

**Minutes of the Meeting of the
University of Missouri-St. Louis
Faculty Senate
December 9, 2014- 3 p.m.
202 JCPenney**

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by the Senate Chair, Dr. Keith Stine. Dr. Stine asked for approval of the minutes from the meeting on Nov. 11, 2014. The minutes were approved as written.

Report of the Chairperson (Dr. Keith Stine):

Chair Stine reported information about the following topics:

- The Board of Curators will hold their meeting on the UMSL campus this week on December 11 and 12 in the MSC Century Rooms. On December 12, the Faculty Senate will host a breakfast with the curators. This year's theme for the breakfast presentation will be the SUCCEED program.
- Dr. Stine explained that last year the Senate Office was contacted by Student Affairs to organize a fun event for students and faculty as part of the Homecoming activities. Last year's Senate Chair Chris Spilling agreed and the chili cook-off competition was begun. The Senate has agreed to sponsor the event again this year. The chili competition will be held on Feb. 18 from 11:30 – 1:30 in the MSC Century Rooms. The deans have been asked to submit their college's favorite chili recipe for the competition. Sodexo Catering will prepare five varieties of chili from the recipes submitted by the colleges. The cost of the chili lunch will be \$5 and participants will vote for their favorite chili. All proceeds will go to the Pagedale Family Support Center. The college with the winning chili will receive the "Golden Ladle" trophy. (Last year's winner was the combined entry from the College of Nursing and Optometry.) The Senate will also be asking for faculty volunteers to help serve the chili.
- Dr. Stine reminded the senators to submit nominations for the UM System President's awards. He encouraged them to make nominations before the deadline of January 30, 2015.

Report of the Chancellor (Dr. Thomas George):

- Chancellor George reported that the Board of Curators will be voting on the proposal for UMSL's potential purchase of the Normandie Golf Course at the closed session on Thursday. Chancellor George also reported that Curator Goode, Curator Downing and Curator Bradley all have terms that expire as of Jan. 1, 2015. Curator David Steelman is the newest member of the Board and will represent Rolla.
- Chancellor George announced that he is implementing a hiring freeze that includes full-time faculty and staff positions. He explained that the on-campus fall student numbers – while up slightly – were lower than expected. The spring registrations are actually showing a decrease at this time. The result of this and other factors is that the campus budget currently is trending toward an estimated \$2 million shortfall for the fiscal year that ends June 30. There will be some exceptions to the hiring freeze. The positions will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Chancellor George addressed the questions of the faculty regarding the hiring freeze.

Appointments, Tenure, & Promotion (ATP) Committee Report (Dr. Patty Parker):

Dr. Parker presented the proposed changes to the UMSL ATP Guidelines as follows:

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
[p.2] Response Options: at each stage of the process when a recommendation is placed in the candidate's Dossier, the candidate shall have seven calendar days from the date of receipt to review the materials and to submit a response. The candidate may: (1) submit a written response; or (2) withdraw from consideration, in writing, thereby waiving any right to further review, reconsideration, or appeal for that cycle.	Response Options: at each stage of the process when a recommendation is placed in the candidate's Dossier, the candidate shall have seven calendar days from the date of receipt to review the materials and to submit a response. The candidate may: (1) submit a written response if desired ; or (2) withdraw from consideration, in writing, thereby waiving any right to further review, reconsideration, or appeal for that cycle.	Clarification. Some candidates interpreted the rules to mean that they must submit a written response even for a positive decision.

The Faculty Senate voted unanimously in favor of the above change.

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
[p. 2 under Response Options] At the Unit level the candidate's Dossier is not forwarded until there is a response from the candidate, or seven calendar days pass with no response. At other levels, the Dossier may be forwarded to the next level of review prior to receipt of a response from the candidate, but shall not be evaluated at the next level of review until a response has been received, or seven calendar days have elapsed. Any response should be addressed to the Chancellor, but sent to the next level of review, unless otherwise noted. The individual at the next level of review is responsible for sending copies of the candidate response to all earlier levels of review.	At the Unit level the candidate's Dossier is not forwarded until there is a response from the candidate, or seven calendar days pass with no response. At other levels, the Dossier may be forwarded to the next level of review prior to receipt of a response from the candidate, but shall not be evaluated at the next level of review until a response has been received, or seven calendar days have elapsed. Any response should be addressed to the Chancellor, but sent to the next level of review, unless otherwise noted. The individual at the next level of review is responsible for including the letter in the dossier and sending copies of the candidate response to all earlier levels of review.	Clarification. The instruction to address the chancellor confused the issue of who should receive the letter and include it in the dossier.

The Faculty Senate voted unanimously in favor of the above change.

