

**FACULTY SENATE  
UM-ST. LOUIS  
MINUTES  
October 17, 2000  
3 p.m. Student Government Chamber, Millennium Student Center**

The first Senate meeting held in the Millennium Student Center was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Lawrence Barton.

Minutes from the September 12, 2000, meeting were approved as submitted.

**Report from the Chairperson -- Dr. Lawrence Barton**

The Chair reported that he is communicating and maintaining good rapport in his regular meetings with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, even though they don't agree on every issue. Faculty Senators received the Chair's solemn pledge that he will be forceful and direct when opposing points should be made to the Administration. The Chair said he has suggested several names to Vice Chancellor Durand for service on the Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion Task Force, and the appointments are about to be made. The Chair further reported that he has been attending meetings of the Chancellor's Cabinet and that he attended the initial meetings of the committees on Bylaws and Rules, Curriculum and Instruction, and Physical Facilities and General Services.

The Chair attended the September Board of Curators meeting and will attend the October meeting, to be held later in the week. A departmental commitment precluded his attendance at the most recent meeting of the Intercampus Faculty Council. He reported that he had an interesting conversation with Vice Chancellor Durand earlier in the day about possible strategies one could use to persuade the powers that be that the UM-St. Louis share of the budget is too small. In addition, the Chair reported that he attended the Nanotechnology Initiative Task Force meeting. He commented that he was disappointed at the poor turnout at the Fall Faculty Meeting, when Dr. Lon Wilkens, winner of the Chancellor's Award for Research and Creativity, gave a most interesting presentation on his work.

The Chair noted that the initial meeting of the Budget and Planning Committee was scheduled for the following day. Despite the best efforts of Ms. Agnew, it was not possible to find an earlier time to meet. The Chair reported that he has met with various people on the campus in an attempt to become more familiar with the budget process.

Concerning post tenure review (which was on the meeting's agenda), the Chair said that he has been following comments on the Faculty Forum and also that he attended the recent hearing with Vice President Lehmkuhle. The Chair remarked that he agrees with some points he heard and finds fault with other points. However, he is a bit unhappy with the tone of a few of the critics, who seem to perceive that the members of the University-wide faculty committee are trying to force their draft policy upon us. There is also some criticism that reflects a lack of respect for the good work that members of the University-wide faculty committee are doing. He exhorted these

critics to remember that the committee is working on our behalf to try to come up with an alternative more favorable to faculty interests than the current procedure--and more favorable than one which could be imposed on faculty from Columbia or Jefferson City. The Chair commented that some of the most vociferous critics clearly have not read the available materials. Since the issue of post tenure review is becoming a very public one, the Chair remarked that we must be well informed on what is going on, especially when our comments may be reported in the press. Some have urged that we take note of what is happening in Columbia, but the Chair cautioned against following MU's lead--at least for the present.

Turning to other matters, the Chair indicated that we will have another presentation on the campus master plan, either at the Faculty Senate or (more likely) at a forthcoming meeting of the University Assembly. Work on the Interstate 70/north entrance project will begin very soon. It was suggested that more information on this major construction project be placed on the campus's website, since there is much interest both at UM-St. Louis and in the community.

The agenda for the October 19 Board of Curators meeting includes the language proficiency of faculty members issue, the strategic plan, and something on information technology, a topic for which little information was provided. At the last Board meeting, Interim Vice Chancellor Durand gave a good report on the language proficiency issue and represented the campus very well.

In closing, the Chair announced that the Committee on Faculty Teaching and Service Awards will be distributing a nomination short form with a deadline of October 27. The Chair had been concerned that this may not give nominators enough time, but he was assured that the form is very easy to complete and may save much more work for nominators.

### **Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill**

The Chancellor led Faculty Senators in a moment of silence for Missouri Governor Mel Carnahan, his son Randy, and his campaign aide Chris Sifford, all of whom were killed in a plane crash in rural Jefferson County the preceding evening. Chancellor Touhill said she will always remember Governor Carnahan as a genuinely nice man who cared about people. "He was the kind of person who would speak kindly and act kindly but was firm in his convictions," she said.

His concern for people was perhaps highlighted best by the bold stands he took in support of education at all levels.

