



Faculty Senate Courier

December 06, 2010

Volume 2, No. 4

Message from Faculty President

Webster Today

I hope that you are taking the time each day to glance at it and reading those items that are pertinent to you. Webster Today replaced the St Louis Announcement List Serve. Instead of numerous emails sent out to the community each day, the link to Webster Today is sent out. All of the items that would have been in those emails are now in one place, and the benefit is that they are archived. For the current issue or archived news, please see

<http://blogs.webster.edu/webstertoday/>

I would like to call your attention to one of the items in Webster Today that appeared just before Thanksgiving. It was the information on viewing your electronic pay stub and that you will no longer receive a paper pay stub. The article is next.

Electronic Viewing of Your Pay Stub

U.S. employees, please take a moment to view your pay check details electronically via [Connections](#). Instructions on how to navigate to the correct link and logon can be viewed at www.webster.edu/technology/epay.

E-PayStub provides the information that is currently available on your paper paystub, as well as, information about Webster paid benefits. Beginning January 1, 2011, we will no longer print and mail direct deposit information.

St Peter and Paul – Consider a Gift? It Would Make You Feel Warm!

How much do you spend on Starbucks each day? Looking towards the holidays and the increasing number of homeless, hungry people in our community, how about donating one of your daily Starbucks to St Peter and Paul?

As you may know, once a month, the Webster family (faculty, staff, and students) volunteer serving food at St Peter and Paul's soup kitchen. Donate those Starbucks to Webster University (People to People). Please send that Starbucks' money to Mary Ann Drake, Webster Hall, Nursing Department, Room 200. It will warm you up more than that cup of coffee will.

Theatre and the Galleries

I saw the matinee on December 5, 2010 of the Repertory Theatre production of *Over the Tavern* starring Spencer Davis Milford as Rudy, Darrie Lawrence as Sister Clarissa, Celeste Ciulla as Ellen, Braden Phillips as Georgie, Eric Nelson as Eddie, Katie McClellan as Annie, and Kevin Cutts as Chet. It was terrific! The scene is set in Buffalo, New York in autumn 1959. It reminded me of my elementary education in a Catholic school in St Louis. Even if you are not Catholic, the real plot is about relationships within a family. I agree with Sr Clarissa, "It is a must see!" Our own Dottie Marshall-Englis was the Costume Designer. Great job Dottie!!!!

The May Gallery is displaying the *Photo Imaging Education Association International Juried Exhibition* photos showing student work from across the country. I had the opportunity to be at the opening of the show on December 03, 2010. You still have time to catch this remarkable exhibit. Thanks Bill for the opportunity to see this exhibit.

Dates to include on your calendars:

Faculty Socials:

- a.) Jan. 21 (3:30pm – 5:30 pm) --- Faculty Senate House – 2nd Floor
- b.) Feb. 18 (3:30pm – 5:30 pm) --- Faculty Senate House – 2nd Floor
- c.) Mar. 18 (3:30pm – 5:30 pm) --- Faculty Senate House – 2nd Floor
- d.) Apr. 15 (3:30pm – 5:30 pm) --- Faculty Senate House – 2nd Floor

Spring Institute – March 25, 2011 (3:00 pm – 6:00 pm) --- in Sunnen Lounge

Faculty Assembly Meetings --- 3:00-4:30 pm

Tuesday, Feb 8, 2011

Tuesday, April 12, 2011

(We usually hold one more assembly meeting to ratify the contract agreement. TBD.)



The walkway to access the new patio or Maria Hall.



The landscaping near the new patio.



The new hallway in Maria Hall. The glass provides more light for Marletto's.



The intersection provides a general view of the stairs, the new patio, and the entrance to Maria Hall.



Construction has begun on our new Academic Building which houses the George Herbert Walker School of Business and Technology.



The new construction project certainly holds water.



Another view of the new Academic Building.



Still another view of the landscape encompassed by the New Academic Building.

