

- **Retirement**
- **Electronic Voting and Surveys**
- **Committee on Tenure Membership**
- **General Education Review**
- **Grievance Policy**



Results of Faculty Vote

Revision of 300.010 to Allow Electronic Ballots

Yes	463
No	18
Abstain	5

M. Revision of Bylaws. Revisions of these Bylaws may be proposed by Faculty Council. Proposed revisions shall be presented and discussed at a meeting of the General Faculty or a faculty forum. As soon as possible after the General Faculty meeting or faculty forum, all faculty members will be notified of the proposed revision and provided access to a ballot. Ballots will be tabulated by a committee of Faculty Council within two weeks following completion of voting. A simple majority of the votes submitted will be required for approval. Results of the vote will be reported to Faculty Council and then all faculty members as soon as feasible. Revisions become effective upon approval by the Board of Curators.

Evaluation of Chancellor Deaton

Three Ballot Decisions for Consideration This Spring

- Changes to wording for Faculty Tenure Committee (CRR 300.010)
- Consideration to keep Grievance Process CRR 370.015 New Pilot as the official process for MU.
- Revisions to the General Education Program



CHANGES TO WORDING FOR FACULTY TENURE COMMITTEE (CRR 300.010)



Faculty Tenure Committee

Current Wording

K. Faculty Tenure Committee

The University of Missouri-Columbia Faculty Committee on Tenure shall be composed of one member elected by the Faculty of each of the following divisions:

- College of Agriculture
- College of Arts and Science
- College of Administration and Public Affairs
- College of Education
- College of Engineering
- School of Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife
- College of Home Economics
- School of Journalism
- School of Law
- School of Library and Informational Science
- School of Medicine
- School of Nursing
- School of Social and Community Services
- School of Veterinary Medicine

Proposed Wording

K. Faculty Tenure Committee

The University of Missouri-Columbia Faculty Committee on Tenure shall be composed of one member elected by the Faculty of colleges and schools that are headed by a Dean who reports to the Provost for Academic Affairs.



**CONSIDERATION TO KEEP GRIEVANCE
PROCESS CRR 370.015 NEW PILOT AS
THE OFFICIAL PROCESS FOR MU.**



Academic Grievance Issues at MU

2003-4. Faculty/administrator committee evaluated CRR 370.010 and filed grievances and outcome. It was recommended and approved that MU pilot a new grievance process 370.015 for three years.

Prior to the end of the trial period, the University of Missouri-Columbia will review section 370.015, share the results of the review with the other campuses and then all four campuses will use the information derived from the pilot to craft a common grievance procedure for all campuses for consideration by the Board of Curators by the end of the 2007-2008 academic year.

2008. Faculty Council and its Faculty Affairs subcommittee revised 370.015 to address continued concerns and criticism by faculty groups. The revised document was voted favorably by faculty (March 2008) but was not acceptable to legal (and would not likely have been accepted by the other campuses).

2008. Council approved formation of a Grievance task force of administrators and faculty to develop a new process that emphasized problem solving/settlement over legalistic hearings (new 370.015). MU Faculty voted (2009) to pilot this process for 2 years. Both UMKC and MS&T joined in the pilot effort.

2011. Process reviewed and evaluated by each testing campus and information used to revise the pilot that is now be considered for implementation by BOC for all four campuses.

Motivation for Development of New 370.015

➤ Wanted a Resolution Process

- Wanted to increase opportunity for informal settlement
- “Mediation with Teeth”
- Resolution Panel vs. Hearing Panel

➤ Wanted a Faster Process

- 130 vs. 320+ days
 - Grievant exhausts administrative remedies sooner
 - Less time for pain to fester and positions to entrench further
- Collection of only relevant materials

➤ Wanted a Less Disjointed Process

- IO → Hearing Panel → Chancellor
- Evidence collectors as mediators/decision makers

➤ Wanted Oversight

- Continual monitoring of overall grievance process
- Evaluative and summative vs. only summative report
- Follows up on the implementation of remedies

Comparisons at MU

Number of Grievances

370.010 (Incomplete data 1996-1999)

21 cases

- 6 In Process (Sept 1999)
- 10 Finished full process (Sept 1999)
- 1 Withdrawn
- 4 Informally Resolved

370.015 OLD Pilot (2005-2008)

15 cases

- 4 In Process (April 2009)
- 5 Finished full process (April 2009)
- 1 Not Accepted
- 1 No Decision
- 4 Informally Resolved by IO

370.015 NEW Pilot (1/2009-Present)

9 cases

- 2 In Process
- 2 Finished full process
- 4 Not accepted (one goes to staff)
- 1 Withdrawn

Outcome

Respondent: Appealed to President. Duration: 5mns
Respondent: Appealed to President. Duration: 18mns
Respondent: No Appeal. Duration: 15 months
Respondent: No Appeal. Duration: 19 months
Respondent: Appealed to President. Duration: 15 months
Respondent: No Appeal. Duration: 15 months
Respondent: No Appeal. Duration: 20 months
Respondent: Appealed to President. Duration: 13 months
Grievant 1/3: Chancellor reviewing. Duration: 19 months
Respondent: No Appeal. Duration 6 months

