

(to be considered
for approval at
4/29/97 Senate meeting)

SENATE MINUTES
UM-ST. LOUIS
March 25, 1997
3:15 p.m. 126 J. C. Penney

The meeting was called to order at 3:18 p.m. Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting (held February 18, 1997) was deferred to a subsequent meeting.

Report from the Chairperson -- Dr. Lawrence Friedman

Dr. Friedman announced that at the first organizational meeting of the 1997-98 Senate, he was reelected Chairperson, Dr. Deborah Larson was elected Secretary, and Dr. Harold Harris was designated Parliamentarian. The announcements were greeted with applause.

Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill

The Chancellor reported that 21 faculty members have been awarded tenure or promotion or both this year. These individuals will be identified in Friday's Update. They were collectively congratulated by Chancellor Touhill, who also expressed thanks to faculty members who have served on the various committees which comprise the campus's tenure and promotion process.

More than 1,400 people from seven states attended the Job Fair which was hosted by UM-St. Louis on March 13 and 14. Seventy school districts and 134 companies were represented. A new "Job Strategies Handbook" has been published by Career Services to aid students seeking employment. The cost of the handbook was underwritten by company-sponsored advertisements.

The process of bar-coding equipment has been completed on the North Campus and will be completed within the week on the South Campus. There will be a follow-up phase to search for items which could not be found during the first pass.

Gifts have been received from the May Department Stores (\$40,000 to support students in the Pierre Laclède Honors College--the third installment of a \$200,000 pledge), the Monxmode Foundation (a pledge of \$60,000 for a scholarship program to assist single parents who are working to complete their education), and the Huls Corporation (a pledge of \$75,000 over the next five years to help build a German Studies Program in the Center for International Studies).

The Chancellor announced that Mr. Emil Woolley, the new Manager of Custodial Services, will begin employment on the campus on April 1, that air conditioning is scheduled to begin on or about April 15, and that repaving of selected roads and lots is scheduled to begin in July. Temporary repairs will begin shortly, as weather permits.

Chancellor Touhill reported that the staff of the Coordinating Board for Higher Education will inform CBHE that they have approved the M.F.A. in Creative Writing and the Ph.D. in Mathematics.

Other good news was the announcement that our new student center was approved by the Curators. The building is scheduled to open at the end of 1999. It will house all student services.

Report from the Faculty Council -- Dr. Herman Smith

(see attached)

Following his prepared remarks, Dr. Smith invited questions from the floor. Dr. Charles Larson referred to a meeting at which the Chancellor questioned the acceptability to the Curators of the Faculty Council's proposed salary policy. Chancellor Touhill said she had raised the issue with the General Officers. She said she described the policy proposed by the Council, expressed the view that it is not in keeping with Board policy, and received confirmation of her position from those present at the General Officers' meeting. Dr. Smith noted that Faculty Council Secretary Steven Spaner was informed by the Secretary to the Board of Curators that there is no written salary policy in existence--and therefore no written policy in opposition to the Council's proposal. Dr. Smith further reported that two Curators said they saw nothing wrong with the Faculty Council's proposal, but Chancellor Touhill maintained that Board policy is that we have a market/merit system. Dr. Smith stated that he would like to meet with the Chancellor to discuss the issue further.

Report from the Intercampus Faculty Council -- Dr. Susan Feigenbaum

(see attached)

Following her IFC report, Dr. Feigenbaum reported on activities of the Faculty Consultative Committee on Presidential Succession. She commented that the campus was well represented by Curators Professors Thomas Jordan and Robert Murray. The Committee was able to significantly impact the selection process, Dr. Feigenbaum reflected, noting that the Committee's criteria for judging the three candidates who were submitted for review was in some instances duplicative of the Board's criteria and in other cases complementary. She lamented the fact that concern for confidentiality

prevented contacts to faculty from the candidates' campus who were not offered as direct references.

Dr. Feigenbaum reported on the qualities that made the chosen candidate attractive to the Committee and indicated that committee members were very satisfied at the selection of Dr. Manuel Pacheco.

At the close of her report, Dr. Feigenbaum was asked by Dr. J. Martin Rochester if Dr. Pacheco is aware of the research component of the mission of the campus, a question that surfaced after a Post-Dispatch article contrasted UMC as a research institution and UM-St. Louis as an urban campus. Dr. Feigenbaum assured Dr. Rochester that the new President is well aware of our research activities.

Chancellor Touhill offered the information that the Curators were pleased with the faculty committee--and particularly with Dr. Feigenbaum, who served as chairperson.

