

Faculty Senate Minutes
Thursday, December 5, 2019, Alumni House 2:34 PM

I. Attendance

B. Lynch, K. Armbruster, J. Bohus, P. Davis, S. Jensen, J. Lassetter, KK Pease (via telephone), L. Risik, D. Smith, D. Stiles.

II. Approval of Minutes - All

*Upon motion by J. Lassetter, seconded by J. Bohus, the Senate unanimously approved the minutes of the **November 21, 2019** Faculty Senate meeting.*

III. President's Report - Bill Lynch

- a. B. Lynch stated that the passing of former Dean, Peter Sargent, is not only difficult for the Webster community, but also difficult on an entire global network. No plans have been set yet, but there are plans forthcoming to celebrate his life.
- b. B. Lynch reported that he attended an Administrative Council meeting wherein the discussion centered on distribution lists and who owns them.
- c. B. Lynch said he attended the President's Council meeting where it was discussed that the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness are compiling data concerning why students leave Webster University. Through the help of STARFISH, they are tracking retention rates. The current Strategic Plan has retention from the first to second years reaching 82% by the year 2020. There are a small number of students who are reporting that they will be 'taking a break' from school next semester. There are approximately 250 students with outstanding balances over \$7,000. There are less than 250 students with no holds, are not taking a break and are not registered for next semester. Part of the debt issue is due to grades of incomplete being carried over multiple semesters and being charged for the classes. Many of these students could be served well if advisors were proactive in registering them.

IV. Old Business

- a. OPEN Faculty Senate Committee Seats - there continues to be approximately nine (9) open seats as seen in **Attachment A**.
- b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee - Recommends reducing the minimum number of credit hours in order to graduate with a Bachelor's degree from 128 to 120 hours. (**Attachment B, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee supporting documentation is available upon request**)

Senator D. Smith moved that the Senate approve reducing the minimum number of credits for an undergraduate degree from 128 hours to 120 hours for all undergraduate degree programs.

The Faculty Senate unanimously approved a motion by S. Jensen, seconded by L. Risik, that the Undergraduate Catalog be amended to state that the minimum number of credit hours to graduate with a Bachelor's degree be reduced from 128 to 120 hours. Senators Glasgow and Reilly voted affirmatively by proxy vote.

After voting, the Senate commenced in discussion concerning the financial ramifications of this change as well as how it will affect certain programs.

The Senate recognizes that there may be revenue risks regarding this change, but it is most beneficial to the students. The Senate recommends that Rick Meyer and John Pyle gather research concerning this decision. Programs will have to be discussed within their departments concerning how to proceed in adjusting their course offerings due to the credit hour reduction.

The credit hour change will more than likely occur beginning with the Fall 2020 catalog.

- c. Restructuring utilizing the Eckel Article (*Attachment C*) - K. Armbruster
Senator Armbruster recognized that the article aligns with her ideas concerning advancing Webster University. Both Eckel and Senator Armbruster believe that strategic planning is limited in its usefulness. She is pleased that the Webster leadership administration is utilizing this article in making decisions about Webster's future.
- d. Senate Response to Emeritus letter (*Attachment D*)

The Faculty Senate unanimously approved a motion by S. Jensen, seconded by J. Lassetter, to amend the draft as proposed and forward to the Professor Emeriti in response to their letter to the Senate dated November 27, 2019. Senators Glasgow and Reilly voted affirmatively by proxy vote.

President Lynch and Vice President Pease will decide how to distribute the letter to the Emeriti.

- e. Compensation Conclusions - S. Jensen
In the conclusions of the 2012-2013 Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee, professors are to be compensated for teaching extra hours up to 6 hours only.

President Lynch would like this matter placed on the next meeting's agenda in January for further discussion as this matter will more than likely have to go through the Salary and Fringe Committee.

V. **2020 Fall Faculty Institute**

The Senate unanimously agreed to cancel the reservation previously secured for Oct 2-3, 2020 at Pere Marquette Conference Center as there was little interest in attending the 2019 Fall Institute at Pere Marquette. C. Guehring will cancel this reservation and the Senate is aware that there is a \$250 cancellation fee.

C. Guehring will conduct research concerning some new venues that were discussed and report on them at the next meeting.

The Faculty unanimously approved a motion by S. Jensen, seconded by L Risik, to adjourn the Senate meeting at 3:50 PM.

