

**FACULTY SENATE AND UNIVERSITY ASSEMBLY**  
**UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI – ST. LOUIS**

**RESPONSE TO FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT - FALL 2011**

(Submitted to Academic Affairs - Feb. 29, 2012)

Michael Murray, Senate Chair  
(Professor, College of Fine Arts & Communication)

Fred Willman, Senate Secretary  
(Professor, College of Fine Arts & Communication and College of Education)

**Steering Committee**

Susan Feigenbaum  
(Professor, College of Arts and Sciences)

Joseph Martinich  
(Professor, College of Business Administration)

Mark Pope  
(Professor, College of Education)

## Response to External Report – Issues on which there is Agreement

### 1. Non-Tenure Track Faculty Participation in Governance

a. One of the topics of discussion during the external review of the Faculty Senate reflected on the important contributions of Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty members, both in terms of the crucial academic services they provide and the revenue they generate.

b. The external review reinforced the need to insure that Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty members have an opportunity to participate in discussions of key issues -- and the members of the Senate very much agree. The role of NTT faculty has long been noted, along with the current key leadership positions they hold, including current chairmanship of the Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) Committee and the Information Technology Committee. Actual and potential roles for NTT faculty in faculty governance and Senate activities were reviewed, demonstrating their involvement in the breadth of Senate activities, while at the same time clarifying the nature of their appointments and emphasizing the fact that decision-making by the Senate reflects the views of faculty members who are associated with academic departments, those offering regular coursework and academic degrees. We recognize that the application of NTT faculty status will vary across UM campuses: for example, at UMKC, ranked Librarians are Senators, and have recently pursued codification of their regular faculty status.

c. The Senate will continue to invite the participation of NTT faculty members from the entire campus and indeed welcome these colleagues as voting members of the Senate, when their qualifications are consistent with the Senate's By-laws and Operating Rules.

d. With the current Operating Rules and By-Laws in mind, the Senate leadership, with the assistance of the Chancellor and the Provost, and as a follow-up to this review, recently clarified the ways in which broader objectives might best be met, including the need to have NTT faculty from "non-parallel units" (as described by the Senate By-Laws) represented through joint appointments with the support of their academic departments, acknowledged through completion of a PAF, with the support and appropriate "sign-off" of the department chair, the academic dean, and the Provost. We also expect that NTT faculty could play increasingly central governance roles in the future, including additional committee chairmanships, as is currently the case, and as noted previously in this response.

e. As an added follow-up to this review, the Steering Committee of the Senate met with the Provost and Chancellor and further articulated the Senate's goal of including NTT faculty, with the proviso that they hold joint academic appointments and obtain the proper academic approvals.

### 2. Research Policy Committee and the Fall and Spring Research Panels

a. The external review reflected upon how, in the past, two Research Panel committees had been charged with determining the Fall and Spring recipients for UMSL Research Awards;

indicating however, that there had been no money recently to continue with these awards. The report further specified that, at the present time, the Fall Panel decided Junior Faculty Travel Grants (maximum \$1000 each) and the Winter Panel made a recommendation to the Chancellor regarding the recipients of the Campus Research Award. The recent and recurring question noted in this review focused on whether Panels should be combined.

b. It was noted that there is a strong faculty view (as evidenced by discussion with research committee members, the broader Faculty Senate and the Provost) that these separate panels should be continued, presuming that as the economic and budgetary climate improves, it is reasonable to expect that funds will once again become available to resume research grant awards in both semesters.

c. This review saw merit in the panels with committees having input from the office of the Vice Provost for Research (VPR) and recommended that rather than completely eliminating the panels and the RPC, the VPR might work more closely with the Senate through the Provost, who meets with the Senate Steering Committee and Chancellor regularly, to ensure all faculty concerns are being addressed.

d. The Senate endorsed the need to continue to have the Provost investigate opportunities to support Research funding. In concert and consultation with the Provost, the current Research Committee has been encouraged to produce a written, detailed proposal which would help to re-initiate these important campus-wide research awards.

e. We anticipate receiving a proposal to share with the Provost that will serve as a vehicle to continue the panels and expect that the proposal will arrive by the end of the current term, Winter, 2012.