Report from the Executive Committee -- Dr. Lawrence Friedman

On behalf of the Executive Committee, the Chair proposed the creation of an ad hoc committee to provide input and monitor efforts toward preparing the campus's report for the reaccrediting agency. The Chair recommended that a committee of seven (one faculty member from each unit) be nominated by the 1997-98 Committee on Committees for election by the incoming Senate.

Dr. Paul Roth inquired how the ad hoc committee's work would intersect with the existing Committee on the Assessment of Educational Outcomes. The Chair suggested that the reaccreditation committee's role would be to coordinate efforts. Dr. David Ronen opposed the creation of the ad hoc committee, stating that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs should prepare the report. The Chair explained that the formation of the ad hoc committee was suggested by Dean Douglas Wartzok as a way to involve faculty in the process; certainly, it is not intended that the Committee write the report. The question was called by Dr. Lawrence Barton, after which the formation of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Reaccreditation was approved with some dissent.

In closing, the Chair announced that the results of the Winter Panel research awards competition would be appended to the minutes (see attached).

Report from the Budget and Planning Committee -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill

The Chancellor reported that the Committee has been meeting to discuss cost reallocations in preparation for the 1997-98 academic year, the mission enhancement proposal, the third five-year plan, possible rate reallocations for salary increases and/or faculty infrastructure requirements, and the campus mission statement.

In response to a question from Dr. Mark Burkholder, the Chancellor noted our uncertainty about the size of state appropriations and what will be mandated by the Board of Curators in terms of salary increases and/or infrastructure funding.

Dr. Joseph Martinich inquired about the University's mission. Chancellor Touhill reported that President George presented a preliminary statement to the Curators at the last Board meeting. In it, he emphasized graduate, research, and outreach-extension. Mission enhancement categories included biomedical sciences, science technology, information processing (computing), leadership, Education, research for both graduate and undergraduate, and working with state agencies to meet the needs of Missouri's citizens.

Responding to a question from Dr. Lawrence Barton, the Chancellor recalled that for the past ten years or so we have reallocated .5 percent for salary increases. It is unclear if that amount will move to 1 percent or 1.5 percent, she said, and it is uncertain if the Board will require us to set aside rate dollars for infrastructure funding. She defined "infrastructure" for Dr. Jane Williamson as including computers, technology, paper, travel, and graduate students.

Dr. Bernard Feldman requested an update on enrollments. The Chancellor reported a projection of 207,000 student credit hours for next year--a decline from the current year. Dr. Harold Harris asked if the other UM campuses experience the same discrepancy we do in terms of expected and actual enrollments. Chancellor Touhill noted that if the difference represents a permanent change, serious rate cuts may be needed. If the difference is a temporary fluctuation, however, she favors making cost cuts over firing people who may be needed when enrollments improve. She indicated her belief that the chancellors on the other campuses are having similar enrollment concerns.

Report from the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction -- Dr. Lawrence Friedman

Dr. Friedman called the Senate's attention to course actions and minor "housekeeping" changes which were effected by the Committee. He presented a proposed change to the B.S. in Criminology and Criminal Justice, which prohibits counting courses for the major as part of the social sciences distribution requirement or the state requirement, thus encouraging breadth of study. Dr. Charles Larson offered the information that the proposal was

not discussed in the College. Dr. Deborah Larson reported that the proposal is intended to formalize departmental policy which has been in place for some time. Dr. Mark Burkholder spoke in favor of the proposal, after which it was approved by the Senate without dissent.

Next, Dr. Friedman presented a proposal for a new program, the B.S. in Actuarial Science. Dr. Ronald Dotzel, of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, was present to answer questions from the floor. Dr. Joseph Martinich inquired about the number of students in the programs at Maryville and Central Missouri State. Dr. Dotzel estimated enrollments at 60 and 25, respectively.

Dr. Mark Burkholder pointed out a typographical error on the third page of the Actuarial Science proposal ("Ecometric" should read "Econometric"). With this correction, the proposal was approved by the Senate.

Report from the Committee on Faculty Teaching and Service Awards

-- Dr. Edward Andalaft

Dr. Andalaft reported that the Committee has met and forwarded its recommendations for the Chancellor's Teaching and Service Awards, the Presidential Award for Outstanding Teaching, and the Thomas Jefferson Award to Chancellor Touhill.

Senators were reminded that nominations for the Governor's Award for Excellence in Teaching and the Emerson Electric Teaching Award will be accepted through April 18, 1997. Individuals who have been nominated for other teaching awards this year will automatically be considered and need not be renominated.

The Chair reported that the Committee on Video and Instructional Technology would defer its report until the forthcoming meeting.

