

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**Thursday, November 21, 2019, Alumni House, 2:30 PM**

**I. Attendance**

B. Lynch, K. Armbruster, J. Bohus, L. Cuille, P. Davis, G. Glasgow, S. Jensen, J. Lassetter, J. Palmer, KK Pease, T. Reilly, L. Risik, D. Smith, D. Stiles.

**II. Approval of Minutes – All**

a. *Upon motion by J. Lassetter, seconded by G. Glasgow, the Senate unanimously approved, the minutes of the November 7, 2019 Faculty Senate meeting.*

**III. President's Report – Bill Lynch**

- a. B. Lynch reported that he attended the President's Council meeting wherein he was impressed with the Sophomore President of the Student Governance Association (SGA). In the past, the campus-wide subscription to the New York Times cost the SGA approximately \$20,000. By obtaining digital access to the New York Times for all faculty, staff and students in the amount of \$10,000 annually, he has saved the university money and increased exposure to the entire Webster community.
- b. B. Lynch explained that the President, Julian Schuster, functions under the by-laws of the Board of Trustees for Webster University. However, as no one has access to these by-laws, it is difficult to learn about their content and to verify statements made by the administration. B. Lynch thanks members of the community for reach out to the University Secretary about obtaining these by-laws. He, along with KK Pease, will continue trying to obtain access to the by-laws.
- c. B. Lynch reported that he was unable to secure a meeting with Board President Reeg prior to the holidays, partly due to the administration not wanting him to meet with the Senate alone. B. Lynch is going to continue to try to set a meeting with the Chancellor, President, President Reeg and KK Pease in order to move the discussion concerning shared governance forward.

**IV. Old Business**

- a. Senate Committee Open Seats: We need more people to step up, especially for the Academic Program Review Committee as terms have not been decided upon yet. When the Handbook language was initially written, term limits for the positions of this committee were left open with the idea that half of the committee's population should be reappointed at the end of this academic year and the other half at the end of 2020-2021.
- b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Recommendation/Future Actions:

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee unanimously approved the following recommendation:

*That the undergraduate catalog language for certificates be adjusted to be in line with the graduate catalog language. Namely, that the phrase "at least 18 credit hours" be removed.*

*The Senate unanimously approved a motion by S. Jensen, seconded by J. Bohus, to amend the University Catalog as proposed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee removing the language “at least 18 credit hours” concerning certificates.*

**The Senate will inform Academic Affairs that this language is to be amended .**

- c. Handbook Document concerning Service (*Attachment A*) – KKPease  
KK Pease explained this document is a harmonization of existing language in the University Handbook concerning faculty workload and what came out of discussions at the spring and fall Institutes of 2019. Much discussion ensued concerning this document and it was agreed that a few edits were necessary (*See Attachment B*).

*The Senate unanimously approved a motion by L. Risik, seconded by J. Lassetter, to replace the existing University Handbook language concerning Stated and Status-Track faculty work load with Attachment A as amended and edited pursuant to discussion and seen in final form as Attachment B.*

- d. Re-envisioning/Strategic Planning – B. Lynch  
President Lynch would like all Senators to read the Peter Eckel article again to be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.
- e. Future Fall Institute Locations/ideas – All  
President Lynch reports that we have Pere Marquette reserved for October 2 & 3, 2020 at this time. If we cancel, it must be done **no later than June 29, 2020** and we will owe another **\$250 in cancellation fees**. Please think about other venue possibilities and bring to the next meeting.

#### **IV.**

##### **Other Business**

- a. Compensation for extra work load and independent studies – S. Jensen  
S. Jensen reports that in his department, faculty are only paid for the first 6 hours of teaching and anything over that is done for no pay. He would like to know what is the university policy for teaching independent study classes and teaching over the normal workload.  
B. Lynch asks that everyone find out what the policy is in each of their respective colleges/schools and provide the Senate with written copies of these policies.
- b. Emeritus Letter (*Attachment C*) – All  
Discussion took place concerning whether the Senate should address and respond to the Emeritus letter received from select Emeriti concerning how the President and Provost positions were unilaterally changed to Chancellor and President. A Senator has volunteered to draft a letter that will be forwarded to President Lynch for review.
- c. Changing Departmental Curriculum – B. Lynch  
Curriculum changes should not be performed unilaterally by Deans or Chairs without approval from the faculty. If anyone knows of this happening, please contact President Lynch.