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE OPEN SEATS

Faculty Senate: SOE, end May 2021

At-Large, end May 2021

GCP: SOE, end May 2022

Honors Board: AT-LARGE, end May 2022

Undergrad Curriculum: SOE, ending May 2021

Speakers: AT-LARGE, end may 2020

Academic Program Review: SOC - Terry Sullivan is an ADJUNCT

AT-LARGE, end May 2020 or 2021

AT-LARGE, Aaron Aubuchon is an **ADMIN**

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stephanie Schroeder <schroeds@webster.edu>

Date: November 19, 2019 at 5:16:18 PM CST

Subject: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Recommendation for minimum credit hours for undergraduate degrees

Bill

The Webster University Faculty Senate charged the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to make a recommendation regarding the minimum credits required to award academic Undergraduate Degrees as outlined below:

Resolved: The Faculty Senate charges the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to make a recommendation to the Senate regarding the minimum credits required to award academic Undergraduate Degrees (B.S., B.A., B.M., B.S.N., B.F.A., B.M.Ed.). The Faculty Senate recognizes that some degrees may require more than the University minimum requirement depending upon design of degree and degree title, and may be reflected in the committee recommendation; however, that should not affect a recommendation regarding University Undergraduate Policy.

We have discussed this recommendation thoroughly and have considered data/information provided from Academic Affairs, Academic Advising and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Members of the committee have consulted with colleagues in their schools/colleges. I am attaching files that were shared with the committee to provide to the Faculty Senate. Kylie McCool (Academic Advising) and Justin Bitner (OIE) provided their powerpoint presentation that they made to the committee on Nov 5, 2019. Data from Academic advising and OIE as far as number of credit hours/major, 1 credit hour courses and the time to milestones for Webster undergraduate students are also attached.

In today's meeting, the members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee voted unanimously (8 members present of the 11 member committee) to recommend to the Faculty Senate that the minimum number of credit hours required to award academic Undergraduate degrees at Webster University be lowered to 120 credit hours.

Please let us know if you have any questions

Best

Stephanie and David

Stephanie C. Schroeder, PhD
Dept of Biological Sciences
Chair of Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences
Webster University
Phone(314)246-7518
email: schroeds@webster.edu

<120128CH.pptx>

<AH-01014_TimetoMilestone_Hellerud_JB_11052019.xlsx>

<AH-01017 Undergraduate 1-Credit Hour Course Analysis_KM cCool_LB_10 292019.pdf>

<CC Data - 2019-2020 UG Majors with Required Hours.pdf>

<Program Requirements - A National Survey(I).pdf >

<US News 2020 Benchmarking Institutions.pdf>


WEBCAST

Modernizing the Workforce

October 30, 2019 | Wednesday | 2 P.M. ET

REGISTER

INSIDE HIGHER ED



#Views (/views) #Opinion (/Views)

8111Jrmt1views/2019/02/14/colleges-need-rethink-strateg

Stop Planning!

Colleges and universities would be better served by focusing on the other half of strategic planning the strategy. Peter Eckel and Cathy Trower argue

By [Peter Eckel and Cathy Trower](#)

// February 14, 2019

COMMENTS

(Y.HF).isiz!!llllW & QQJ.L.E:

NEED RETHINK:

STRATEGIC-PLANNING:

QffllON*JISQUSTHR!All) <>

Sma,l
Succinct and
Strategic Plann
an Age of Unce

f, grade for adm1n1 tr.1to1
and of f a: college ond

INSIDE
HIGHER ED

Purch



[https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_vfill_large/public/media\(0.g.:ellil:2!ganization-of-ll!.K.:Qrtll.mm!:-c\9_rk19JQf.Sll!i.,_Q.jpg?!Qll=-v_z1Jlrl w.\)](https://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_vfill_large/public/media(0.g.:ellil:2!ganization-of-ll!.K.:Qrtll.mm!:-c\9_rk19JQf.Sll!i.,_Q.jpg?!Qll=-v_z1Jlrl w.))

Certainly, strategic plans are important to accreditation institutions. Colleges and universities invest a tremendous amount of time and effort (holding many meetings with various constituent groups on and off campus 10 gau1 input) -- and some times also money (for consultants) - in their strategic plans. Once finished, there is great fanfare and publicity, often around the plan's creative name and new, bold priorities. Plans appear in highly visible places on websites. Institutions hold retreats, often over many days, to talk about plan implementation and progress. They design and put in place new data systems to track progress and create elaborate metrics and key performance indicators. And all the while, those who lead the planning process can be heard say "this plan will not sit on the shelf (this time)."

Yet despite all this investment of time and resources, few strategic plans enjoy strong consensus that they're meaningful and have a real impact on the trajectory of the college or university.