Great Quotes to Remember

“Anyone who stops learning is old, whether at twenty or eighty.” --- Henry Ford

“Beautiful young people are accidents of nature, but beautiful old people are works of art.” --- Eleanor Roosevelt

All-Steinway School



Jeff Carter was kind enough to write the following article:

As of the end of December 2010, the Department of Music at Webster University will be recognized as an All-Steinway School. From the Steinway page: "All-Steinway Schools demonstrate a commitment to excellence by providing their students and faculties with the best equipment possible for the study of music." <http://www.steinway.com/institutions/all-steinway-schools/>

We are only the fourth All-Steinway School in Missouri. Our new pianos will be installed in the Thompson House recital hall, all of the Thompson House practice rooms and classrooms, and all faculty studios (except mine, where space is lacking). Moore Auditorium receives a new Steinway D as the flagship piano for the department.

This milestone achievement is in large part a recognition of our role in the university and in the cultural and educational life of the greater Saint Louis area. We owe a huge debt to Peter Sargent for keeping this dream alive for several years, and to the good folks in Finance who saw the benefits of this recognition.

Large grand pianos were chosen in November by Daniel Schene and others in a quick trip to New York and the Steinway factory. Pictures from that trip are posted at <http://musicchair.wordpress.com/2010/11/04/picking-steinways/>. The next steps include delivery and installation of pianos at Webster in December; tuning of the new pianos immediately prior to Spring 2011; and an official celebration event during Spring 2011 at a date to be determined.

The All-Steinway School designation is truly a major step forward for the Department of Music in our continuing quest for excellence and our push toward a more national profile.

The May Gallery

Photo Imaging Education Association International Exhibition



Grades 9 and Under
CAROLINE VANACORE
Greens Farms Academy, Greens
Farms, CT



Grades 12 and Below
KATHLEEN SCHENCK
Nevada Union High School, Grass
Valley, CA



Grand Prize, Grades 9 and Under
ADRIANA VAN MANEN, Fleeing
Princeton Day School, Princeton, NJ



College/University
TIM DOLEN
Brooks Institute, Santa Barbara, CA

3 - 17 December 2010

Uniting those who see the extraordinary in the ordinary, the [Photo Imaging Education Association \(PIEA\)](#) inspires its members to become better teachers at every level of education. PIEA is an international network of educators and students creating resources, solving problems, sharing ideas, and building stronger relationships with the photo industry.

The May Gallery is located on the second floor, west wing, of the [Sverdrup Building](#) at 8300 Big Bend Boulevard, Webster Groves MO 63119. Hours are Monday-Friday, 9:00 am-9:00 pm; Saturday-Sunday, noon-5:00 pm.

MINUTES/FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 04, 2010

Attendance

The Faculty Senate met on Thursday, November 04, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. in the Faculty House with Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, presiding.

Members Present: John Aleshunas, Gwyneth Williams, Don Morse, Carla Colletti, Marti Smith, Jef Awada, John Orr, Art Silverblatt, Dan Hellinger, Kathy Corley, Eileen Solomon, Roy Tamashiro, Keith Welsh, Ralph Olliges.

Also present: GCPTF members Bruce Umbaugh and Stephanie Schroeder and Provost Julian Schuster.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the Faculty Senate Meetings of 16 September, 7 October, and 14 October were approved. The minutes of the Faculty Assembly meeting of 21 September were approved.

Faculty Senate President's Report

- A. Announced that Insurance information packets would be mailed to arrive on 6 or 8 November and that there would be an informational meeting on 16 November.
- B. Reported that construction has been delayed on building the Marletto's patio, but that it is hoped to have the project completed by Christmas.
- C. Reported on a "Table-Top" Crisis campus scenario conducted during an Administrative Council meeting. Based on a real event—the case of a student who died of meningitis after having been in situations where she could have infected others—the scenario was designed to challenge how the University would cope with a widespread crisis situation.
- D. Reported on Ben Hockenull's recommendation to Administrative Council to cap the number of e-mails sent at one time from one Webster e-mail address at either 30 or 50 in order to prevent the Webster server from being used to send out mass spam-mailings, viruses, and other generally undesirable internet-type things. This would not include distribution lists.

Senators noted that this would create serious problems for those faculty with more than 30 advisees and for those faculty who need to contact the membership of a professional organization or participants in a conference, where creating a distribution list would not be efficient. The Senate asked the President to seek further clarification on this proposed policy.

E. President's Activities: Attended the Delegate's Agenda meeting, 28 October, attended Wellness Community Charity Dinner, 23 October, plans to attend Daniel Webster Society dinner, 4 November. Plans to attend Top 50 Dinner, 11 November.