Dr. Paul Roth commended Dr. Susan Feigenbaum for her efforts on behalf of the Faculty Consultative Committee on Presidential Succession, and the Chair added his compliments on the competent and effective job Dr. Feigenbaum continues to do in her role as Chairperson of the Intercampus Faculty Council. Dr. Feigenbaum was enthusiastically applauded.

Completing the business at hand, the Senate adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


David Ganz
Senate Secretary

Attachments: Report from the Faculty Council
Report from the Intercampus Faculty Council
Results from Winter Panel research awards competition

(minutes written by Ms. Joan M. Arban, Senate Executive Assistant)

Report from the Faculty Council
Senate Meeting
March 25, 1997
Herman W Smith, Presiding Officer

Spring brings more than April showers and May flowers. Spring is also the time that the Faculty Council evaluates administrators. This year we focused on Deans, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans of the College and Schools. I took the optical scan forms over to the computer center yesterday and will have the results of those survey forms shortly. I shall be meeting with the Chancellor and all persons evaluated during April to discuss these results.

Due to serious concerns about the financial implications of the Chancellor's reports to the Senate Budget and Planning Committee over the past two months or so, the Faculty Council authorized me to take on an emergency survey of faculty sentiment. The Administrator Evaluation Committee passed on the completed questionnaires to me yesterday. I spent last night entering the data into my trusty statistical program and this morning analyzing the data for presentation today.

I was pleased with the high return rate with such short notice. Roughly half of the full-time faculty, as usual, returned completed questionnaires. We know from a similarly motivated survey sponsored by the Faculty Council two years ago that the response rate is highly dependent on length of service at (and hence commitment to) UM-St. Louis. That is, we receive virtually no responses from unvested faculty (those with less than five years service) and up to 90% of those with 20 years or more service. Keep this in mind as you digest the following data because it is those without tenure who do not understand the political system at UM-St. Louis and hence, we can safely assume, who don't bother to fill out our questionnaires. The faculty who are most aware of the politics and history of this university, and whom are most politically active are those whose opinions are well represented here.

Concerning specific items of the budget crises:

1. 1.5% College and School Budget Cuts. According to the Chancellor, the Curators are mandating that each campus implement an additional 1.5% addition to the salary-increase pool on top of a 3% base provided by "normal" funding this year. Our survey indicates that the faculty as a whole do not support funding this additional 1.5% through requiring budget cuts from College and School funds. Fifty-nine percent of the entire faculty said that they are opposed to funding a 1.5% increase in their own salaries through such sources as E and E and the cutting of instructional positions. I want to emphasize that this does not mean that faculty are not interested in salary increases. Rather, a clear majority of the faculty understand that it makes no sense to take money for pens, pencils, phones, travel to conferences, and funds for lecturers who teach large, basic sections of freshman and sophomore courses, etc. that supports their teaching and research by making it a tax-deductible part of their own income. The faculty would lose twice

under this Curator-imposed system. The Faculty end up paying increased taxes to the federal, state, and local governments on money that was not heretofore taxed, but which was supportive of their research and teaching. And they end up being "taxed" by these proposed budget cuts through reduced E and E, higher teaching loads, reduced flexibility in course offerings to the very freshman populations that Woods Hall says it is interested in increasing, etc.

2. Delaying or Forestalling Pay Raises. The Faculty is similarly unsupportive of delaying raises as a solution to "raising" their salaries by another 1.5%. The percent opposed to delaying or forestalling pay raises as a solution ranges from 55% in Nursing to 78% in Business, and averages 59%.

3. Method of Making Enrollment Projections. A third question asked about sentiments toward enrollment planning policy as this has been the major source of budgetary "shortfalls" over the past two years.

An overwhelming Seventy-three percent of the faculty would like to see a return to basing the projection of student fee income for next year based on a given year's actual enrollments. Only 16% of the faculty expressed no opinion, or choice, between the two systems.

The present policy of setting next year's budget based on next-year projections of student enrollments and student credit-hours has been shown to be highly flawed by three separate surveys of returning students and non-returning students. The Chancellor likes to say at Senate Budget and Planning Committee meetings that students should compare us with Washington University at \$21,000 tuition per year, or St. Louis University tuition of \$12,000. However, the fact is that prospective students compare our tuition with local junior colleges of \$42 per hour which is two-thirds less than they would pay here. Unhappily, these prospective students do not see a UM-St. Louis education as worth more than the tuition they pay at local junior colleges. Further, the cutting of the positions of low-paying, but highly cost-effective, instructors who teach basic freshman courses in order to fund salary increases of full-time equivalent professors is seen as very bad policy by the faculty. Only eight percent of the faculty in our poll support current enrollment-projection policy as a source of budgeting.