### 3. Committee Structure and Activities / Terms of Office / Interaction with Campus Leaders

a. Another major theme reflected in the external report and thus related to the Senate's annual activities, was the need for regular turnover in Senate leadership with special efforts made to infuse "new blood" into the organization, while at the same time recognizing an increased workload for Senate officers and Committee chairs, also offering suggestions on IFC representation.

b. The expertise and hard work of the IFC representatives were recognized in the review as having been crucial in navigating important, recent issues with the UM central administration. But the general outlook from this review was the need for a better balance between veterans and newcomers, which would avoid placing an undue burden on Senate officers as well as IFC representatives over extended periods of time. The report also alluded to the need for turnover among the officers, as well as the need to interact regularly with key campus administrators.

c. Regarding reports from the Deans who participated in the review, note that unlike other institutions, UMSL is very inclusive of administrators in its faculty governance body. For

example, we do not exclude associate deans whose time is 50% (or less) administration from sitting on the Senate (or IFC). This is not the case everywhere – even within the UM system. More formally, we grant all deans (as well as Vice Chancellors and Vice Provosts) ex officio membership in the University Assembly, where they have the same voice as all other members. But in light of this 5-Year Review, the Senate/Assembly Chair will be encouraged to make a point of briefing new deans on their rights within the Senate/Assembly soon after each new dean joins the institution.

d. The current thinking is that it would be a serious error to institutionalize regular reporting by deans at the Senate and Assembly meetings when we already request regular reports from the Chancellor (representing the campus administration) to parallel the reports from the Senate/Assembly chair (representing the faculty), the president of the Staff Association (representing non-faculty employees), and the president of SGA (representing the students). It was noted that the leadership of the Senate recently made a special effort to communicate the means by which it regularly interacts with the campus administration, while also recognizing a major change in committee leadership this year. As a follow-up to this review, the leadership of the Senate noted this area would once again be targeted for continual improvement while recognizing that the Senate and Assembly committee chairs achieved a better than 85 % “turn-over” rate this past year. It was noted, for example, that key committees such as Research and also Appointments, Tenure and Promotion (ATP), achieved new leadership during the current year. Both the Senate Chair and the Senate Secretary positions will also be “turning-over” at the conclusion of the current academic year and, as a result, the campus IFC representation will once again change next Fall. Post review conversations concluded that the “image” of a cohesive, small group of Senate decision-makers and leaders had somehow been created in the minds of some individuals and the leadership will work to better define and discuss its operations and decision-making to insure that the perception is more in line with the reality, in terms of how things really work, and how decisions are made.

e. The result will be that two of three IFC representatives from UMSL will have “turned-over” in two years. In terms of the Senate’s most recent election, 8 of 14 Senators are new, again reflecting the call for “new blood” in the Senate. The other areas noted in the review, including non-uniformity of committee workload, consideration of moving IFC elections with the idea of offering greater incentives to serve, and the possible appointment of a chair-elect for the UMSL Senate were all shared with the Senate by the current Chair and input was invited on ways these objectives might be achieved. The deans who participated in the review also expressed a desire to have greater interaction with the Senate, with the suggestion that deans provide periodic reports to the Senate on particular topics of special interest to the Senate. The Senate’s protocol with respect to how invited speakers are chosen was covered as a follow-up to this review. All are welcome to suggest and address topics. None, to our knowledge, have ever been rejected.

## Additional Conclusions Regarding the External Report

During the External Review Committee's meetings with the campus administrative officers, student government leaders, staff association leaders, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the deans, and the committee chairs, several issues were agreed upon. Though some were very minor in nature, others require careful consideration. It was pointed out that reviews of this kind have greater impact if the emphasis is on the process, with recommendations that are forward-looking. It was noted that shared governance is considered a "holy grail" issue on campuses across the nation. And as higher education is undergoing change, there is potential for erosion of shared governance which places an extra burden on University of Missouri faculty and the university administration to ensure that the principles enshrined in shared governance are valued and reinforced in word and deed.

Overall, this review credited the faculty, staff, administrators, and students at UMSL for creating a very workable and collegial environment. The report noted in numerous places that Faculty Senate operations have improved dramatically since Loy Harvey became the Senate's Administrative Assistant.