Too often strategic plans fall short of serving as a guiding light for the future. Some are triumphs of form (or

COLLEGE PAGES

College Name

Featured college pages

9J
Y.2ffil!!H
g
(college
state-co




</college/218520/piedmont-te>

POPULAR RIGHT NOW

...ordsm,thing)over subsance. T11elr eyptoms ol enare expecte d. and they sha e much in common with those > of s1m1lar, but also d1ss1m1lar. Institutions "Educate students for the global 21st century," anyone? How about "Produce cutt11g-edge research?"

So, f the results are less than-mpac tfl1l, then why do we invest so much ,n strateg- planning? Trustees and faculty members wonder what all the fuss was about why the> process was so t'me-consuming and arduous and why, ,n the end the work see>ms to havs> had so rttfe re ,l impact

The solution. tried and tr ed aga n, 011 most camplses ,s to improve plann ng efforts to create tter strategic plans Involve more people, develop new metrics, lure different consultants. have leaders say earlier, ,n the process that- 111 splan wll not sit on the shelf" But what 1f 1mprovlngplann ng is the wrong focus? Maybe nst, tutions would be better served by focus ng on the othesr half or strategic planning the strategy

Why Strategy, Not Planning

A concern, ,on on str;tegy rrrnght help institutions oper:,i f e more efficiently. m: i e smarter choices amono compet, ng prlontles and set the course for a sustainable future Dunning a recent wo, kshop on strategy (and not plan 11 ng), the following exchange occurred between an experienced administrator and one of us -1 ve been 11wolved 111 three different strategic planning efforts at my institution And with each one we get better,' she said. "Great- we s, 11d, 'but better at what? Better as an 1nst11 ut on or better at plannl ngr Her reply, sheepishly. "Ah, believ at planning-

As she realized during ths exchange tile real obiecuve shouldn't be to mprove planning, but rather to improve the inst1 tut1 on t1 nd pos1 11 on It for success 111 the long run Given the demands on campuses and the complex1 tes that .icadem1 c leaders face, might ,nstitutions be better served by lookmg at the future through some new lenses rather than remvesung 111 yet another round of s1m1lar work? Thus- we have the title of ths essay (wh ch1s an ntent. onaf overstatc me, t. as we w, 11 expla , below)

Strategy, as a concept. sits between m ss, on and operational plans. And historically In higher education, it has been overlooked uicnversation about each. An institutional mission statement says why a college or university ex sts. 11, ; the purpose The better ones convey particular actions with respect to target audiences as well as articulate outcomes. Strategy s the pathway to dehve, on that mlsson It is the game plan that cont:,i, ns answe, s to key questions, such ns in what arenas will you engage (undergraduate, graduate, health care. humanities, liberal arts, professional. local, national. globa. l adult trad1 c1 onal age, etc) and how will you succeed? Operations are the steps to ,mplemer i strategy and therefore dehvE' f on them ss10n Too many university strmeg- plans are mostly outc omes or ideals (or unfunded -wish lists") with O\lt an art.: Culat ion of s1rategy.

Strategy has numerous defin.tions, and those peoples who work on strategy in other settings l ke health care or the corpo1ate sector often disagree on its meaning. But what is clear across many competing defm, rons is thE ll strategy- 1) 1s the hnk between mission and the realities of the external. competitive marketplace, 2) is about choices associated w11h organizational d- rection and 3) d, ffrs from operations. The problem with many college and university strateg c plans is that they do not arttulate choices; they are internally, not externally focused, and are muddied by operations While inportont operot, oni: Jl prorr11ies .>re r, e quently advanced m traditional strategic plans - such as creating a finanl' lly sustainable business model. leveraging technology or growing enrollments - they are not strategy. Strategy s the purpose for which you will *be* taking these operational steps Operations address how to do things right. whereas sttiitegy, s about the right things to do.

Articulating the> right things to do is difficult work. Roger Marr l, former dean of the business school at the L1 mvtirstly of Toronto, has a wonderful test about plans versus strategy. He argues t1 at you do not have an effective strategy 1f you and your competitors nre doing the silme things. S1rategy exists if some competitors choose different. 1f not opposite. p. iths Therefore>. if the opposite of your strategic cho, ces looks stupid, then all competitors are going to have pretty much the same strategy as you. doing you little good

[i.l.l.lge finds that Harvard not discriminate against Asran](#)
(<http://www.IOSdehlgooe uidge-finds-haryards- d1scnm1nate-aq l>)

[How instructors have shaRfill.1](#)
([http://www. !Jy!:irn;I J. D, pr.o.gr.il.m; s1 r11 \(hnp //www.msidehi9hered.co1 _g/a!11cle.JZO _J 9/10/02/ht _ped-curricula-two-hvb1](http://www. !Jy!:irn;I J. D, pr.o.gr.il.m; s1 r11 (hnp //www.msidehi9hered.co1 _g/a!11cle.JZO _J 9/10/02/ht _ped-curricula-two-hvb1))