4. Faculty Council Salary-Raise Plan. We asked two questions concerning the efforts of the Faculty Council efforts over the past decade to replace the current ad hoc salary-raise policy. The first question asked about support for giving meritorious faculty raises of no less than the UM System mandated raise during years in which the raise is equal to or less than the St. Louis cost-of-living increase.

A clear consensus favors a transparent merit-based increase system. Two-thirds of the faculty responding said they support the Faculty Council efforts. Only 28% said they opposed those efforts. Interestingly, half of those opposed were from the School of Business. We also had about 15 people who did not answer the question, but who wrote extensive commentary. That commentary is interesting in that it indicates a significant alienated minority feel that their Deans

say they give raises based on merit, but play favorites. Hence, this alienated minority feels as if the administration doesn't practice what they preach. Given the overwhelming support of the Faculty for the efforts of close to seven Presiding Officers in a row, I'm here to say "Thanks" for giving more impetus to our efforts to change the status quo to one in which the Faculty have more voice.

The final question in our survey asked whether Deans ought to be allowed to pay for individual "market adjustments" only from funds separate from those available for cost-of-living increases to meritorious faculty. Sixty-one percent of the whole faculty support the Faculty Council on this issue. Interestingly, only faculty in Business (56% opposed) and Optometry (57% opposed) were not in favor of Council efforts to limit market adjustments to funds available after cost-of-living increases were given to meritorious faculty. Essentially, this implies that most faculty believe that a "flat" system of pay raises such as is current practiced by the School of Education (where 79% favored our plan) is preferable to current ad hoc policy in other Schools and the College.

As we know from my previous statements before the Senate that the Board of Curators does not have any policy statements in opposition to the de facto plan used by Education, I am going on record here as supporting the formal adoption of the School of Education policy by the Schools and College of UM-St. Louis. Over the past month, there has been much debate and discussion of proposed salary policies over the Council's listserv. Much of that discussion and debate has centered around complaints of inequities caused by the decades of status quo actions that a majority of the Faculty clearly resents. A flatter salary-increase policy of the type used by the School of Education will certainly not rid this university of those institutionalized inequities, but it should slowly bring about a more equitable distribution of pay for meritorious service as can be evidenced by the much more collegial atmosphere of the School of Education faculty concerning past inequities than exists in other units.

The 1997-8 Faculty Council. For the past two months, the Steering Committee of the Faculty Council has been engaged in preparations for the 1997-8 Council. We have decided to become more proactive in soliciting departments and units to elect representatives with fresh ideas as well as to re-elect former representatives who carry institutional memory. This is because our officers, Steering Committee members, and chairs of our two standing committees are elected from the larger Faculty Council. The results of this simple survey that I have just described gives new impetus to my resolve to fight for a cause in which I now know that the larger body of the Faculty stands behind. I thank the Faculty who care enough about the future of funding for this university for giving us what I consider a very strong vote of confidence as I speak for you at the remaining Senate Budget and Planning Committee meetings left during my term.

I'll now gladly entertain any questions before relinquishing the floor. Thank you.

IFC Report
UM-St. Louis Faculty Senate
March 25, 1997

The Intercampus Faculty Council met in Columbia on March 14, 1997. Susan Feigenbaum reported on the functioning of the Faculty Consultative Committee on Presidential Succession and its role in the final selection of Dr. Manuel Pacheco, current President of the University of Arizona. The IFC reviewed student computing fee policies that are either in place or in draft form at the Kansas City and Columbia campuses, the latter policy designed by Vice-President Ralph Caruso and a faculty committee from Columbia. At the February IFC meeting, Caruso had distributed the Columbia proposal and discussed several perceived advantages, including the decentralization of some funds for unique instructional needs of specific units. The primary catalyst for developing a more detailed student computing fee policy was a request from the UM-Columbia School of Journalism for specialized hardware and software, which led President George to request a 16% across-the-board increase in the 1997-98 student computing fees for all campuses at the January Board of Curators meeting. The question of how such funds would be distributed and accessed followed from this fee increase proposal. The Kansas City policy, now in place, allocates a portion of the funds to competitive awards for instructional computing projects; in addition, both the Kansas City and Columbia policies allocate a portion of computing fees back to units, with strict accountability standards.

The IFC discussed mission enhancement with President George. The President affirmed that he expects a full 80% of mission enhancement dollars to go to improving existing programs, with a renewed focus on research and undergraduate instruction as well as graduate programs. He has been reassured by CBHE that all requests do not have to be finalized by this September given that enhancement dollars will be paid out over four years and the University is undergoing a leadership transition this summer. President George did emphasize the need for crisp mission statements from each of the campuses. He encouraged the IFC to think about creative ways to improve faculty infrastructure via the mission enhancement process; one well-received suggestion was to develop faculty leave programs with state and local agencies and private industry.