The work environment seems to be very good and very healthy overall, with all of the stakeholders very committed to the shared governance model. The level of commitment to meaningful shared governance on all sides was very encouraging and the exit interviews with the Chancellor, the Provost, and the IFC representatives reinforced the mutual respect existing between the UMSL faculty and the administration, along with the strong sense of collegiality.

## Response to Internal Report—Issues on which there is Agreement

### 1. Insuring Representation of Stakeholders

a. It was noted that college deans and at least one Vice Provost were able to participate in this review. Based on the report, all of those participating expressed a level of respect for the Faculty Senate and also communicated the view that the level of participation is generally good. Senate meetings were regarded as interesting and valuable. But those individuals also reported that they rarely speak at Senate meetings and feel that there may be a lack of clarity, in particular, with respect to the units which do not have representation in the Senate, such as: Continuing Education, Pierre Laclède Honors College, and Missouri Institute for Mental Health.

b. It was noted upon review of this report that these are just a few of the entities on campus that do not qualify as "parallel units" by way of Senate By-Law requirements, meaning they do not have their own faculty members reporting to an academic dean, with the full scope of teaching/research/service responsibilities (and also fewer than 5 tenure/tenure track faculty members, also as required by Senate By-Laws).

c. The administrators participating in this review felt that that they do not have a way to formally interact with the Senate; and in sum, their relationship is not optimal in the sense that it is not what they would like for it to be. One view was expressed that most faculty members serving within that context do not feel empowered in such a role. They would like to see the constituency broadened and would like to formalize some type of active representation.

d. An additional comment on this topic was that there is a lack of formal communication between the Provost Council and the Senate. Although the Provost is a member of the Senate Steering Committee and does often address the Senate, there is no specific discussion pertaining to the issues confronting the College Deans.

e. Regarding voting rights, the Senate will continue to reinforce the importance of joint appointments as the key means of addressing the perceived issue of lack of representation. The leadership of the Senate will also continue to welcome all College Deans who may wish to provide information regarding issues of special interest related to their units. Again, faculty from all units can seek joint appointments in units represented in the Senate and thereby represent academic units, with the support of their unit colleagues and Dean.

## 2. Representation by Staff Association and Student Government Association

a. It was noted that there is a strong staff presence in the Faculty Senate and University Assembly in terms of regular interaction and frequent invitations to share information. The Staff Association President provides reports on staff activities and concerns at Assembly meetings regularly and often communicates with the Senate leadership and with committee chairs when necessary.

b. Representation is strong in that all campus staff members vote for their staff representatives and are given the opportunity to participate in key committee assignments outside the Senate, such as the system-wide University Benefits committee. Additional communication occurs as the Staff Association President works with the Senate Chair on issues related to special staff needs and interests. This structure is regarded as being very positive.

c. While it is possible that conflicts could occur in hypothetical situations described in the report in which staff representatives could possibly serve on the same committees as their supervisors, operationally, this has seldom, if ever, been the case and never where there would be a potential conflict-of-interest between staff members.

d. Regarding input from the student government association, student representatives currently attend and participate in more Senate and Assembly meetings than at any time in recent memory. They are represented at the Senate meetings and also by way of giving regular reports on activities and through interaction with IFC members at Board of Curator meetings held across the state.

e. It was suggested that a staff member be included on the Senate Steering committee. This is one suggestion that we could not support pursuing at this time. Campus leaders have the

opportunity to inform staff members and others about levels of unit representation in the Senate, including issues such as learning about how policies are developed and how the campus governance process works. Staff representatives already serve on sensitive Senate committees, such as the Budget and Planning committee. We are unaware of any instances or potential conflicts of interest due to having a staff person and/or his/her supervisor serving simultaneously, although the Faculty Senate is always sensitive to having students and staff privy to issues of shared governance.