Committee Appointments. The Senate approved the appointment of Larry Granda and Herman Krueger to the Sustainability Coalition.

Faculty Assembly Agenda on Nov 9. The Senate reviewed the agenda for the 9 November Faculty Assembly meeting, to include a report from Paul Carney, Vice President for Enrollment Management, on enrollment numbers for Fall 2010; and a report from the Insurance Committee on the increase in premiums we face this year.

GCPTF: The Senate received part of the final report of the Global Citizenship Project Task Force and subsequently discussed the material presented with the representatives of the task force, Bruce Umbaugh and Stephanie Schroeder. It was noted that Julie Weissman would report on assessing the GCP at the 18 November Senate meeting.

Question: What are the major changes?

- Each GCP course will be coded for only two goals.
- Critical Thinking and Communications would be assessed University-wide.

Question: What about the Practical Experience Requirement?

- There was some disagreement as to whether the revised requirement was acceptable to faculty in the WSBT.
- The requirement would be assessed by students in a reflective essay to be read by their advisors.
- The student and advisor will need clarification on what qualifies.
- This could be amended during the deliberation process.
- What if the student has not had a practical experience that could be considered global?

Comment: Two skills to be addressed by every GCP course is still a lot to do. This could still be a problem for the proposal.

Question: What about the Keystone Seminar? How will it be administered and assessed? What mechanisms are there for quality control?

TF: -Many faculty are enthusiastic about this requirement.

-Determining the logistics is beyond the scope of the task force.

Comments: Will need to be offered on-line to serve students throughout the Webster system: some juniors at various domestic sites, but in small numbers.

Question: What about transfer students?

TF: –Students who transfer in with less than 16 hours from a degree granting institution would be required to complete the entire program.

–Sequential Degree students would not have to complete the program.

–Students with an Associate of Arts degree would not have to complete the program.

Question: What about students from technical schools?

Question: How can we know that transfer students are truly being prepared?

Question: Why was problem-solving goal dropped?

–Is the introduction of the Quantitative Literacy requirement enough?

Question: How can a keystone seminar touch on all the required skills of the GCP?

TF: Does not need to touch on all.

Comment: We need to know the learning outcomes.

Comment/Question: What are the “big questions” mentioned in the discussion of the Roots of Culture requirement?

Comment: The requirement that all GCP courses be Integrative or Interdisciplinary will require most courses to be revised/rewritten before they can be accepted into the program.

TF: –Must think in a broad way

–Can be “non-major” courses

Question: Can’t we take out the integrative/interdisciplinary language at the bottom of page 15.

Comment: I want courses that will expose students to different ways of thinking.

Comment: We need to brainstorm how these courses will work. What process will we follow to get there?

Comment: The preponderance of this work would fall on College of Arts and Sciences Faculty.

Question: What will motivate faculty to submit courses for consideration as part of the GCP?

What if only a few courses are submitted? Will there be sufficient quantity and diversity to meet student needs? Few courses were submitted to be part of the proposed writing across the curriculum program.

TF: –Staffing is not the job of the TF.

Discussion: Money as incentive was considered; it was noted that most faculty felt that an increased stipend for the Great Thinkers Seminars would not attract them to teach in the program.

Julian Schuster commented at length on resource questions and the GCP.

- The commitment should be to shared governance with an emphasis on investing in human resources.
- We need to create a compensation system that will attract the best faculty.
- Should we add new faculty lines to continue to do the job we have always done, or should we assess our programs and figure out how to do it better?
- Resources should not be an issue when it comes to “doing our best for our students.”
- Demonstrable quality is necessary for allocation of resources.
- Of course we are enrollment dependent.
- There will be new faculty lines this year; some will be added to the College of Arts and Sciences. There will also be new staff lines.

Question: Does this mean we will have to rethink established programs?

JS: That will happen irrespective of the GCP proposal. No one likes change, but change will or should occur regardless as we assess what we do and seek to do it better. It should be a transparent process and should not worry anyone. Assessment is needed for improvement. Universities don't last forever. Change is inevitable and essential.