The Chancellor noted that UM-St. Louis and its students benefited from Governor Carnahan's passionate belief that education was an investment in Missouri's future. Under his leadership, the campus was able to broaden its academic programs, extend its reach into other counties, and enhance the quality of its faculty. "UM-St. Louis grew tremendously under Mel Carnahan," the Chancellor said. For example, under the Governor's tenure:

UM-St. Louis received nearly \$86 million to build and renovate facilities and to purchase nearby

property through capital appropriations and a 1994 statewide bond issue. This funding allowed the campus to, among other things, purchase 130 acres of property, construct a Fine Arts Building, begin renovation of its Science Complex, and begin construction on its \$50 million Performing Arts Center.

UM-St. Louis was allowed to expand into St. Charles, Jefferson, Franklin, and St. Francois counties, offering programs and classes to 3,750 students.

UM-St. Louis created 27 new degree programs, including the UM-St. Louis/Washington University

Joint Undergraduate Engineering Program, and graduate programs in nursing, health sciences, education, and business.

The state participated in a program that helped UM-St. Louis create 25 endowed professorships.

And, UM-St. Louis received \$7 million in funding targeted for academic improvements through a statewide Mission Enhancement initiative.

In closing, Chancellor Touhill said, "I believe in many ways Mel Carnahan fulfilled his promise to be Missouri's education governor, and he should be remembered as a friend to all the campuses of the University of Missouri, but particularly this one."

### **Enrollment**

The Chancellor reported that the final fall enrollment report, issued October 1, showed that on-campus enrollment increased about one-half of 1 percent over last fall, but that total enrollment was down about 12 percent. She commented that the decline in total enrollment is due to new guidelines created by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education in the advanced credit program. UM-St. Louis enrolled 3,500 high school students in this program last fall, but only about 1,500 students this fall. While changing our total enrollment figure, the decline in advanced credit enrollment does not impact our campus-wide budget. For budget purposes, we have always booked advanced credit under Continuing Education. Chancellor Touhill said she and vice chancellors Grace and Krueger would provide a more comprehensive enrollment report the following day, at the meeting of the Budget and Planning Committee.

### **Highway Construction**

Chancellor Touhill reported that the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDot) has informed her that it will begin the process to demolish property along Florissant Road this week or next week to make way for the realignment of Interstate 70. MoDot will start by fencing off much of Florissant Road to protect pedestrians and cars from the demolition work. Among properties to be removed are Mount Providence, the old Wendy's and Uncle Chunkies restaurants, and the strip mall at Florissant and Gieger roads.

## **Interest on Gift Accounts**

In closing, the Chancellor reported that she was informed by Central Administration that the implementation of PeopleSoft would be simplified and enhanced if all four campuses handled investment income on gift accounts in the same way. To follow the model of the other three campuses, we have begun to collect and shift into a central account interest on all non-endowed gift accounts. Chancellor Touhill said she would be discussing with the people whose accounts are affected where this money will be placed.

Questions were invited from the floor. Concerning the gift accounts, Dr. Mark Burkholder inquired if the Chancellor was open to other alternatives. Chancellor Touhill said she plans to have a meeting with everyone involved. "We will have a dialogue and I will take recommendations," she stated. Dr. Raymond Balbes commented that a trust exists between the recipient and the donor. To this, Chancellor Touhill said it can be discussed, and that she has an open mind. Dr. Gary Burger noted that his department, for example, has put off spending from the gift account in favor of long-range goals. With inflation, the department actually has less to spend now than if the money had been spent immediately.

The Chair remarked that he wrote to the Chancellor about this subject.

## **Report of the Intercampus Faculty Council -- Dr. Joseph Martinich (see attached)**

Referring to an article in the Spectrum stating that UM-St. Louis has "outlined a plan in which any professor with less than 90 percent communication approval on student evaluations will be counseled on an individual basis," Dr. Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi inquired as to the source of the plan and how it was approved before it was presented to the System. Vice Chancellor Durand said he was not interviewed by the Spectrum about the St. Louis plan; the article simply appeared. He explained that the System asked each campus to respond. A committee was formed, and the same criteria were used as when they developed the analysis of which faculty had difficulty with the English language. Vice Chancellor Durand reported to the System that if over 50 percent of the students in a course had problems or claimed they had problems, we would identify that section and counsel (i.e., talk to) the professor about what was happening. He noted that over half of the people identified as having proficiency problems have English as their primary language. The Vice Chancellor noted that the problem tends to cluster itself in a very small number of sections. We are not, he said, the campus under the microscope on this issue. Faculty who are conscious that there is a communication problem are likely to correct the problem in the subsequent semester.