- d. Nominations for Selection Committees of the new Dean of Students and the new CFO – B. Lynch

President Lynch reports that he needs two nominees from the Senate to serve on the search committees for the Dean of Students and the CFO. One Senator for each committee.

S. Jensen nominated himself to serve on the search committee for Dean of Students.

President Lynch asks that others contact him if they wish to be on the search committee for the CFO.

- e. President Lynch reports that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has recommended that a change should be made so that students are only required to take 120 hours to graduate. He would like to act on this at the December 5 Senate meeting. I have information that I will be sending you in advance of the meeting.

***The Senate unanimously approved a motion by K. Armbruster, seconded by KK Pease, to adjourn the meeting at 3:50 PM.***

## V. Workload for Stated and Status-Track Faculty Policy Statement

Faculty appointments at Webster University entail a variety of interdependent activities; guidelines and expectations for those activities are explained below.

### A. Elements of Faculty Load

**Teaching and Advising:** Webster faculty should demonstrate genuine excellence — not just minimal competence — in teaching, generally defined as designing and conducting classes, evaluating assignments, and conferring with students.

All faculty are expected to:

- Submit grades by the due date.
- Meet classes as officially scheduled, making up missed classes and avoiding the canceling of classes, limiting cancelations to cases of illness, scheduled holidays, etc.
- Routinely review and update curriculum and syllabi.
- Develop new curricula.
- Assess and review their academic programs.
- Use technology to enhance instruction as appropriate.

Faculty are also expected to advise and counsel students. This may include formal advising, whether of first-year advisees or departmental majors, and the more informal advising and counseling that are associated with everyday teaching duties.

**Professional Development:** In order to be effective, professional educators and advance the mission of Webster University, faculty are expected to remain current and credentialed in their fields. Webster University recognizes that a “one size fits all” notion of professional development is not desirable; however, professional development should be verifiable. Thus, faculty in each academic discipline/department, in collaboration with the leadership of their schools/colleges, should define and communicate:

- Professional development expectations that conform to the university handbook.
- The activities that constitute discovery, integration, application, scholarship of teaching and learning within the discipline/department.
- The relative value of different kinds of professional development/research activities.

Based on these shared expectations, faculty should assess the success of professional development/research activities completed by faculty in their department/discipline.

In addition, discipline/department faculty are expected to create an environment of mentorship, support, and encouragement for scholarship, broadly defined; each department and/or disciplinary unit should provide faculty with space, time, and resources for professional development to the best of its ability, including advocating to the dean/administration for additional resources.

**Service:** Service to the university community (e.g., serving on Faculty Senate, Senate committees, university task forces, administrative searches) is an expected part of a status/status-track faculty member's load. Not only is it a requirement for Initial Status and Continuing Status as assessed by the Committee to Review Faculty, but it is also an integral component of the shared faculty governance instituted by the university as a whole. University service need not be in lieu of Departmental service, and conversely Departmental service is not a replacement for University service when it comes to assessing an individual with regard to Initial or Continuing Status. Though it may not be possible for an individual faculty member to make service contributions at the University level every year, a review of an individual faculty member's activities over the course of several years should show consistent and significant University service.

## **B. General Guidelines for Faculty Teaching Load**

In order to support teaching excellence and leave time and energy for professional development and service, a faculty member's course load should include no more than nine credit hours per semester, or, if teaching multiple sections of a course, no more than twelve credit hours in a semester. In no case should a faculty member teach more than six different three-hour course preparations or the equivalent per academic year.

In general, equity should be maintained in teaching assignments. Factors to consider when determining equity include:

- The number of different course preparations (not just number of class hours per week).
- Additional work required to introduce a new course or substantially revise an existing course.
- Extreme differences in scope and difficulty between courses due to issues such as the need for intensive consultation with students or an unusually large amount of grading.
- Class size (though a larger size does not always make a class more difficult to teach).