Final comments from Julian Schuster and Ralph Olliges:

- the compensation study has been delayed by the need for feedback on the consultant's analysis.
- the budget is being simplified. There will no longer be an Institutional Planning Committee. Expenditures must be tied to the proper line item, even if that creates an apparent deficit in that line. For example, if postage exceeds the amount budgeted, the excess should still be tied to that budget line. This will help better allocate resources. There will no longer be an excess disbursement made in the spring.
- Searches for the AVP for programming and the CFO are progressing well. There are faculty recommended by the Senate President on both search committees. There are already over 80 applications for the CFO position.

New Business: A question was raised concerning the role of a school in approving the division of one department into two. It was noted that College approval was not sought in the division of Theater and Dance into two departments.

MINUTES/FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 11, 2010

Attendance

The Faculty Senate met on Thursday, November 11, 2010 at 1:30 p.m. in the Alumni House with Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, presiding.

Present: John Aleshunas, Gwyneth Williams, Don Morse, Carla Colletti, Marti Smith, Jef Awada, J.P. Palmer-Schuyler, Art Silverblatt, Dan Hellinger, Kathy Corley, Eileen Solomon, Roy Tamashiro, Keith Welsh, Ralph Olliges.

Also present: Dean Debra Carpenter, Jorge Oliver, Barry Hufker and Gary Gottlieb from the School of Communications and Electronic and Photographic Media Department; Jeffrey Carter.

Minutes Approved: The minutes for the November 4 and November 9 meetings were reviewed and approved by the Senate.

Proposal for Audio Production as a Department

- Gary Gottlieb and Barry Hufker, full time Audio faculty in the Electronic and Photographic Media Department (EPMD), EPMD Chair Jorge Oliver and School of Communications Dean Debra Carpenter presented the proposal.
- Gary Gottlieb summarized the rationale, as outlined in the proposal distributed to the Senate, for the creation of Audio Production separate from the EPMD. He noted that the full time faculty in EPMD unanimously approved the proposal.
- Senators made suggestions regarding the addition of details that address such issues as staffing to the proposal that will be presented to the Faculty Assembly in the meeting on November 30.
- The Senate voted unanimously to recommend the proposal to the faculty assembly.

Discussion of procedures regarding the vote on the General Education proposal when it is submitted to the Faculty Assembly

- A draft of suggested procedures was reviewed and discussed.
- Recommendation: Present a proposal that is reviewed and recommended by the Senate to the Faculty Assembly.
- Comment: The Faculty Senate may consider postponing the vote until the Senate has time to review and discuss a General Education proposal from the Task Force report (which was not received by the Senate by the November 11 meeting).

-Comment: The Senate, after reviewing and discussing the proposal received from the Task Force, may decide to have different positions on different aspects of the Task Force proposal.

-The Senate discussed parliamentary procedures about debate, motions and voting procedures. The question was raised regarding what percentage of approval of the faculty is required in order to consider that a substantial percentage of faculty will have full buy in with the proposal.

-Suggestion: Present a motion to the Faculty Assembly at the November 30 meeting to adopt rules for debate and voting prior to the final voting on the proposal.

-Comment: Allow for sufficient time to receive, review and discuss the Task Force proposal (and other possible proposals that may be presented) sent to the Senate before scheduling a vote by the Faculty Assembly.

Recommendation: The Senate should contact the Task Force to let that committee know that there will not be a November 30 vote because the Senate did not receive the Task Force report to review at the November 11 Senate meeting. As a professional courtesy, the Senate should also inform Provost Julian Schuster of the Senate's decision not to vote on a General Education proposal at the November 30 meeting.

-Comment: The Senate should determine the definition of a supermajority in the vote and should present a voting procedure proposal to the Faculty Assembly.

-Comment: The goal is to have substantial faculty buy in to the program.

-Comment: A filibuster situation may be possible, depending on how a supermajority is determined.

-Suggestion: Require 66% or 2/3 majority to create a supermajority.

Motions and votes:

1) A motion was presented to require a supermajority when voting on the General Education proposal that will be presented to the Faculty Assembly at a later date. Eleven senators voted yes, three senators voted no. Motion passed.

2) A motion was presented to require a 67% vote as a supermajority to support the General Education proposal. Eight senators voted yes, six senators voted no on this motion. Motion passed.

Procedures for the November 30 Faculty Assembly meeting:

-The Senate will propose that a 67% supermajority vote be required when the Faculty Assembly votes on the General Education proposal. A rationale for the supermajority will also be provided.

-Discussion: How will an abstained vote be counted in the voting procedures?