Dr. Paul Roth urged IFC representatives to push Vice President Lehmkuhle to survey the campuses on issues related to faculty recruitment and tie this to issues of benefits, such as tuition remission for spouses and children. Recruitment is becoming an increasing problem. Faculty demographics are shifting. The wave of retirements is hitting. It is increasingly difficult to replace faculty, particularly at the level at which we are accustomed to do this. Dr. Martinich concurred with Dr. Roth and pointed out that this was already an agenda item for a future IFC meeting. Dr. William Long noted that the tuition remission on this campus is 75 percent, but he could take a course at his wife's campus (the community college) free.

Responding to questions from Dr. Susan Feigenbaum concerning the Columbia hospitals, Chancellor Touhill reported that the hospitals have an \$80 million problem and will begin to terminate people. As they do this, they will come forward at the Board of Curators meeting this week with a transition assistance plan. The Chancellor was uncertain when the plan will begin but expects that it could take effect as soon as it is passed. The plan will be extended throughout the System, so that if a person is laid off due to budgetary problems, this transition assistance program will be in place for 24 months. She said she believes it is the unit's responsibility to come up with the money for the assistance. The Chair remarked that in addition to the \$80 million problem, the hospitals have \$125 million in accounts receivable.

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

The Chancellor reported that the Committee would meet on the following day. On the agenda are such topics as the strategic plan, master plan, enrollment management, marketing plan, and President Pacheco's plan for reallocation.

The Committee will meet several times during the semester, and the Chancellor said her goal is to have a recommendation on the amount of the cut this year for next year by early December.

### **Report from the Committee on Bylaws and Rules -- Dr. Deborah Aldrich-Watson (in the absence of Dr. Lois Pierce, Chairperson)**

Dr. Aldrich-Watson presented proposals for reinstating two committees which are required to exist by virtue of the Collected Rules and Regulations: the Committee on Issues of Tenure Removal (previously known as the Senate Grievances Committee) and the Committee on Research Dishonesty (previously known as the Senate Committee on Research Misconduct). Dr. Gail Ratcliff protested, pointing out that for the purpose of streamlining the Senate, these committees were intended to be moved to the Faculty at large. The Chair remarked that now the Senate represents the Faculty. People, he said, don't show up at Faculty meetings anyway. Dr. R. Rocco Cottone inquired if the work of the proposed Committee on Issues of Tenure Removal could be done by the Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion. Dr. Aldrich-Watson responded by noting that ATP has a heavy workflow and this assignment would increase its burden. Dr. Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi countered by pointing out that the proposed Committee would almost never have business. She suggested that in light of this, it would fit comfortably under ATP. Dr. Aldrich-Watson replied that if it became necessary to meet and conduct business, we would need a committee in place that would not conflict with regular ATP work. The Chair added his view that ATP has enough on its plate and that, this year, ATP members will be involved in rewriting the procedural guidelines. The Faculty Senate then decided by voice vote with some dissent to reinstate the Committee on Issues of Tenure Removal (see attached).

Turning to the proposed Committee on Research Dishonesty, Dr. R. Rocco Cottone inquired as to why the name of the Committee had been changed from Research Misconduct. The Chair noted that misconduct can relate to a whole host of things. This Committee is chiefly concerned with misrepresenting results, which is not misconduct, but rather dishonesty. The Faculty Senate

then decided by voice vote with some dissent to reinstate the Committee on Research Dishonesty (see attached).

Dr. Paul Speck requested that in the future there be a show of hands rather than merely a voice vote.

### **Report from the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction -- Dean David Ganz**

Dean Ganz reported that he was elected once again to chair C&I and that Dr. Nancy Gleason will be groomed to take over next year.

C&I has established a deadline of February 2, 2001, by when all proposals except course additions, changes, and deletions must be received by the Office of Academic Affairs. Course additions, changes, and deletions must be received by Academic Affairs by March 2, 2001. The two deadlines should help to spread out the work of C&I and should allow for a more methodical and timely proofing of the Bulletin.

