawal. The "W" grade would have no effect on one's grade point average; both the course and the "W" grade would appear on the permanent record card. Faculty members would be notified immediately upon the student's withdrawal from the course.

Presently there are no withdrawals after the twelfth week except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the instructor and the dean's office. In most academic units, the determination of whether the circumstances are or are not exceptional is delegated to the instructor of the course. If approval is granted, the grading is as described in the first part of the preceding paragraph. **We are recommending a change** which would automatically delegate the determination of whether or not there are exceptional circumstances to the course instructor. If the instructor approves of the late withdrawal, the "W" grade (described above) would be assigned with the assigning of grades at the end of the semester; if the instructor does not approve, a "regular" grade is assigned at the conclusion of the semester. Regular grades are: "A," "A-," "B+," "B," "B-," "C+," "C," "C-," "D+," "D," "D-" and "F" for undergraduates; there are no "D+," "D" or "D-" grades at the graduate level.

Approved by the Senate on October 13, 1992

1. All parking lots will be designated Faculty/Staff, Student, Visitor, Handicapped, or Patients.
2. Lot assignments will be eliminated for Faculty/Staff and Student permit holders.
3. Parking will be first-come, first-served in all lots.
4. Students may park only in lots designated as Student lots.
5. Faculty, staff and students will be ticketed if they park illegally.

(Attachment continues with the article from The Current dated May 10, 1999.)

Parking resolution leaves questions

BY SUE BRITT
staff associate

A dispute concerning the interpretation of a parking resolution, and whether faculty may use student parking lots, has remained unresolved after the last meeting of the senate.

William Connett, chair of the senate Committee on Physical Facilities, said that until this fall, faculty were not ticketed for parking in student-designated lots. He said that recently complaints by faculty were brought to his attention and that since the last senate meeting ran long, the parking issue was not addressed.

Connett said that in 1992, a parking resolution was passed and accepted by the chancellor that eliminated the lot specific faculty parking assignments. He said that it was assumed then by faculty that because there would be times when faculty parking would be full, they would be allowed to park in student parking.

"It was realized at the time that they did this, the number of spots that were going to be in the faculty lots would not always be enough for the number of people who were faculty," Connett said.

Connett said with recent construction of the new Student Center, students began to complain about the lack of close parking spaces, as many were lost in the construction. He said that it was then that faculty parking in student lots began to be ticketed.

Issue of whether faculty can use student spots remains unresolved

Connett said the 1992 resolution specifically states students may only park in student lots but does not read that faculty may not park in student lots. The resolution only states faculty and staff would be ticketed for parking illegally. He said the lack of specificity regarding faculty in student lots allowed for faculty to infer that it would be legal.

"[The resolution] says that people will park in their designated areas, and for years that was understood to mean that you should park in the lot that was of your sort . . . and if you were faculty parked in the student lot, you wouldn't get a ticket," Connett said, "because it was perceived that the student parking places were not as good as the faculty parking places and nobody would park there unless there was some reason that they couldn't park [in the faculty lots]."

Reinhard Schuster, vice-chancellor of Administrative Services, said that the senate resolution is open-ended in regard to whether faculty may park in student parking spaces. He said that although the senate passed a resolu-

Page 8

PARKING, FROM PAGE 1

tion, the rules for parking have not been changed.

"The effect was that the rules were never changed. The parking rules that accompany the annual permit that state where you can park," Schuster said, "were always specific. It said students park in student lots, faculty/staff park in their designated lots."

Schuster said that a student group brought to his attention that there were a number of faculty parked in student lots.

"We do ticket students in faculty/staff lots," Schuster said, "and it seems only fair that we ticket faculty and staff in student lots."

Jeanne Zarucchi, senate chair, said if faculty cannot find parking in the immediate vicinity of a classroom building, they should be allowed to park in any legal open space.

"It's not an issue of convenience," Zarucchi said. "What's at stake is the consequence of a faculty member not being able to make it to class on time. That situation disadvantages not only the faculty member but every student in the class."

Michael Rankins, vice-president of the Student Government Association, has been asked by the SGA to compose a letter to the senate expressing the views of the SGA in this regard.

"It is important for a faculty member to be on time to class; however, that does not permit for blatantly breaking the rules," Rankins said. "[If a student is late for class] their grade can be chopped as a result."

Rankins said in the letter that he will write to the senate, he may recommend some faculty parking be added in lots further from classes, where there is more space regularly available.

"Let them take the shuttle," Rankins said.