[Accreditation works for innova](#)
([http://www.r.l.o.WllQQt.O._h..Q:JeR.Qll.S!Y.!! \(hno://www.msldeh19hered.cor works-1nnovation-can-slow-1t-d1 m }](http://www.r.l.o.WllQQt.O._h..Q:JeR.Qll.S!Y.!! (hno://www.msldeh19hered.cor works-1nnovation-can-slow-1t-d1 m }))

[With S, !RP.Q!! fr9.JJt.K,i,p n.P. L!!](#)
([http://www.low-cost-edX.dear \(hnp.J/www.111s1dehtg _qtarde/20191101021s1 purdue:launches-low-cost-edx](http://www.low-cost-edX.dear (hnp.J/www.111s1dehtg _qtarde/20191101021s1 purdue:launches-low-cost-edx))

[70 Texas Students Accused of](#)
(<http://www.ns1deh1g texas-students-accused-cheau>)

[ative consequences f](#)
([\[New Federal Profile of Low-Inc\]\(#\)
\(\[http://www.federal-profile-low_ncome-stud\]\(http://www.federal-profile-low_ncome-stud\)\)](http://www.mel.P.0.9LfQt_STMfield$. (ClP..ir fu1to://www.ins.deh1g _consequences-RJQehne-metaru: o R!!!!QD))</p></div><div data-bbox=)

[Tulk!Le9Afor_ry....tor..Bi!11](#)
([http://www.Remarks \(burr. J/www.J.n'l'i:tlleh.Jgherer.J.i.:Qr .:mP.oers-cQntrovers1al-rerr](http://www.Remarks (burr. J/www.J.n'l'i:tlleh.Jgherer.J.i.:Qr .:mP.oers-cQntrovers1al-rerr))

[Kids in Class | Confessions of](#)
([http://www.insideh.g community.:f.Qlllege-dean/kids-<](http://www.geOean (http://www.insideh.g community.:f.Qlllege-dean/kids-<))

For example, the opposite of "performing high-impact research"? Provide some students with a transformational learning experience? Provide all students with a transformative experience or provide all students with less than transformational experience. While each opposite rarely occurs in practice, rarely are they listed as institutional goals. How well do the strategic choices in your institution's plan possess this opposition? (Most do not, but they generate a pretty good laugh.)

Furthermore, in higher education, the five-year plan is not the norm. Most strategic plans tend to adopt an artificial focus of five years (the bold ones aim for 10 years or more). What is magical about 60 months? Why should time matter more than other variables that might define strategy and its execution? (For some, the answer is simply five years of reprieve before they have to go through the planning process again.)

The environment for most universities is volatile and variable, not static and predictable; it is challenge dependent and not time dependent. Yet, most plans are time bound. Therefore, institutions either 1) revise their priorities and priorities as the world evolves during that five-year window or 2) ignore some (or most) of what is in their plans as they respond to new challenges and "urgent" opportunities. It's also common to hear someone say, "culture eats strategy for lunch (or break fast)." which is fine. But the more substantive the strategy meal, the better, yes?

The result for most institutions is that faculty members, administrators, trustees, alumni, and others spend a lot of time and energy developing documents that give incomplete directions. As the roads and conditions keep changing, calendars and universals may be better served by keeping an eye on the horizon rather than trying to follow turn-by-turn signs. Think compass, not map.

What might happen rather than developing and arguing over objectives, goals, timelines and key performance indicators, administrators, faculty members and trustees spent the time framing and asking a limited number of strategy-related questions? And once answering those, developing a series of operational plans to deliver on strategy, successful as linking budgets with priorities for the next two years? Separate products to serve distinct purposes.

A caveat: strategy questions, as the long-term to-do questions, are difficult to frame and to frame well if strategy were easy, every question would have a well-articulated and unpaired one.

New Approaches, Different Questions, Novel Outcomes

Strategy as a field may have a lot to offer colleges and universities. Drawing again on the work of a range of strategy thinkers, examples of potentially impactful questions include:

- What key objectives will best ensure that we fulfill our mission in the foreseeable future?
- Who are our key audiences and how are their needs and aspirations changing?
- How is the environment evolving and what does that mean for our competitive advantage?
- Who are our competitors - both traditional and nontraditional - and in what ways are they competing differently? How might we respond?
- What do we not do or consider not doing? What are the boundaries of our efforts? What criteria is used to demarcate what is inside and outside those boundaries?