On behalf of the Committee, Dean Ganz recommended to the Senate that the second semester (currently designated "Winter") henceforth be known as the "Spring Semester." The rationale for this change is to be consistent across all four campuses when we implement PeopleSoft. Dr. Joseph Martinich supported the change to Spring semester but noted that this is the second instance in this meeting when we have been asked to change our procedures to accommodate PeopleSoft. Dean Ganz reported that there is a committee on this campus, headed by Vice Chancellor James Krueger and including Ms. Mimi LaMarca, which is in charge of implementing PeopleSoft here. They have been regularly going to Columbia for meetings, and there has been a whole layer of administration created just to deal with this PeopleSoft issue. The proposal to change to the Spring semester came to Dean Ganz via e-mail from Ms. LaMarca. Dean Ganz wrote her back that he would take it to the Faculty. Interim Vice Chancellor Durand said this issue came up in a meeting of Provosts and Academic Affairs Vice Chancellors in Columbia. He said he doubted that PeopleSoft is the impetus behind it.

The question was called and approved. The motion was approved by show of hands with one dissenting vote.

Professor Ganz reported on several items that are on the C&I agenda. He noted that CBHE approved a revision to the Transfer and Articulation Guidelines a little over a year ago. In the new Guidelines, the ceiling of transferable hours from the community colleges has been removed. At present, we will accept 60 hours from a community college if a student does not have an Associate of Arts degree or 64 hours with an Associate of Arts degree. That was detailed in the old Transfer and Articulation Guidelines as the maximum number of hours transferable. The new guidelines do not mandate that we accept more; however, they do drop all references to a maximum number of transferable hours. The community colleges are making a strong argument that if we are willing to accept lower division courses in fulfillment of degree requirements from a four-year institution, then we ought to accept them from the community colleges as well. Using as an example the College of Business Administration, Dean Ganz reported that 120 hours are required for the degree, and the minimum requirements are for 45

hours of upper division work. Therefore, a student may graduate from UM-St. Louis with a degree in Business with as many as 75 hours of lower division coursework. We don't really have a clear definition now of what comprises lower division and upper division work, so C&I will be considering a possible revision of the numbering system.

Another item on C&I's agenda involves the Enrollment Management Task Force, which had several sub-groups. One of the sub-groups came up with a proposal for a revision in the format of the calendar. It would move to a modular arrangement of a year-round calendar. There would be four-week sessions that could be grouped into 4, 8, 12, or 16-week terms.

Recently, Dean Ganz attended a meeting of Missouri Academic Advisors Association. A principal topic was CBHE's adoption this year in June of new general education requirements, which will change from 39 to 42 hours. Dean Ganz indicated that a group on this campus has been working on general education requirements, but this effort has not been brought into faculty ranks. He expressed the hope that this will happen soon. The sense of the new requirements is that if the sending institution says that general education has been satisfied, we have to accept it as complete on this campus.

Dean David Young stated that the policy says that each institution in the state must designate a 42-hour block of credits that constitute the 42 hours that were defined by CBHE. Each campus can decide how many credit hours of general education it requires. If we wanted to have, for example, 57 hours of general education, 42 hours of which would be lower division and 15 hours upper division, we are free to do that. If a student completes the 42-hour block of credit hours at the community colleges, which could all be lower division, then we must accept those 42 hours as the equivalent to our 42 hours. If we include upper division courses in the 42 hours, it is correct that those would transfer as a block and would meet our requirements. The task force that is working on this is about to go public with something. Our 42-hour block that we would propose is all lower division. We are also proposing that there be upper division requirements, but they would be outside the 42-hour block.

Dean Ganz commented that the key is not that they are outside the 42-hour block but that they are outside general education. Dean Young disputed this. The Chair said he believes the latest version of the CBHE document is up on the web.

### **Discussion of Post Tenure Review -- Dr. Mark Burkholder**

It was explained that Dr. Teresa Thiel, who chairs the System-wide committee on post tenure review, was attending a forum on the issue at UM-Kansas City and could not be present at the UM-St. Louis Faculty Senate meeting.

Dr. Burkholder reminded Faculty Senators that we have post tenure review without the label (i.e., Executive Guideline No. 27), which was set in place by President Emeritus George Russell in 1993. We have a policy that does not involve faculty in the recommendation for dismissal. There have been innumerable e-mails concerning the proposed draft. The committee is scheduled to meet next Monday to discuss this input. He stressed that we are talking about a draft, not a final document.