Grievant 2/5, others modified. Duration: 10 months
Grievant 1/3. Duration: 12 months
Grievant 4/5 all with modifications. Duration: 15 months
Grievant 1/5, one with modifications. Duration: 14 months
Delays sent this to Trial. Duration: 14 months

Not in favor of grievant, chancellor appeal findings upheld: 3 months
Not in favor of grievant, chancellor appeal findings upheld: 5 months

Comparisons at All Campuses

UMSL

No Grievances filed under 370.010

MS&T

One Grievance filed under 370.015 New

UMKC

370.015 NEW Pilot (10/2009-Present)

8 cases

- 1 In Process
- 5 Finished full process
- 2 Not accepted

Favor of Grievant = **6**

(some grievances had multiple claims which favored either the Grievant or Respondent by claim)

Favor of Respondent = **3**

(some grievances had multiple claims which favored either the Grievant or Respondent by claim)

Neutral Findings = **1**

(some grievances had multiple claims which favored either the Grievant or Respondent by claim; Neutral findings benefit both the Grievant and the Respondent)

Controversy about Administrator on GRP

- AAUP Opposition (Conflict of Interest)
- MU Oversight Committee (4-5 members)
 - one member opposed to administrator
 - one member opposed to administrator and OC.

UMKC (GRP and OC Members)

Summary of Comments regarding the presence of an administrator on the panel:

- “Personally, having an administrator assured that we adhered to appropriate policy/procedure and provided a seamless (as much as possible) process for the grievant. This particular administrator provided some history for some grievances (where the person has sought help prior to filing, concerns raised during meetings prior to filing, etc) as well as a ‘link’ to other processes (AAO, for example).”
- “I think these results speak for themselves: in no way does the presence of an administrator stack the deck against faculty grievants.”
- “I think it’s important to note that there are no clear ‘winners’ or ‘losers’ in grievance cases. The panel investigates each of often several claims within a case, communicates findings for each claim, and makes a recommendation for each claim independently of the others.”
- “I think there are advantages to having an administrator on the panel.”



GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW



General Education Program Review

Task Force: Chair John Adams

Speck, Angela

Rice, Jeff R.

Zguta, Russell

Huelsbergen, Deborah L.

Nilon, Charles H.

Jesse, George W.

Marrs, Mary E.

Prather-Kinsey, Jenice

Steffens, Marty

Wilkins, Lee (Journalism)

Carr, Deborah L.

Fine, Mark A.

Solbrekken, Gary

McDaniel, Roxanne W.

Gibson, Kyle

Merrill, Megan L.

Wilcox, Dale L.

Preface: General Education Task Force report

- A mere checklist of general education requirements should not replace or hamper good academic advising. We must acknowledge that the advising students receive at MU is too frequently uneven, and we suggest that **an institutional commitment to quality academic and career advising** ultimately is as important as is a commitment to a particular common set of graduation requirements.
- A comparison of the MU General Education Program with requirements at other universities suggests that the MU program is fairly typical, consisting of distribution requirements plus additional specified requirements (e.g., WI and MRP courses). **The on-line resources for students planning their general education programs are woefully substandard, however.** Students generally appear to be unaware of the lists of courses that satisfy general education requirements and unaware of the general education requirements themselves. If a student goes to the MU homepage, clicks on the “Current Students” tab, that student does NOT find a direct link to the general education requirements. Only by clicking on “Undergraduate Advising” and finding “General Education Program” buried in the list of items under “Information About” does that student get to a page where the requirements can be found (after another click). Even if one overlooks the unattractive manner in which the information is (eventually) presented on the MU website, one still has to admit that the difficulty in finding the information in the first place is embarrassing and a deterrent to good advising.

Laboratory Course Requirements Statement

The following statement is proposed as a guide to determining whether a particular course should qualify as a biological or physical science laboratory course.

The aims of laboratory science General Education courses are manifold. A major aim of many such courses is providing non-science majors with both science content and an understanding of how science “works”. Since observation of the natural world and experimentation are integral parts of the scientific process, participation in these procedures necessarily is an integral part of science education.

Specifically, we use the term “laboratory” in reference to courses or portions of courses that satisfy the following criteria.

- They provide students with an opportunity for the active collection and/or analysis of data from real-world observations and experiments. These activities need not take place in a conventional “laboratory” setting but may be undertaken anywhere that an appropriate experiment or observation can take place (*e.g.*, in the field).
- They promote scientific literacy and critical thinking/problem solving skills.
- Whenever possible, they include opportunities for students to design experimental or observational protocols
- If the laboratory is directly associated with a specific lecture course or is included as part of a course that also includes lecture, the laboratory activities promote understanding of the content presented in the lecture.

Task Force and Faculty Council Recommendations

- *Limitation of general education courses to no more than one prerequisite.*
- *College algebra and freshman composition requirements for MRP and WI credit, respectively.* Although it is highly desirable that students be advised to take college algebra prior to an MRP course and ENGLISH 1000 prior to a WI course, we cannot justify withholding MRP and WI credit if class performance was satisfactory but the prerequisites were not met.