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
<p>[p. 4 under I.2.b.] A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must include supporting evidence that the individual's contributions have had an impact on the discipline; that is, the research should have made a significant contribution to knowledge that is recognized by professional colleagues. One common method of documenting such impact is through outside evaluations by authorities in the field. The most relevant letters of evaluation usually are written by disinterested experts who are recognized nationally and internationally for their own achievements. Because they may be biased, letters from former students, departmental colleagues, research collaborators, or former mentors should be used sparingly, if at all, and under no circumstances should the number of such reviewers exceed the number of wholly independent external evaluators; when such letters are submitted, an explanation of the personal relationship should be included.</p>	<p>A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must include supporting evidence that the individual's contributions have had an impact on the discipline; that is, the research should have made a significant contribution to knowledge that is recognized by professional colleagues. One common method of documenting such impact is through outside evaluations by authorities in the field. The most relevant letters of evaluation usually are written by disinterested experts who are recognized nationally and internationally for their own achievements. Because they may be biased, letters from former students, departmental colleagues, research collaborators, or former mentors should be used sparingly, if at all, and under no circumstances should the number of such reviewers exceed the number of wholly independent external evaluators; when such letters are submitted, an explanation of the personal relationship should be included.</p> <p><u>If the candidate's dossier includes collaborative research, the Ad Personam committee may seek information on the nature and extent of the candidate's collaboration. Normally, a letter from a collaborator should address only the nature and extent of the collaboration without including an evaluation of the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.</u></p>	<p>The current instructions discourage the solicitation of letters from research collaborators, which conflicts with actual practice by disciplines that customarily solicit letters from research collaborators, which deal only with the nature of the collaboration. The new wording reflects actual practice.</p>

The Faculty Senate voted unanimously in favor of the above change.

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
[p. 13 under 3. The Dean of the School or College] The Dean shall review the candidate's Dossier and shall prepare a written recommendation. In preparing her or his recommendation, the Dean may consult with the Unit Committee, members of the faculty individually, form an advisory committee, and/or confer with persons at other institutions or organizations. However, any new information solicited by the Dean must be made part of the candidate's Dossier. The Dossier is forwarded with the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.	The Dean shall review the candidate's Dossier and shall prepare a written recommendation. In preparing her or his recommendation, the Dean may consult with the Unit Committee, members of the faculty individually, form an advisory committee, and/or confer with persons at other institutions or organizations. However, any new information solicited by the Dean must be made part of the candidate's Dossier. <u>When this information is considered, an explanation of how and why it was solicited should be included in the recommendation.</u> The Dossier is forwarded with the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.	This adds the same rigor to the Dean's collection of information that is required of the ad personam committee in its report.

The Faculty Senate voted unanimously in favor of the above change.

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
[p. 8 under III.A.2] A comprehensive performance review of all tenure-track faculty shall be conducted at the midpoint of their probationary period at UM-St. Louis. The Unit Committee, consisting of all qualified faculty members (i.e., those 11 holding tenure and, in cases involving promotion, rank higher than the individual under review), shall conduct this review. Faculty under review shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Unit Committee and to submit material that she or he believes should be reviewed by the Committee.	A comprehensive performance review of all tenure-track faculty shall be conducted <u>at the midpoint</u> in the third year of their probationary period at UM-St. Louis. The Unit Committee, consisting of all qualified faculty members (i.e., those holding tenure and, in cases involving promotion, a rank higher than the individual under review), shall conduct this review. <u>The Unit Committee may solicit outside reviews as appropriate.</u> Faculty under review shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Unit Committee and to submit material that she or he believes should be reviewed by the Committee.	Simpler wording achieves the same meaning. Legitimizes the possibility of sending out the dossier for outside review at the third-year point if departments so desire.

The Faculty Senate had concerns regarding the change in the first sentence. It was suggested that it could read: "A comprehensive performance review of all tenure-track faculty shall be conducted at the midpoint (commonly in the third year) of their probationary period at UM-St. Louis." The Senate voted unanimously on the motion to refer this change back to the ATP Committee for revision.

