

November 26, 2011

Dr. Glen Hahn Cope
Provost & Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs
University of Missouri-St. Louis
426 Woods Hall
One University Boulevard
St. Louis, MO 63121-4400

Dr. Helene Sherman
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, Doctoral Faculty
Division of Teaching and learning
156 Marillac Hall
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, MO 63121-4499

Dear Drs. Cope and Sherman:

It is my pleasure to send you my report as the external reviewer on the University of Missouri-St. Louis Faculty Senate Review Committee. It has been my privilege to be asked to be the external reviewer. I've greatly enjoyed interaction with a broad cross section of the UMSL community. It was a pleasure to meet the dedicated faculty, staff, as the student representative.

The authority of the Faculty Senate and University Assembly to act on behalf of the faculty of the campus is granted through delegation of responsibility as set forth in the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri 300.040.A.2. The Faculty Senate is guided by its bylaws as included in the Collected Rules (300.040.C) and the University Senate follows its bylaws stated in the Collected Rules (300.040.D). During the 1999-2000 academic year, the UMSL faculty voted to eliminate the University Senate and the Faculty Council in favor of the officially recognized governance structure that exists today. Since the 2007 Review, staff changes have also occurred. Instead of two staff positions, the Senate now has one executive assistant, currently occupied by Loy Harvey, who came on board in April 2009.

I am happy to report that the review enabled me to conclude that shared governance is taken seriously at UMSL by all its stakeholders. This is an encouraging state of affairs. As higher education is searching for new paradigms to ward off existential threats, all the stakeholders pulling in the same direction can only help navigate the choppy waters of the challenges facing higher education.

UMSL has been blessed with dedicated faculty leaders, as well as enlightened administrators, in recent years. It was evident during the Committee deliberations that, one of the most important goals of the UMSL faculty and administration is to ensure that the culture of shared governance, so deeply embedded in the workings of the UMSL campus, will be institutionalized. It can also become a model for the sister campuses to emulate.

In the Fall 2011 Self-Study Report of the Faculty Senate and University Assembly, a brief overview of the functioning of the Senate/University Assembly is provided. The report lays out how these two important entities provide the framework for shared governance. The Senate and the University Assembly hold regular meetings to conduct business. The committees meet as necessary as determined by the committee members.

One of the important roles of the Senate is its relationship to the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) as a conduit of information from the IFC meetings with the administration, held roughly every month, to the faculty. As the discussions in these meetings usually are of a sensitive nature, detailed minutes are not disseminated. The IFC representatives need to exercise great judgement as to what is conveyed and how. Reporting to the faculty on the UM Board of Curators meetings is another important function that the Senate performs, facilitated by at least one of the Senate officers attending the Board of Curators meetings. In spite of the time-consuming travel involved, as a common practice, an UMSL Senate representative attends each of these meetings. The Chancellor also reports on the Board of Curators meetings, of course, but the Faculty Senate's independent interpretation of issues discussed by the Board of Curators is important to the faculty. The campuses rely on feedback from the Senate leadership at the system level for a fuller sense of what is going on there. Campus faculty leaders taking the effort to attend the Board of Curators meetings does convey to Board that the faculty leaders are dedicated and take their responsibilities seriously.

The Chancellor and other administrators are invited to attend the Faculty Senate meetings and give their reports. During the period covered by this study the chancellor and other administrative officers have taken advantage of this opportunity to provide information to the membership, answer questions of concern to the campus community, and receive input. The meetings thus provide a forum for the faculty to interact with the chancellor and other administrative officers and improve communication between the faculty and the administrators.

The president of the Student Government Association is invited to report at the meetings of the University Assembly. These student leaders have taken this opportunity very seriously and have used it to discuss topics of interests to them with the faculty and administration, to provide information about student-sponsored events, and to exchange information and insights with the Assembly members. A recent example is the Tobacco-Free Campus initiative that highlighted the need to address a few concerns that the students have.

The president of the Staff Association is also invited to give a report to the University Assembly. The staff appreciates the opportunity to share their information and provide input on issues of concern to the campus community. Campus discussions on the changes to the Retirement Plan are a good example in which interaction between the faculty and staff has been crucial. Both the faculty and staff representatives who participated in the review sessions felt that there was effective communication between the two groups.

During the Review Committee's meetings with the administrative officers, student government leaders, staff association leaders, Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the deans, and committee chairs, several issues were brought up. Though some were of minor nature, others require careful consideration focusing on student learning and continuous improvement. Reviews of this nature will have greater impact if the emphasis is on process rather than personalities, and if the recommendations are forward-looking. Hopefully, the following paragraphs are in line with these expectations.