In the end, as Manin and his colleagues suggest, strategy is fundamentally about answering two key questions: 1) Where to play, and 2) how to succeed. How well do higher education strategic plans provide answers to those deceptively simple questions?

Strategy Meets Shared Governance

Strategy is set and advanced by a collaborative effort. It is not the sole undertaking of faculty members, administrators or the board. The strategy that is pursued comes through collective and intentional efforts as well as through emergent

act1v1t1es by colleges, departments and even 1ndM dual faculty members Strategy 1s what we say we will do, but it also ,s about the cumulative effect of what we have done

Fo, intenuon[ll strategy formation, involving key sti.lkeholders is impo1tan1, if not essential. Strategy is a primary example of that inescapable interdependence- the [A/ IPS 1% 6 St:w-nwnt r,n Government](#)

(!lll P.i.J.L W.1.fij .1. ll.ll Qfg/rnP.2f1L:t l.emeQl-gQY rnmn8;QL g lb !!IQ3n_V.f i!i.lll) artfully framed over 50 years ago

Framing the right questions can help craft strategy, as those questions can energ,ze the collective will and creative 900d thinking ocross campus that 1s needed to address today's pressing ch,1llenges

For example, the University of Vermont's College of Education and Social Services brought together faculty members, administrators and staff members 10 articulate its strategy. That included adopting a system to address problems in education, human development, counseling and social work; focusing on the people, ploces and history of Vermont (the vermoot!Jistinction); and p<ioritizing its impact on a diverse, globalized society. Those elements answer the college's "where to play" question.

But other strategy emerges from the work on cam1>uses. pa1ticularly among the faculty Institutions should recognize that strategy can be created from consistencies and synergies across efforts, and need not always come from a formal strategy-development process. At the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, the suite of executive programs is nkey stmgty. They we1e not created through a committee or market nalysis. Rathe1, they came<1 bout because a few savvy faculty members saw the need to offer a doctoral program in a new format in higher education management (the where-to-play deas1on). Once the program m higher education took root, others saw the potential for similarly structurE'd programs 1n school adm1111 strat1on, educc1t1on entrepreneurship, medical education and for chief learning officers Now they matter a good deal to the 1nstitut10n

To conclude, t11e title of this essay 1s a gross overstatement Institut1ons s1111 need pla1s They nPed plans to operauonalize their strategil.'s. A strategy without a plan may simply be a wish

But plans are not strategies. Institutions would be belier served to first start by 3r1 Jculating scatements of s ratygy and ct1en creating operational plans to deliver on those statements (see the University of Vermont's College of Education and Social Se,vices pa1hw<1ys in its illi.lflllling.<:;!Qr..U£00!

(lllls://www.uvm.edu/sites/defaultfiles/media/CESS.Slra.l.f.Qi.c.ã ruJ.J!@ J . These operational plans can decouple operations f1om st1a1egy, develop a sho<t-te,m (12- to 18-month) road map, and ensure g1eater agility and ,esponsiveness as needs arise and conditions change.

As we have said here, strategy is not planning. A focus on strategy is intended to help institutions experiment and take initiative, to 3sk questions and c,eate synergies, and to move institutions ahe<1 d in often unknown and unknowable environments. By framing different types of conversations as part of strategic planning efforts, our hope is that we can generate different, and more beneficial, outcomes from those processes.

Bio

Peter Eckel serves as senior fellow and director of leadership programs at the Affiance for Higher Education and Democracy in the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education. He co-directs the Penn Project on University Governance Cathy Trower is president of Trower & Trower Inc. (a governance consulting firm). This essay is based on a chapter in their new book, [Practical Wisdom: lblokmg Differently About CoUeje and Vrniversity Governancel:111 b- presswarehouse.com/Books/8 1wl..llllw<?produc110=5304J3\).](#)

Read more by [Pew Eckel](#) and [Cathy Trower](#)

Attachment D

November 27, 2019

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

Dear emeritus faculty colleagues,

The Faculty Senate is grateful for your letter of October 28, outlining your concerns with respect to the state of shared governance at Webster University. Your collective institutional knowledge, insights, and input are vital to our conversations and deliberations at this important moment in the life of our university.

Your letter validates and reinforces the concerns raised by faculty across the campus. Your letter articulates those concerns concisely, eloquently, and firmly.

We can assure you that all of these points and questions you have raised are being addressed fervently through general Senate meetings, Faculty Assembly meetings, and targeted Senate meetings with the senior administration and the Board Chair.

We thank you for your past and ongoing contributions to Webster University and will certainly keep you up to date on our progress.

Sincerely,

The Faculty Senate