

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**March 7, 2013**

Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, Presiding

**Members Present:** Glen Bauer, Mary Bevel, Carla Colletti, Susan Heady, Sally Howald, Don Conway-Long, Victoria McMullen, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Marty Smith, Xiaoyuan Suo, Roy Tamashiro, Emily Thompson, Carole Tucker

**Announcements**

The March 21<sup>st</sup> Faculty Senate meeting has been cancelled due to no additional business. If there is pressing business that needs to be handled, Ralph will meet with the Senate prior to or directly following the March 22<sup>nd</sup> Spring Institute.

There will be two more Faculty Senate meetings that were not on the original schedule. Those dates are May 2<sup>nd</sup> and a business lunch on May 9<sup>th</sup>.

Ralph stated that regarding the University Policy Handbook the following has been completed:

- 1) Accessibility Committee language has been updated.
- 2) Institutional Review Board language has been updated.
- 3) Global Citizenship Program Committee has been added.
- 4) General Studies Committee has been deleted.

**University Challenges Plan – Barrett Baebler and Gary Renz**

Barrett Baebler and Gary Renz attended the senate meeting to share documents from Saint Louis University with the idea of using these documents to start a dialogue with the administration regarding issues at Webster University.

They had a discussion among the Department of Management faculty about some of the issues the university is facing. It is felt that there has been a breakdown of communications between faculty and the administration. As a faculty body, we need to move forward as a single voice and meet some of the challenges head on that we are facing at the university. Given the challenges we have now, we need to start a dialogue. Without open dialogue and transparency, issues will arise.

This is not a threat towards the administration. It is a step forward to increase communication and collaboration between faculty and the administration. This is also a chance to take a lead with the student and staff associations to form stronger ties with them.

The question was asked “what exactly are you requesting to change?” The Senate already meets regularly with the administration, sits at the administrative council meeting once a month, and attends the Board of Trustees meeting. The answer given was to possibly increase the level of

communication at the Board of Trustees level rather than just getting updates, i.e., as a participant.

It was suggested to have a conversation with faculty in each school to get an idea of their definition of what shared governance is. We have shared governance, but do not have a clear idea of what that includes. It is thought that this is the time to look into a plan as reorganization is coming.

Another issue discussed is that faculty have been told that they have not met projections and should try to raise enrollment. How much responsibility do we have to share on budget numbers when we are not allowed to see those numbers? How much cutting back should we be doing?

The statement was made that students have complained that they cannot get a response from admissions so why would they even bother to come to Webster University? A complaint has also been made that it is difficult to find things on Webster's website. These issues are being investigated.

This discussion will continue at a future Senate meeting.

### **Faculty Assembly Agenda**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed Faculty Assembly Agenda that Ralph presented to the Senate. All were in favor; motion carried.

### **Spring Institute Update**

The format will be different for the Spring Institute. The committee wanted to have an event different from the diversity summit. A social type of event has been suggested so there will be social time before and after the event with no break in between.

Because the diversity summit was on a regular day of classes, many students/faculty could not attend. It was suggested that in the future, this type of event should be scheduled on a day when classes have been cancelled.

The statement was then made that for the Webster Works Worldwide day, classes are cancelled and it is difficult to get students to volunteer without placing some type of incentive on the activity. If there is nothing to hold the student accountable, they just take it as a day off.

### **New Business**

The department representatives in the School of Education asked that the Senate be made aware of the following: In the past, department representatives have been asked to schedule rooms and since the Registrar's office is now scheduling rooms, there is trepidation that next fall faculty will not have what they need for class. It was stated that the timeline in asking for room requests was not very well planned.

### **Committee to Review Faculty Changes – Ted Green**

Any changes to CRF procedure must be in place on April 1<sup>st</sup> the year before faculty are to apply for tenure/status. CRF is proposing that they be able to pilot electronic submission of faculty portfolios. CRF has spoken to Erik Palmore in FDC and they are proposing that electronic submission of faculty portfolios commence in Academic Year 2014 – 2015. In order to accomplish this objective, a pilot test may occur in 2013 – 2014. A great place to house the electronic portfolios would be in Canvas. Ted stated that Nancy Hellerud, Information Technology, and Faculty Senate need to be involved before CRF can move forward with this proposal.

Moving to electronic submission of portfolios would be very efficient and would benefit the more creative interests of faculty. Currently, only 50 pages can be submitted to CRF and can include optional appendices that showcase artwork, etc. CRF does not have to review those appendices as part of the portfolio. Moving to electronic submission would make it easier for CRF to review any appendices. At present, portfolios are housed in the Library and Matt Wier oversees the process of CRF committee members viewing the materials. For final recommendations, the Dean's Offices are contacted to see who will retrieve the materials for them to review. The portfolios are housed in the archives for one year.

A question was asked as to what role department chairs would play in the electronic submission process? The candidate is responsible for his/her review and the only letters not viewable by faculty are those that are sent directly to CRF. CRF would be responsible for any letters sent directly to CRF. It would probably be up to the department chair to make sure that all of the letters are included before submission.

It is very difficult for CRF committee members to find a time that everyone can meet. If portfolios were electronic, everyone could review them at their convenience and could be viewed by multiple people at the same time.

The electronic portfolios could be set up in Canvas and the Faculty Development Center could offer training. For those resistant to technology, Canvas is very easy to use. To begin, electronic submission could be voluntary and then mandatory in the next three years.

Concern was expressed regarding electronic submission of letters of recommendation as they are confidential. There will need to be a way to protect confidentiality and authenticity of letters of recommendation. Caution will need to be taken in terms of the letters and who has access to them.

The question was asked if it would be possible to have letters of recommendation sent to CRF electronically. Currently, if someone is in Paris and mails a letter and it is late, it cannot be accepted. It was stated that this could be included in the whole electronic submission process.

The question was asked as to whether or not CRF has checked to see if other schools are moving in the direction of electronic submission of portfolios for faculty review? CRF has not checked with other schools, but more and more items are being submitted electronically in this age of technology.

It was stated that CRF will need to be very explicit when they say “electronic submission” of portfolios and state that a specific site is to be used to submit portfolios. The guidelines for submission will not change, just the way the information can be submitted.

Ted Green asked the Senate for permission to further explore electronic submission options and have CRF Committee meet with Nancy Hellerud, Erik Palmore, and IT and return to the Senate to make a presentation in the future.

A motion was made and seconded that the Senate is in support of CRF investigating and piloting this new electronic support option. All were in favor; motion carried.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 2:56 p.m.