-Suggestion: A ballot will list yes, no and abstained voting options.

A review of the Global Citizenship Program Review Committee

- The Senate President distributed a list of suggested faculty for a Global Citizenship Program Review Committee (GCPRC), which would be created as a standing university committee to be created.
- Suggestion: Department chairs should generate names of faculty who could serve. Proposals for courses should also come through department chairs.

JoAnn Herwig's retirement

- The President congratulated JoAnn Herwig for her 20 years of service to the Faculty Senate and 21 years of service to the university.
 - A search committee will be formed to review applicants for the replacement administrative position. This committee will consist of the Senate President and two other representatives from the university.
- Suggestion: Former Senate Presidents and Vice-Presidents should be asked to serve on the search committee.
- Suggestion: The job description and job level rank for the position should be reviewed, and former Senate Presidents, Senate VPs and others who worked directly with this staff position should be consulted for suggestions on developing a job description.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

MINUTES/FACULTY SENATE MEETING

November 18, 2010

Attendance

The Faculty Senate met on Thursday, 18 November 2010 at 1:30 p.m. in the Alumni House with Ralph Olliges, Faculty Senate President, presiding.

Present: John Aleshunas, Jef Awada, Maxine Bauermeister, Mary Bevel, Kathy Corley, Dan Hellinger, Don Morse, John Orr, J. P. Palmer-Schuyler, Art Silverblatt, Eileen Solomon, Marty Smith, Roy Tamashiro, Keith Welsh, Gwyneth Williams

Also present: Barbara Wehling, Mike Hulsizer, Stephanie Schroeder, Julie Weisman, Bruce Umbaugh, Julian Schuster.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the 11 November Senate meeting were approved with minor corrections.

Institutional Review Board Proposals.

Barbara Wehling and other members of the Institutional Review Board presented two proposals:

- A) To increase the number of board members by two;
 - B) To implement a non-compliance policy (see attached).
- 1) The IRB has seen a marked increase in the number of proposals to review. 98 proposals were reviewed in AY 2009-10; 80 proposals have already been reviewed in the fall of 2010. Increasing the size of the board will allow the board to handle the increased workload.
 - 2) Without a clear non-compliance policy in place, the University can lose Federal funding (and would be in violation of the law).

Action: The Senate postponed action on the request to increase the board by two members. The Non-Compliance Policy was approved.

Announcements from the Provost

- 1) There will be a holiday faculty reception hosted by the Provost on 3 December from 3:30-5:30 in the FDC.
- 2) There will be a luncheon for the Senate and the Provost to be scheduled before the end of this semester.

- 3) Julian proposed finding time for a retreat of the Senate and Provost to brainstorm various issues in the emerging relationship between the Provost's office and the Senate.

Report on the Assessment Plan for the proposed Global Citizenship Program

Stephanie Schroeder and Julie Weismann outlined the assessment plan for the proposed Global Citizenship Program.

- 1) Assessment data would be gathered by both direct and indirect means. Student work would be captured in e-portfolios generated in the Great Thinkers Seminar and the Keystone seminar. In addition, reviews of syllabi, employer surveys, exit interviews and other indirect means of assessment would be used.
- 2) Rubrics will be derived from the AAC&U LEAP Rubrics.
- 3) There are 10 outcomes to assess; we would assess three/year.

The Senate raised a number of concerns. Many of these had to do with the hard, time-consuming work involved in actually carrying out the assessments.

- Will there be sufficient compensation to pay faculty
- How will training be handled
- Will faculty receive release time for the work
- Can we really be sure that the administration will step up and adequately fund the assessment of the GCP?

Other concerns focused on questions of validity of the assessment:

- Because of our large transfer population, how would it be possible to draw valid comparisons between GTS and Keystone seminar portfolios?
- How can some goals such as ethical reasoning and teamwork be assessed?
- How can the student data be standardized to allow for meaningful evaluation? Do all students need to complete the same assignment? Do the assignments need to be included in the e-portfolios?
- How are we going to establish baseline measures?
- How will the feedback loop be closed?

Agenda for 30 November Faculty Assembly meeting

The agenda for the 30 November meeting will include a vote on the proposal for a new department of Audio Production and Aesthetics, a presentation of survey results by the Salary and Fringe Benefits committee, and a consideration of suspending parliamentary rules to allow for a supermajority requirement to pass the GCP and to allow members of the Faculty Assembly not present to vote on the GCP proposal as amended by the Faculty.