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
<p>[p. 9 under III.B] B. Who is to have a complete tenure and/or promotion review</p> <p>In the spring the Provost will establish a schedule for reviews to be conducted during the following academic year. Each year Units will determine which faculty members are to be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion during the coming academic year based on the following guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Untenured regular faculty who will be in their sixth year of service creditable towards tenure must, in the sixth year, go through a complete tenure and promotion review. 2. Untenured regular faculty who were appointed at the associate or full professor rank without tenure must go through a complete tenure review no later than their fourth year of service at UM-St. Louis. 3. A Unit may recommend an Associate Professor for promotion at any time. In cases when the Unit has not acted sooner, Associate Professors are entitled, at their written request, to go through the full promotion process after their fifth year in rank and at least three years after their most recent request. 	<p>B. Who is to have a complete tenure and/or promotion review</p> <p>In the spring the Provost will establish a schedule for reviews to be conducted during the following academic year. Each year Units will determine which faculty members are to be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion during the coming academic year based on the following guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Untenured regular faculty who will be in their sixth year of service creditable towards tenure must, in the sixth year, go through a complete tenure and promotion review. 2. Untenured regular faculty who were appointed at the associate or full professor rank without tenure must go through a complete tenure review no later than their fourth year of service at UM-St. Louis. 3. <u>In accordance with Section 310.035B. of the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri, the Chancellor may grant a maximum of two one-year extensions during the probationary period.</u> 4. A Unit may recommend an Associate Professor for promotion at any time. In cases when the Unit has not acted sooner, Associate Professors are entitled, at their written request, to go through the full promotion process after their fifth year in rank and at least three years after their most recent request. 	<p>To make the written procedures consistent with practice, it seems reasonable to mention the possibility of a postponement of the tenure review.</p>

4. A Unit Committee may grant the opportunity to other regular faculty to go through a complete tenure and/or promotion review in any annual cycle. Untenured regular faculty who are put forward prior to their sixth year of service creditable toward tenure and who are not awarded tenure may be considered again in their sixth year under conditions of III.B.1.	5. A Unit Committee may grant the opportunity to other regular faculty to go through a complete tenure and/or promotion review in any annual cycle. Untenured regular faculty who are put forward prior to their sixth year of service creditable toward tenure and who are not awarded tenure may be considered again in their sixth year under conditions of III.B.1.	
---	---	--

The Faculty Senate voted unanimously in favor of the above change.

Non Tenure-Track (NTT) MyGateway Site (Dr. Lynn Staley):

Dr. Lynn Staley explained that Non Tenure-Track faculty members have inquired about having a forum established as a means for them to discuss their interests and concerns. In response to the NTT faculty request, Dr. Staley discussed the matter with Senate Chair Keith Stine. It was suggested that a MyGateway site be created to address this request. Dr. Staley announced that she is working on the creation of the site and will provide more information to the NTT faculty as soon as the site is organized. Any suggestions or questions can be directed to Dr. Staley.

Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) Report (Dr. Keith Stine):

Dr. Stine reported that the IFC met on November 13, 2014 and discussed the following topics:

- The IFC received an update on the retirement plan. An informational session was provided on how investments are managed in the retirement plan. The IFC was told that UM System's investments are in better health than other states.
- Members of the IFC had a discussion about academic titles in extension. This topic was of bigger concern at UM Columbia's campus due to the academic titles for agricultural specialists. At UMSL, it might affect faculty with clinical appointments.
- Dr. Stine reminded the Senate that he serves as the UMSL representative on the Title IX Subcommittee. The subcommittee is working on revising the collected rules for Title IX offenses related to faculty. UM System President Wolfe hopes to have these rules approved at the February Board of Curators meeting.
- Dr. Stine updated the Senate on the lawsuit from the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). Some time ago NCTQ submitted a Sunshine Law request for syllabi from faculty members in Colleges of Education (and in areas of related coursework) on our four campuses. UM System maintained that syllabi are the intellectual property of the faculty members who develop them. The Missouri Supreme Court declined to hear the appeal.

- Dr. Stine reported that the new software system called MyVITA which will replace the Faculty Accomplishment System (FAS) is not expected to be ready for use this academic year. MS&T are working with it on a trial basis. There are concerns about how data will be transferred from FAS to MyVITA which has delayed the implementation of this new system.
- The Ability to Work Document that was reviewed by the Senate earlier in the Fall was endorsed by the IFC. The IFC recommended that the document be reviewed again in a year to see if there were any issues that came up related to its implementation.

Curriculum and Instruction Committee Report (Mr. Michael Allison):

Mr. Allison presented the following program proposals:

- Addition of the Undergraduate Certificate in Criminology and Criminal Justice
- Change in the B.A. in Criminology and Criminal Justice
- Change in the Minor in Environmental Studies
- Change in the undergraduate requirements for Physics
- Change of the Ph.D. in Political Science

The Senate approved all of the above proposals.

Executive Session:

The honorary degree procedures and the suggested guidelines for selecting honorary degree recipients were reviewed. The Senate met in Executive Session to consider candidates nominated to receive honorary degrees.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Keefer
Senate/Assembly Secretary

(Minutes written by Loyola Harvey, Faculty Senate/University Assembly Office)