### 3. Administrative changes

a. A large number of significant changes were noted since the last (and in our case, first) Senate 5-year Review: These included: major By Laws changes; a change in the physical space--with Senate offices having been moved to the center of the North campus--the Tower, and having new committee research policy under review, as well as the overall reduction in numbers of committees, a change in the level of student participation and the Senate Chair choosing people for the Steering Committee. For example, a recent effort by the Provost and Senate Chair to work jointly to address important campus Safety issues resulted in the Provost working with the Senate to appoint a committee that regularly reports at Senate /Assembly meetings. While not under the purview of the Senate, this is viewed as a very positive and fruitful development with a new campus security officer also offering periodic updates.

b. As indicated in the External review, new faculty members are needed to serve in the Senate although there are few formal incentives provided for service on campus; and with some administrators terming the Senate a "clique" in that some faculty members feel faculty governance can be ineffective, citing comments that campus Budget & Planning cuts occurred, though some faculty had contrary views they maintained had not been aired. The time required for faculty representatives to spend on Senate work--and the level of required commitment, were also of major concern. The suggestion was made that the Faculty Senate needs to plan for regular leadership replacements, as well as some sort of explicit reward system.

c. Additional suggestions included moving the IFC elections to the Senate from the Spring Faculty meeting and the Senate chairmanship might be better extended to a longer term of 2-3 or possibly more years. This suggestion has been reported to the Senate and Assembly by the current Chair and it is the hope that subsequent leaders will consider an extended term of office with more release time granted. Past chairs could serve on IFC and the Steering committee; Chair elect, chair and past chair should work together. Voices of NTT faculty members should be heard as well as tenure track and tenured faculty members with a caveat: "The organization should be about individuals, not procedures." It was recommended that non-represented faculty be associated with an academic unit to expand possibilities for membership and participation.

d. The Internal review acknowledged how much time and effort a committee Chair assignment requires. The Chairs have seen some improvement in committee structure and also reported they felt the Senate was very well organized and planned efficiently for all of the work

it undertook. Serving on committees before serving as a committee chair was regarded as a helpful approach. It was noted that much of the current work is accomplished via e-mail and this works very well. The chairs did not favor instituting "term limits" for Senate chair members. It would be better, according to some chairs, to expand the Senate to involve more faculty members. There is too little support from some departments to serve on the Senate. Institutional incentives are needed to encourage membership and departments should create incentives. Research panels must be retained as committees along with the Tenure Removal committee. It was suggested that at the first committee meetings, the Senate Chair continue to explain the committee's purpose and operations; adding that committees would benefit from hearing from an ex officer. The budget process was considered a good example of success. Key administrators, students, Staff Association and faculty participated in the process and deliberations, and as result there were fewer complaints from the faculty than in the past. The chairs liked the idea of a chair elect and a past chair serving on IFC although, as with the Senate Chair extended term suggestion, that amount of responsibility may translate to as much as a 3-6 year commitment; meaning even less turn-over in faculty leadership.

e. Among the most important observations were those reflecting a lack of regular "turn-over" among leaders, including important committee chairs and the elected leadership of the Senate as well as the IFC. This issue turned attention to the reward system although, upon reflection, Senators are credited by unit leaders for service and the Senate Chair receives release time and teaching credit. Beyond the Senate Chair, the responsibility of the Committee Chairs varies considerably due to the nature of their assignments, the committee(s) on which they serve, and the overall level of required commitment. The Senate has clearly made a good faith effort to seek out new Committee Chairs recently, and it is up to the unit leaders, in most cases, the college deans, to recognize the individual commitment of faculty members to the Senate and reward accordingly, offering assurances that the level of work is understood and communicated within the context of each college. The current leadership has communicated -- and will again state the need for "new blood" represented in leadership positions, but it is difficult to dictate how change may occur, beyond creating a general awareness and spreading this message to eligible faculty.

### Conclusions Regarding the Internal Report

The Chancellor and Provost at UMSL are very experienced in, and very highly committed to, shared governance. This commitment is reflected in the Faculty Senate and University Assembly and the current leadership was credited in this review report for open communication and in working well with the campus and university-wide administration in most of their efforts. The Faculty currently elects the IFC member who reports to the Senate at its Fall term and Spring term meetings. Meetings were judged to be run efficiently and the UMSL Senate and Assembly are also regarded as "models" of efficiency and self-governance. The Senate's Administrative Assistant, Loy Harvey, was repeatedly praised for her ability to interact with a wide range of constituency groups, for her accountability and the overall quality of her excellent work.