Dr. Joseph Martinich stated that the campus needs to decide whether or not it wants to take a vote supporting this version of the document and, if so, whether the vote should come from the Faculty Senate or from the Faculty as a whole. Dr. R. Rocco Cottone proposed that the vote could come from both bodies. Dr. Martinich recommended against taking a vote at more than one place. He reported that President Pacheco was confused by the two voices he heard in the past from the Faculty Council and the Senate.

Dr. Zarucchi opposed a vote. She commented that a decision of this magnitude affects the permanent employment status of every faculty employee, every student on this campus, and every employee. It would be unfair, she said, to ask people to take a vote on something that has been publicly declared a draft and that has been submitted without any recognition that IFC members or campus members are even guaranteed any input in the process. President Pacheco has stated very clearly, she added, that he will receive recommendations but has not promised that he will accommodate those recommendations to any extent. Further, the President has not indicated that there will be a final version that he will circulate for approval on the four campuses. Dr. Zarucchi commended the committee for doing a very good job in preparing the document.

Dr. Martinich responded by saying that we wouldn't have to vote on the draft. We could endorse or not endorse the recommendation that the System-wide task force makes, rather than what the President ultimately decides. He noted that the Faculty almost never decide anything; what we decide in St. Louis, Columbia, Kansas City, or Rolla, are merely recommendations to our respective chancellors or to the President, and they and the Board always have the opportunity to change those recommendations, and often do.

Dr. William Long commented that if there is to be a vote on this matter, it should come from full-time regular faculty, not the Faculty Senate.

The Chair remarked that the President told the System-wide committee that he wanted whatever it came up with to closely conform to the AAUP statement on this subject.

In response to a question from Dr. Martinich, Dr. Long said he is proposing that this issue be voted on by regular faculty.

Dr. Martinich moved that within 30 days after submission of the System-wide committee's final recommendation there be a referendum of all regular faculty on this campus. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Burkholder reminded senators that they are the elected faculty governance body. The way the Faculty Senate is constituted means that every department on campus is represented and that the Faculty at large had the opportunity to elect other faculty members, as well. One of the great concerns about this document was that the majority of the discussion has really not been related to the proposal that has been made. It was related to the issue which the Committee was not charged to address, namely, should there be post tenure review. We have post tenure review in the frame of Executive Guideline No. 27. Despite the 48 percent absentee rate at the meeting, Dr. Burkholder



suggested that the Faculty Senate is more attuned and informed -- and may have actually read the documents involved -- than the entire Faculty. Dr. Burkholder said that he brought the issue up to his colleagues in the History Department, and he expressed hope that all elected Senate representatives are having such conversations with their colleagues. He spoke in favor of having the vote come from the Faculty Senate and against Dr. Martinich's motion.

Dr. Zarucchi favored the Martinich motion. Dr. Paul Speck opposed it, persuaded by Dr. Burkholder's argument that the Faculty Senate is the elected representative body. Dr. E. Terrence Jones also endorsed Dr. Burkholder's position, noting the deliberative character of the Faculty Senate. One of the difficulties with a referendum is that it only offers two options: yes or no. In the Senate we could endorse the document in part and withhold approval from other parts, added Dr. Jones. Dr. Long agreed that the Senate is a deliberative body and a representative body but, he said, we have redefined faculty. The Senate is not the appropriate place to vote. Over half the people in his School are academic non-regulars. They elected Dr. Long, and he feels he has to represent them. Dr. Jones said he believes that the non-regulars do have a stake in this as it relates to the quality of the Faculty overall.

Dean Ganz asked what we are voting on. Dr. Burkholder said that if a vote were taken by the Faculty Senate, a yes vote would indicate the draft by the committee is preferable to the existing policy. A no vote would indicate the desire to continue Executive Guideline No. 27 as the ruling document.

Dr. Nasser Arshadi called the question. The question was approved. Dr. William Long called for a quorum.

Dr. Burkholder noted that there were more than the 21 voting members necessary for a quorum. The Faculty Senate then voted on the Martinich motion. One Faculty Senator voted in favor of the motion; 2 Faculty Senators opposed the motion; and 19 Faculty Senators abstained.

Dr. Martinich then moved to amend his previous motion so that, within 30 days of submission of the final draft of the document, there is a vote of the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded. In response to a comment from a Faculty Senator, Dr. Martinich clarified that the spirit of his motion was that the Faculty Senate would deliberate and vote on the proposed post tenure review document. The motion carried without dissent.

Completing the business at hand, the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan M. Arban  
Faculty Senate Assistant (in the absence of the Secretary)