MINUTES/FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 09, 2010

Paul Carney, VP Enrollment, presented various data to the assembly.

YEAR:	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	5 Years
Freshman	417	485	415	477	425	444
Transfer	384	431	426	360	383	397
Total	801	916	842	837	808	841

As of November 5, 2010:

UG full-time (flat-fee) student credit hours are at 99% of projected budget.

UG part-time credit hours are 92% of projected.

MAT credit hours are 103% of projected.

On-line credit hours are 104% of projected.

MA credit hours are 102% of projected.

European campus credit hours are 92% of projected.

- Transfer students become more important to us as the pool of high school students becomes smaller.
- Webster would like to stabilize the number of Freshmen at 450-460.

Dr. Carney addressed various questions regarding retention and feeder schools. The following were his answers to the questions posed.

- Webster has an 80% retention rate from freshman to sophomore year. The #1 reason is financial, then academic progress.
- Losing students at the high end academically is a problem.
- Articulation agreements are important with the community colleges.
- An honors college may need to be considered.
- Front assessment should be considered. What does the student need to enroll? He would like to use our own survey of questions.

Faculty President Ralph Olliges spoke about 2011 insurance coverage. AVP Betsy Schmutz addressed various questions about insurance from the assembly.

With no action items, the assembly adjourned at 3.50 p.m.

MINUTES/FACULTY ASSEMBLY MEETING

November 30, 2010

Announcements:

Reminder: December 3 there will be a Faculty Social from 3:30-5:30 hosted by Julian Schuster in the Faculty Development Center.

Proposal for the Creation of the Department of Audio Aesthetics and Technology

Gary Gottlieb presented the proposal. It has been endorsed by the Department of Electronic and Photographic Media. The idea of a Department of Audio Aesthetics and Technology has been in discussion for years. In talks with Dean Debbie Carpenter, it was decided that now is the time to proceed.

The proposal was approved by Faculty Senate. In terms of numbers currently almost 3/5 of majors in Electronic & Photographic Media are audio majors. The proposed department sees a number of possibilities for new majors in the field in the future. The department also sees this as great for recruitment leveling the playing field with other institutions that have this department. Audio is a unique aesthetic and in many ways the faculty already operates as an independent department. The plan is to continue to serve students throughout university. Further plans include this proposed department continuing to work closely with Electronic & Photographic Media especially when it comes to faculty reviews.

Joe Stimpfl asked if the faculty feel that they can you accept more students? The number of students is limited only by facilities and past growth has been supported by the School and the University.

Jim Evans raised the point that it sometimes seems that any two or three people can get together and call themselves a department. The Senate should consider under what circumstances do we create/revise/combine departments. This needs broader discussion perhaps to develop guidelines for the creation of new departments. Jim raises no objection to this proposal.

Ralph Olliges stated that the Senate will discuss guidelines for creation of departments.

Chris Parr gave a strong endorsement to the proposal and moved to call the question.
Mike Hulsizer seconded the motion.

Vote - the proposal was unanimously approved.

Results of Salary & Fringe Benefits survey

Scott Jensen presented the results of the survey. 45% of faculty (84) responded. The Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee includes Scott Jensen, Joe Stimpfl, Carole Tucker, and George Slusarz.

The presentation included a breakdown of respondents by college and rank. The most frequent comments concerned correct pay imbalances, better retirement plans/coverage, parking problems and lack of alternative transportation benefits, and benefits for adjuncts.

The Committee will meet again this year and take a proposal to administration in January. Mid-to Late February administration is expected to respond. The Committee hopes process will be complete shortly after spring break to allow for assembly input and a vote prior to April 1

Proposal from Senate for voting procedures relating to the Global Citizenship Program

Keith Welsh stated the timeline for working with the formal motion. The Assembly will consider the proposal just after 1st of year. The resulting motion will come to assembly for an anticipated vote on Feb 8, 2011.

Currently the voting percent for approval in the Faculty Handbook is 50%+1. The Senate proposes changing this percentage to 67% of those in attendance – this number demonstrates (arbitrarily) that the faculty is buying in. Abstentions don't count as votes. Keith moved that the Faculty Assembly approves the suspension of rules for voting such that 67% of those in attendance are necessary for passage.