Grievances regarding teaching load should be addressed to department chairs. If

redress is not available from a chair, the faculty member should appeal to the Faculty Senate.

## **V. Workload for Stated and Status-Track Faculty Policy Statement**

Faculty appointments at Webster University entail a variety of interdependent activities; guidelines and expectations for those activities are explained below.

### **A. Elements of Faculty Load**

**Teaching and Advising:** Webster faculty should demonstrate genuine excellence — not just minimal competence — in teaching, generally defined as designing and conducting classes, evaluating assignments, and conferring with students.

All faculty are expected to:

- Submit grades by the due date.
- Meet classes as officially scheduled, making up missed classes and avoiding the canceling of classes, limiting cancelations to cases of illness, scheduled holidays, etc.
- Routinely review and update curriculum and syllabi.
- Develop new curricula.
- Assess and review their academic programs.
- Use technology to enhance instruction as appropriate.

Faculty are also expected to advise and counsel students. This may include formal advising, whether of first-year advisees or departmental majors, and the more informal advising and counseling that are associated with everyday teaching duties.

**Professional Development:** In order to be effective, professional educators and advance the mission of Webster University, faculty are expected to remain current and credentialed in their fields. Webster University recognizes that a “one size fits all” notion of professional development is not desirable; however, professional development should be verifiable. Thus, faculty in each academic discipline/department, in collaboration with the leadership of their schools/colleges, should define and communicate:

- Professional development expectations that conform to the university handbook.
- The activities that constitute discovery, integration, application, scholarship of teaching and learning within the discipline/department.
- The relative value of different kinds of professional development/research activities.

Based on these shared expectations, faculty should assess the success of professional development/research activities completed by faculty in their department/discipline.

In addition, discipline/department faculty are expected to create an environment of mentorship, support, and encouragement for scholarship, broadly defined; each department and/or disciplinary unit should provide faculty with space, time, and resources for professional development to the best of its ability, including advocating to the dean/administration for additional resources.

**Service:** Service to the university community (e.g., serving on Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees, university task forces, administrative searches) is an expected part of a status/status-track faculty member's load. Not only is it a requirement for initial status and continuing status as assessed by the Committee to Review Faculty, but it is also an integral component of the shared faculty governance instituted by the university as a whole. University service need not be in lieu of departmental service, and conversely departmental service is not a replacement for university service when it comes to assessing an individual with regard to initial or continuing status. Though it may not be possible for an individual faculty member to make service contributions at the university level every year, a review of an individual faculty member's activities over the course of several years should show consistent and significant university service.

## **B. General Guidelines for Faculty Teaching Load**

In order to support teaching excellence and leave time and energy for professional development and service, a faculty member's regular course load should include no more than nine credit hours per semester, or, if teaching multiple sections of a course, no more than twelve credit hours in a semester. In no case should a faculty member be required to teach more than six different three-hour course preparations or the equivalent per academic year.

In general, equity should be maintained in teaching assignments. Factors to consider when determining equity include:

- The number of different course preparations (not just number of class hours per week).
- Additional work required to introduce a new course or substantially revise an existing course.
- Extreme differences in scope and difficulty between courses due to issues such as the need for intensive consultation with students or an unusually large amount of grading.
- Class size (though a larger size does not always make a class more difficult to teach).

Grievances regarding teaching load should be addressed to department chairs. If redress is not available from a chair, the faculty member should appeal to the Faculty Senate.

October 27, 2019

To William Lynch, President, Faculty Senate

Kelly-Kate Pease, Vice President, Faculty Senate

Please share this letter of concern with the members of the Faculty Senate

Respectfully,

In alphabetical order

Professor Emeriti: James Brasfield, Donna Campbell, Kathy Corley, Dian Davitt, Susan Heady, Daniel Hellinger, James Quirk, Michael Salevouris, Meg Sempreora, Anne Schappe, Britt -M arie Schiller, Arthur Silverblatt



October 28, 2019

To the Faculty Senate

We are a group of emeritus faculty members. We wish to express concern about the state of shared governance at Webster, and the recent decision by the Board of Trustees to promote President Stroble to Chancellor and Provost Julian Schuster to President. We have served in various positions in the Webster governance system, and share a concern that such promotions at a time of declining enrollments and belt-tightening reflects a deterioration of the governance system.