On hold while Registrar, Faculty Council and test case (Math Dept) work through prerequisite issues.

Task Force and Faculty Council Recommendations

Information literacy requirement

The question of whether to require a separate course in information literacy is not without controversy, but the prevailing consensus appears to argue against such a requirement. Consideration of such issues in general education courses and in courses taken in the major remains important, however, and all instructors are urged to include content appropriate to the course that addresses information literacy. **We generally believe that existing courses provide the best context for addressing these issues.**

Council Concur

Requirement for a service learning or community service course

Although suggestions that such projects or courses be required are well-meaning, we believe that implementation of such a requirement at MU (including the organization of the courses and the monitoring of the students) would be impractical. Certainly any such requirement would need to be expanded to include study abroad and undergraduate research in order to provide the course capacity. **We believe that students should be encouraged to take advantage of such opportunities (here again, the emphasis on quality advising throughout the institution is important), but imposing a graduation requirement is another matter.**

Council Concur

Task Force and Faculty Council Recommendations

Impact of the growing enrollment on the delivery of capstone and writing intensive courses

Although the increasing need for capstone and writing intensive courses taught by (at best) a non-increasing pool of faculty is acknowledged, we believe that focusing only on enrollment pressure misses the real issue, at least in the case of the capstone courses.

The capstone course requirement is one of the few requirements introduced as part of the General Education Architecture that applies to graduation qualification in individual majors rather than to coursework that broadens students' "intellectual foundation in the liberal arts and sciences". (The quotation is from the 1986 statement of the Board of Curators.) Although the capstone requirement is easily implemented in some disciplines (the senior-level engineering design courses come to mind here), the implementation is problematic in other disciplines simply due to the nature of those disciplines. (Mathematics and English are two such disciplines.) Still other disciplines, because the coursework already is "layered", with each course building on those taken earlier in the curriculum, it is not clear what purpose the capstone course serves. Given these issues associated with implementation of the capstone course requirement, **we recommend that this course requirement be stricken from the University graduation requirements.** We nonetheless encourage disciplines to retain the capstone requirement *if doing so makes academic sense for those disciplines.*

March 17, 2011: Council Approval "Any department can use either a capstone course or a 4000 level course to fulfill the requirement." (unanimous)

Task Force and Faculty Council Recommendations

A “diversity” intensive (DI) course requirement

Task Force: We agree that incorporation of a course requirement dealing with diversity in the most general sense is desirable. In particular, such a requirement should permit exploration beyond the consideration of “race/ethnicity, gender, and social inequality” issues typically associated with “diversity” courses. Courses that introduce students to a broad range of cultures have a place as well, as do courses that “internationalize” the curriculum. Therefore, we recommend that the current general education breadth requirement be modified to require that one course be chosen from the list of courses approved for inclusion in the Multicultural Certificate program. Reflecting the expansion of the “diversity” definition inherent in this recommendation, this new requirement would be termed the “multicultural” or “world cultures” requirement.

Council: Council agrees with creation of a DI course requirement but felt the list of courses in the MCC program were unmonitored as to whether they address issues of diversity or were mono-culture/issue. Council recommends an approval process similar to WI utilizing the Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE) or a subcommittee of CUE to approve DI courses. CUE also will develop criteria for DI course approval which will require faculty council approval.

March 3, 2011 Council approval of DI Course Proposal.

Diversity Intensive Course Proposal

.....we recommend that the current general education breadth requirement be modified to require that one course be chosen **from a list of DI courses—taken from new and existing courses within our undergraduate curriculum**—to fulfill this requirement. Further, that DI courses will be taught through multiple and varied disciplines, theories, methodologies, and pedagogical approaches.

DI COURSE CURRICULUM

1. All undergraduate students at MU would be required to take **3 credit hours** designated as “Diversity Intensive.”
2. DI courses could be fulfilled within courses counted in the Distribution Requirement in the current general education architecture (GEA) such as humanities, social and behavioral sciences and science requirements, and thus **would not require any additional credit hours for any degree in any college.**
3. The DI course requirement can be **fulfilled through courses within departments** through which they are offered.
4. Courses would go through a **process of approval** to become DI courses, similar to the way courses are submitted online for approval for WI designation.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

DI courses will meet two fundamental criteria:

1) DI courses will focus on understanding differing social groups (locally, nationally, and/or internationally).

2) DI courses will explore social inequalities broadly defined to include class, race, age, ethnicities, disabilities, genders, veterans, rural and urban communities, economic and/or resource disparities, indigenous cultures, among others.

Importantly DI courses will help students to:

- Describe and explain complex worldviews, policies, and issues from multiple perspectives;
- Critically analyze cultural myths and stereotypes about underrepresented groups through an in depth analysis of other cultures and life experiences;
- Communicate and work effectively, reasonably, and with an open mind with people of varied backgrounds, points of view and cultures;



Thank You!!!