Because the vote necessitates a departure from the rules, the assembly needs to vote on the voting procedures.

Stephanie Schroeder questioned if this is only for GCPTF proposal or for any general education proposals that might be put forth. The answer: It is for all proposals.

Debbie Carpenter asked why not use percentages that are acceptable in our federal government. Bill Barrett asked if before we vote, we will discuss the pros and cons of the proposal for extended and international campuses.

Mike Hulsizer asked was this suspension of regular voting procedures implemented for the writing proposal. The answer: The rules were not suspended.

Bruce Umbaugh asked has any vote ever required more than 50%+1? The answer: No. Bruce also asked about the vote in the Senate for changing the voting procedure. The answer: eight members voted for 67%, six members voted against it, but it was unanimous to suspend the rules.

Gwyneth Williams clarified that it was unanimous for a supermajority, but there were differing opinions about the size of the supermajority. The majority of the Senate voted for the 67% suggestion.

Dan Hellinger asked if another proposal is submitted, wouldn't there have to be two votes – one to replace the alternative for GCPTF, then a supermajority to adopt the proposal.

Jeffrey Carter clarified the motion: The Assembly will suspend the rules for the 50% majority with a 2/3 vote on the new general education proposal.

Jeff Hughes asked if we still have a global citizenship proposal or a general education proposal as both terms are being used. The answer: The terms are being used interchangeably.

Monica Moore asked if there is precedent for this. Has the Assembly used a supermajority before?

Vicki McMullen asked was the last general education proposal voted on as a supermajority. The answer: No.

Larry Baden asked about the language in the Faculty Handbook to suspend the voting rules. The answer from Jeffrey Carter: We rely on Robert's rules. Roberts states that a 2/3 majority is necessary to suspend rules. Only 1/3 of members must be in attendance to achieve a quorum. Joe Schuster stated he is not persuaded by proposal as it stands now, but he opposes a supermajority for something like this. It is not a good precedent to set.

Amanda Rosen agreed with Joe. There is a danger in establishing precedents. Creating supermajorities is the tool of the status quo and the minority. With a supermajority we now essentially need 34% to say no and this privileges the status quo.

Chris Parr stated that this is not about a precedent. There has to be a high degree of buy-in to make this change successful in cooperation and collaboration. Without a supermajority, parts of the University are not happy with what they've heard and are likely to vote in blocks.

Keith Welsh agreed that the burden of work of anything we pass will fall more heavily on some schools and departments. The supermajority helps control "I'm in favor, but I don't have to do anything to make it happen." Some departments will have to make major changes.

John Orr questioned the operational definition of "buy-in."

Jorge Oliver stated we are operating on an assumption about how we think people might or might not vote. He is uncomfortable with that assumption.

Amanda Rosen stated that we need to look at a supermajority and turn it around. It's not that we need 67% to pass; we need 34% to block it. We are making an assumption that folks are going to block it.

Gwyneth Williams stated that the core of a general education program would overwhelmingly be in Arts and Sciences, and the faculty burden would be there. The professional programs get a vote without needing to do the work

Vicki McMullen stated that Webster doesn't have a culture of assessment. We need to be assessing outcomes of our students. Perhaps we could spread out the assessment, but we need to do this for our students.

Mike Hulsizer seconded a motion to close debate.

Vote to close debate – debate closed.

New motion: The Faculty Assembly resolves to suspend the rules and require a 2/3 majority vote on final approval of a new general education program – 2/3 of people voting and present.

Joe Stimpfl asked what the majority is; the total assembly or those in attendance.

Jeffrey Carter clarified that we can vote down the motion on the floor and bring it back later after more discussion/clarification. Anyone who voted yes, can ask for a recall.

Dan Hellinger asked if we can vote yes and clarify later, too.

Vote to suspend rules for 2/3 vote – 31 in favor. Motion failed.

New issue: Keith Welsh brought up a second issue – who is qualified to vote. The handbook states that only members who are present at a vote are eligible to vote. Do we suspend that rule? After that, what is the process to count the votes?

Peter Sargent moved that the vote be done electronically of all faculty assembly constituents.

Chris Parr seconded the motion.

Chris Parr stated that the proposal will affect international faculty. We should consider adding them into the vote.