Shared governance is a holy grail at campuses across the country. As higher education is undergoing seismic changes, there is a potential for erosion of shared governance. This situation places an extra responsibility on the faculty and the administration to ensure the principles enshrined in shared governance are valued and cherished.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Participation in Governance

The discussions during the review clearly indicated that the non-tenure track (NTT) faculty associated with the Missouri Institute of Mental Health (MIMH) are a valuable asset to the UMSL campus in terms of the revenue they generate and the service they provides to Missourians. It is to UMSL's credit that MIMH chose to be part of UMSL when its relationship with the Columbia campus ended. Being significant contributors to the activities of UMSL, the roughly 20 MIMH faculty have earned their right to participate in shared governance. There appeared to be unanimous agreement on this among those who participated in the discussions. However, there appears to be differences in the opinions on how participation in shared governance of the MIMH faculty is to be accomplished. Simply allowing them representation on the Faculty Senate may not be an option without changes in the bylaws. Each of the MIMH faculty being associated with an academic unit based on their expertise could resolve the issue. However, the MIMH faculty feel that they might lose their identity as a group if this is done.

Considering the larger issues that have surfaced in recent times concerning the role of NTT faculty in higher education, this reviewer feels that bringing all the NTT faculty on campus into the discussion might be appropriate. One could also look for successful models handling a similar situation at other campuses. At the Missouri S&T campus, we have research and other centers where faculty participate in their activities. These faculty are usually associated with an academic department. However, because of their center-related activities, these faculty are able to keep their collective identity and have their voice heard. MIMH could also explore ways to become more visible on campus. "Out of sight, out of mind," is something we all experience in our lives. In this regard, the administration could become a facilitator to provide the technology infrastructure for web-based communication between MIMH and the main campus.

Research Policy Committee and the Fall and Spring Research Panels

In the past, two Research Panel committees were charged with determining the Fall and Spring recipients for UMSL Research Awards; however, there has been no money to continue that awards. At present the Fall Panel decides Junior Faculty Travel Grants (maximum \$1000 each) and the Winter Panel makes a recommendation to the Chancellor regarding the recipient of the Campus Research Award. One recent and recurring question has to do with whether these Panels should be eliminated. Notably, there is a strong faculty view (as evidenced by discussion with research committee members and the broader Faculty Senate) that this committee should continue. As the economic and budgetary climate improves, it is reasonable to expect that funds will become available to resume the awards. This reviewer sees some merit in the panels and the committees having input from the office of the Vice Provost for Research (VPR). Rather than completely eliminating the panels and the RPC, the VPR might work more closely through the Provost, who meets regularly with the Senate Steering Committee and the Chancellor, to ensure that all faculty concerns are being addressed.

Committee Structure and Activities

The committee structure and representation on the committees have some common thread among the campuses. Continual improvement can minimize the complexity and increase effectiveness in the Senate's activities. Massive restructuring, if undertaken too often, can only cause confusion. The major themes related to the Senate's activities that surfaced during the review are: (i) not sufficient turnover in the leadership, (ii) no effective mechanism to infuse "new blood," (iii) increased workload for the Senate officers, and (iv) not having a good way to choose IFC representatives. Numerous Senate officers and others noted that the Senate operations have improved dramatically since Loy Harvey became the administrative Assistant for the Senate. Clearly, Loy's dedication and hard work deserve recognition. This reviewer also has been observing the current UMSL IFC representatives at IFC meetings. Undoubtedly, their

expertise and hard work have been crucial in navigating some of the important issues being discussed at IFC. Obviously, a right balance between the veterans and the newcomers would ensure continuity and avoid placing undue burden on the Senate officers and the IFC representatives for extended periods of time. Drs. Mike Murray, Susan Feigenbaum and Joe Martinich were thanked by meeting attendees for their services to the Senate and IFC.

Some of the other topics that came up were: (i) non-uniformity of committee workload, (ii) moving IFC elections to the Senate, (iii) greater incentive to serve, and (iv) chair-elect for the Senate.

The deans expressed a desire to have greater interaction with the faculty Senate. While informal interaction on a one-to-one basis should be encouraged, a good avenue for the deans to interact with the faculty is the Senate and the assembly. While a report from every dean at every meeting may not be feasible, the deans could be asked to give report on a regular basis—if given once a year, the people involved could become familiar with each other, since, at least, part of the reason for breakdown of communication is personnel turnover and not knowing each other on a personal level.

Conclusions

To sum up, I was impressed by the faculty, staff, administrators, and students I met during the review. The working environment seems to be good and healthy with stakeholders truly believing in shared governance. The level of commitment to meaningful shared governance on all sides was most encouraging. The exit interviews with the Chancellor and the Provost, and the IFC representatives revealed mutual respect between the faculty and the administration and a sense of collegiality.

I was specifically asked to address how the faculty governance system contributed to the improved student learning. This is not easy to discern from a one-day campus visit. However, acting in an effective and visible manner in setting academic policies and campus priorities, as well as responding to issues of concern that arise, the Faculty Senate and University Assembly set examples for the students to emulate. This out of classroom learning plays an equal part in student learning. There is no better way to teach than by leading by example.

During this one-day review, I continually heard from different persons that the Chancellor is a strong supporter of shared governance. These comments speak volumes of the good things happening at UMSL. Institutionalizing shared governance guarantees that it doesn't depend on the occupants of the administrative offices.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need further elaboration on any of the issues raised in this external review.

Sincerely,

KM Isaac
Professor of Aerospace Engineering
Associate Chair for Aerospace Engineering
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering Department
Missouri S&T
400 W. 13th Street
Rolla, MO 65409