Susan Feigenbaum
3/25/97



To: Faculty Senate

From: Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, Chair of the Research Committee

Date: March 25, 1997

RE: Winter 1997 Research Competitions

The Winter Panel of the Senate Committee on Research met and reviewed a total of 29 requests for \$272,289 in research support. Fourteen applications (48%) received funding; a total of \$113,943 (42% of requested) was awarded.

Summer stipend requests totaled 19% (\$51,000) of dollars requested and accounted for 14% (\$15,875) of dollars awarded.

Teaching replacement requests totaled 26% (\$69,733) of dollars requested and accounted for 23% (\$25,889) of dollars awarded.

Travel requests totaled 21% (\$56,502) of dollars requested and accounted for 15% (\$17,173) of dollars awarded.

Equipment, supplies, and other requests totaled 18% (\$49,095) of dollars requested and accounted for 26% (\$30,132) of dollars awarded.

Research Assistants requests totaled 17% (\$45,959) of dollars requested and accounted for 22% (\$24,874) of dollars awarded.

Of the 29 applications, 10 were from Assistant Professors, 11 were from Associate Professors, and 8 were from Full Professors. Funding success based on head count was 40% for Assistant Professors (4 of 10), 45% for Associate Professors (5 of 11), 63% for Full Professors (5 of 8), and 48% overall (14 of 29). Funding success based on amount awarded compared to amount requested was 35% for Assistant Professors (\$33,039 of \$95,438), 36% for Associate Professors (\$40,774 of \$114,641), 65% for Full Professors (\$40,130 of \$62,210), and 42% overall (\$113,943 of \$272,289).

Of the 14 funded proposals, 7 were funded at the requested amount and 7 were funded at less than the requested amount. The School of Education had a head count funding rate of 40% (2 of 5) and an amount funding rate of 46% (\$13,955 of \$30,255). The School of Business had a head count funding rate of 50% (1 of 2) and an amount funding rate of 22% (\$4,200 of \$19,401). The School of Nursing had a head count funding rate of 0% (0 of 3). The School of Optometry had a head count funding rate of 0% (0 of 1). The College of Arts and Sciences had a head count funding rate of 61% (11 of 18) and an amount funding rate of 52% (\$95,788 of \$182,495). In Mathematics and Sciences, the head count funding rate was 83% (5 of 6) and the amount funding rate was 80% (\$48,436 of \$60,213). In the Humanities, the head count rate was 50% (2 of 4) and the amount funding rate was 42% (\$14,500 of \$34,920). In the Social Sciences, the head count rate was 50% (4 of 8) and the amount funding rate was 38% (\$32,852 of \$87,362).

Funding Success on Basis of Dollar Amount Awarded

\$Awarded/\$Requested
% Awarded

Funding Category	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Summer Stipend	15,875 / 24,625 64%	0 / 26,375 0%	0 / 0 0%
Teaching Replacement	0 / 9,375 0%	12,040 / 37,500 32%	13,849 / 22,858 61%
Travel	1,144 / 27,646 4%	9,034 / 20,701 44%	6,995 / 8,155 86%
Equipment, Supplies, and Other	5,868 / 13,618 43%	9,298 / 16,425 57%	14,966 / 19,052 79%
Research Assistants	10,152 / 20,174 50%	10,402 / 13,640 76%	4,320 / 12,145 36%

Funding Success on Basis of Head Count

Number Awarded/Number Requested
% Awarded

Funding Category	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor
Summer Stipend	3 / 4 75%	0 / 3 0%	0 / 0 0%
Teaching Replacement	0 / 2 0%	2 / 7 29%	3 / 5 60%
Travel	2 / 7 29%	3 / 7 43%	3 / 3 100%
Equipment, Supplies, and Other	4 / 10 40%	3 / 8 38%	3 / 5 60%
Research Assistants	3 / 7 43%	3 / 5 60%	1 / 3 33%

Category Distribution of Funding in Comparison to Previous year

Funding Category	FY96 Allocation	FY96 Percent	Fall 96 Allocation	Winter 97 Allocation	Total Allocation	FY97 Percent
Summer Stipend	33,833	13%	22,375	15,875	38,250	17%
Teaching Replacement	47,257	18%	15,625	25,889	41,514	18%
Travel	34,790	13%	4,280	17,173	21,453	9%
Equipment, Supplies, Other, and Research Assistants	149,625	56%	72,385	55,006	127,391	56%
Total	265,532	100%	114,665	113,943	228,608	100%