Jim Brasfield stated that the Faculty Handbook defines the faculty assembly and as Chris's proposal requires a rewrite of handbook, that motion is out of order.

Jim Evans stated that we have not rendered anyone voiceless in this process so he will vote no.

Vicki McMullen agreed with Jim Evans but wants teleconferencing available to all interested faculty during the meeting.

Joe Schuster said that we need to reconsider who are faculty representation but not for this issue. It is simply too much to change at one time.

John Wiley stated that he has participated in the general education dialogue. He won't be here for the vote, but he would like to vote.

Gwyneth Williams clarified that Peter is only proposing electronic voting of the Faculty Assembly, not other constituents. She has concerns that the proposal will change during the meeting, and this is not conducive to electronic vote. She asks that the final proposal be sent out before the vote.

Barrett Baebler stated that both curriculum committees get international feedback already, and we should not make this harder than it is.

Bill Barrett pointed out that the world of Webster is beyond teleconferencing. Time zones are not conducive to teleconferencing. He is concerned that more faculty are not at this meeting (whether they can't or don't want to be here).

Amanda Rosen asked couldn't we make deliberation available to all via transcript then hold the vote electronically. She is against the motion.

Joe Stimpfl said he finds it compelling that this is so important that we need to go to extraordinary measures to enfranchise everyone. How about a podcast for people to review?

Karla Armbruster said ideally we need to require people to read the transcript before they vote.

Mike Hulsizer suggested streaming the deliberation, and do a paper copy ballot. This is simplest option.

Jorge Oliver felt those St. Louis faculty teaching abroad should be included.

Bill Barrett liked making this as inclusive as possible. Have we ever had absentee ballots? The answer: it's not in the handbook.

Dan Hellinger said some people just don't give a shit, and he resents them voting without the care and concern so many others have demonstrated. He concedes that inclusiveness is probably more important at this time.

Jeff Hughes supports Peter's motion. An example is that five faculty members from the Art Department and possibly two more will be gone on Feb 8.

Eric Rhiney defers to political scientists on voting, but pointed out that everyone has voted on something or someone they know nothing about.

Gwyneth Williams suggested an amendment – A paper ballot that is taken after a final proposal is determined with a week to turn in your vote.

Peter Sargent accepted the amendment.

Keith Welsh agreed that the Faculty Assembly should vote to submit the vote to all faculty for the paper ballot after the meeting on Feb 8 with a deadline for returning ballots.

Mike Hulsizer pointed out that transcribing is crazy, but a video stream or another format is preferable.

Jim Evans stated that we are locked into a debate about a date when too many people will not be here. Perhaps we should change the date.

Lindsey Kingston stated that the technology exists to have an electronic vote.

Amanda Rosen said it makes sense for faculty to have video transcript of debate in advance of requiring a vote.

John Orr suggested the transcript be online and password protected.

Mike Hulsizer called the question.

Amanda Rosen seconded.

Vote to end debate – passed

Jeffrey Carter moved to suspend the rules to allow a vote of all members of the Faculty Assembly by paper ballot, submitted within ten business days of the closure of debate on a new general education program.

Vote on the motion – passed

Meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.

A Reminder of Faculty Senate Membership 2010-2011

These are your representatives:

President of the Faculty Senate:	Ralph Olliges (Multidisciplinary Studies)
Vice-President of the Faculty Senate:	Keith Welsh (Religious Studies)
At-large Faculty Senators:	Dan Hellinger (HIPR) J.P. Palmer-Schuyler (Management) Art Silverblatt (Communication & Journalism) Marty Smith (Math & Computer Science) Roy Tamashiro (Multidisciplinary Studies) Gwyneth Williams (HIPR)
College of Arts & Sciences:	Don Morse (Philosophy) Keith Welsh (Religious Studies)
Leigh Gerding College of Fine Arts:	Jef Awada (Theatre) Carla Colletti replaces Glen Bauer (Music) for Fall 2010
George Herbert Walker School of Business and Technology:	John Aleshunas (Math & Computer Science) John Orr (Management)
School of Communications:	Kathy Corley (Electronic & Photographic Media) Eileen Solomon (Communication & Journalism)
School of Education:	Maxine Bauermeister (Teacher Education) Mary Bevel (Multidisciplinary Studies)

AY 2010-2011