The system of shared governance is a critical element of successful universities.

Shared governance principles were first developed by the American Association of University Professors in 1966, and later "commended" by The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and the American Council on Education (ACE) to their members. Times change, but the need for governance may be even greater today. An October 2012 article in the on-line journal of AGB observes:

Gone are the days of passive boards, imperial presidents, and militant faculties. Today, we want—and need—our boards to be active and involved, to participate in strategic and financial planning and in risk assessment. We want them to demand high standards and make data-driven decisions. At the same time, we need presidents who are strong but consultative, both visionary and strategic. And finally, to balance and constrain the potential exuberance of boards and presidents for inappropriate corporate-style governance, we need faculties that are committed to the success of their students and the stability of their institution.

The AGB article goes on to say that strong shared-governance can help universities deal with the strong challenges to faculty and staff morale and help keep presidents (and, presumably, chancellors) in touch with university constituencies. While in this case no additional compensation for top administrators was announced, it cannot fail to be noted by employees that these changes may mean down the road an even wider income gap between most of the staff and high-level management.

Both the University Handbook and the institutional history of shared-governance at Webster University have established procedures and precedents for the recruitment and selection of administrative leadership. For example, in the most recent administrative transition, the President resigned, and the Provost was named acting-President with a national search for a President in which the acting President was a candidate. There had not been a position of Chancellor. When the Board selected an outside candidate to be the new President, they decided to name the acting-President as Chancellor as a presidential advisor for a transition period. Thus, Webster had the benefit of the experience of the acting-President (former Provost) as well as the fresh view of the incoming President. In a short time, a new Provost was selected as a result of a national search.

The concept of a national search with faculty participation for the process of selecting major administrators (as well as faculty and deans) is an integral part of procedures inherent in shared-governance at Webster University, and across higher education. This principle is critical not only for achieving diversity in leadership, but also assures the opportunity for new leaders with fresh ideas and new perspectives.

Does this new arrangement mean, then, that the Chancellor will exercise most of the current duties and role of the President, and the President will exercise most of the duties? It is not so clear that these changes constitute only a shift in title, not a change of roles. For example, are we correct to assume that the position of Provost will not be filled and does not need to be filled? Yet, it seems that there will be a separate Vice President for Academic Affairs; up to now that position was filled the Provost. Surely, choosing a new top academic officer surely requires a national search with faculty participation, a key element of shared-governance.

We are concerned that if the Chancellor someday would retire or move on, this title shift will result in the automatic designation of the current President into the role of President/Chancellor without the normal search process, followed subsequently in the appointment of a new Provost without the normal search.

Would this development be unfair to the new President? Without implying a judgment about the new President's role as Provost, we believe it is in the best long-term interest of Webster University to conduct the normal national search for a new President. The current (recently appointed) President could be a candidate, as was the case in the last transition. With faculty and community participation the Board would have more than one candidate for the permanent role of what is now Chancellor/President. The Board would choose between the experience of the incumbent and the opportunity for a new perspective and fresh voice.

Major organizational leadership positions are not lifetime appointments. Corporate CEOs, University presidents, and baseball managers often move on for reasons not entirely of their making. Institutional shifts and environmental changes cause boards to seek fresh perspectives and new approaches. A guarantee of leadership succession with a national search is not healthy for any organization.

Many of us were at Webster when a previous board decided initially to launch a search for a new president without faculty participation. We protested that decision and pointed out that we regarded the University Handbook as binding on this issue. We worked that out with the Board and enjoyed positive relations subsequently. We think that a clear message from faculty to the Administration and to the Board could produce a common understanding for the future selection of someone to fill the President/Chancellor role.

While we are not widely distributing it, Senators may consider this a public letter and share it as they see fit.

Respectfully,

In alphabetical order

James Brasfield, Donna Campbell, Kathy Corley, Dian Davitt, Susan Heady, Daniel Hellinger, James Quirk, Michael Saleavouris, Meg Sempreora, Anne Schappe, Britt-Marie Schiller, Arthur Silverblatt