

***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charge One through Seven**  
**March 1, 2019**

**Rules Committee members:** Terrel Gallaway (chair), John Heywood, Seth Hoelscher, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Walker (*ex officio*)

**Charge #1**

**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to Senate Actions**

The term "Faculty Senate Action" is used in the Constitution (ART III, line 37) but is defined in the Bylaws (ART I SEC 7, lines 583-585). This makes it possible to change the Constitution by changing the Bylaws, thereby bypassing the more stringent requirements for making substantive changes to the Constitution as described in ART X of the Constitution. Investigate the history of this language and consider a change to the Constitution and Bylaws that would remedy the problem.

**Findings and conclusions:**

1. The current language appears to be completely consistent with the original language that was adopted by the faculty in 1987. Over the years, the original term "Actions" has been replaced, successively, by "actions" and then "Faculty Senate Actions", but these changes were made in parallel in both documents. It appears that the most recent change was made to clarify the distinction between legislative products that are governed by ART III of the Constitution (now called Faculty Senate Actions) and a new category of legislative products (Internal Actions) that are not governed by ART III of the Constitution because they do not alter University policies or procedures.
2. Thus, the potential loophole for amending the Constitution that is identified in this charge was present from the very beginning. It is not a side effect of any subsequent amendments to either document and therefore does not dictate the nullification of any previous amendments.
3. A simple way to close the loophole is to insert into ART III of the Constitution a duplicate copy of the definition of "Faculty Senate Action" that currently appears in ART I SEC 7 of the Bylaws. Because "Faculty Senate Action" (originally "Action") has always been taken to have the same referent in both documents, and the definition that appears in the Bylaws has never been altered, we believe this change to the Constitution would be non-substantive and could therefore be approved by the simpler mechanism normally employed for amending the Bylaws, as described in ART X of the Constitution.

**Summary of Proposed Changes to the Constitution of the Faculty:**

1. Add to ART III of the Constitution the definition of “Faculty Senate Action” that appears on lines 583-585 of the Bylaws.

**PROPOSED INTERNAL ACTION TO MAKE A NON-SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENT TO THE  
CONSTITUTION**

**Original Language**

*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY  
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

ART III POWERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

*[lines 29-38:]*

The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish policy in the areas of authority assigned to the faculty in the *Bylaws of the Board of Governors* and for such other areas or problems as may be assigned to it by the president of the university or the Board of Governors. Shared governance, as delegated by the Board in the *Faculty Handbook*, recognizes the essential interdependence of governing boards, administration, faculty, staff, and students. This shared governance is indispensable to the development of educated persons. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish specific functional bodies to carry out powers granted to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate and its established bodies shall have the power to initiate action in such curricular and non-curricular matters as it deems fit, or in such matters as are brought to its attention by one or more members of the faculty. Every Faculty Senate Action is subject to challenge by the faculty and subject to final approval by the president and, when necessary, by the Board of Governors.

**Proposed Changes**

**Additions in bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, *[comments bracketed and italicized]*

CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY  
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

ART III POWERS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish policy in the areas of authority assigned to the faculty in the *Bylaws of the Board of Governors* and for such other areas or problems as may be assigned to it by the president of the university or the Board of Governors. Shared governance, as delegated by the Board in the *Faculty Handbook*, recognizes the essential interdependence of governing boards, administration, faculty, staff, and students. This shared governance is indispensable to the development of educated persons. The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish specific functional bodies to carry out powers granted to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate and its established bodies shall have the power to initiate action in

such curricular and non-curricular matters as it deems fit, or in such matters as are brought to its attention by one or more members of the faculty. **Faculty Senate Actions, as perfected and passed by the Faculty Senate, represent the collective reasoning of the faculty through its governance process as to policies and procedures to be followed by the University.** Every Faculty Senate Action is subject to challenge by the faculty and subject to final approval by the president and, when necessary, by the Board of Governors.

**Charge #2****Rules Committee Charge pertaining to the Changes in General Education**

Consider whether changes to the General Education curriculum should require more than a majority vote of the Senate.

**Rules Committee recommendations and considerations**

The Committee does believe that there should be a high bar when it comes to modifying General Education. However, a supermajority requirement for approving modifications to the General Education curriculum is something that would have been most effective if it had been in effect immediately after the new General Education program was put into place.

Additionally, there are ongoing issues that relate to GCEIP and General Education. These include an ongoing examination of both CGEIP's structure and the General Education assessment process. Similarly, understanding whether the long-run effects of Missouri's Core 42 Program need to be considered is beyond the scope of this committee.

Accordingly, the Committee believes the university would be better served by having another committee, with greater expertise, look into the issue of how best to ensure the integrity and stability of the General Education curriculum. Conceivably, this could be an additional charge for the ad hoc committee already looking into issues related to CGEIP.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

**Relevant Parts of the *Constitution and Bylaws*:**

1631 **ART IV COUNCIL ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND INTERCOLLEGIATE**  
 1632 **PROGRAMS**

1633

1634 SEC 1 Establishment of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

1635

1636 As an integral part of the Faculty Senate structure, a Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

1637 shall be established.

1638

1639 **SEC 2 Purpose of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1640

1641 This Council shall act upon all curricular proposals affecting the General Education Program, undergraduate

1642 courses and programs offered collaboratively by academic departments in two or more colleges, undergraduate

1643 degrees offered by two or more colleges, and the general requirements for undergraduate certificates. This

1644 Council shall also act on applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree program.

1645

1646 **SEC 3 Powers of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1647

1648 This council is empowered to recommend the approval of curricular proposals or reject and return proposals to

1649 the originator, and to approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of General Studies degree

1650 program.

1651

1652 **SEC 4 Responsibilities of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1653

1654 A Reviews and acts upon general education course proposals to ensure compliance with established general  
1655 education course criteria. A recommendation for the approval of a course proposal will be forwarded to the  
1656 Secretary of the Faculty for review and disposition as described in ART VI.

1766 **SEC 10 Duties of Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

1767

1768 The council shall recommend the approval of a curricular proposal or reject and return a proposal to the  
1769 originator. A proposal may be withdrawn from consideration without motion or vote by the originating units  
1770 before final disposition by the council upon specific request to the council chair. All curricular proposals  
1771 recommended for approval by the council shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty for disposition as  
1772 described in ART VI. The Council shall also approve or deny applications for admission to the Bachelor of  
1773 General Studies degree program.

2124 **SEC 6 Responsibility of Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council,  
and**

2125 **Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs**

2126

2127 A Shall receive, deliberate on, and expedite curricular proposals from academic departments or special  
2128 academic programs in the university.

2129

2130 B Shall reject or recommend the approval of a curricular proposal. A curricular proposal shall be withdrawn  
2131 from consideration before final disposition by the council, upon specific request to the council chair by the  
2132 originator, without motion or vote.

2133

2134 C Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs

2135

2136 (1) If a proposal is rejected, the CGEIP Chair shall notify the originator, the Department  
Head/Director,

2137 and the Faculty Senator representing the academic department or special academic program from  
2138 which the proposal originated. This notification shall initiate the appeals period for the CGEIP  
2139 Action.

2140

2141 (2) The CGEIP Chair shall forward to the Secretary of the Faculty all proposals recommended for  
2142 approval.

2143

2240 **SEC 10 Responsibility of Faculty Senate**

2241

2242 The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action:

2243

2244 A On all curricular matters forwarded to it by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate.

2245 B On all appeals of curricular proposals forwarded to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate by the  
college

2246 councils, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Council on General Education and

2247 Intercollegiate Programs. Senate actions on such appeals are separate from senate actions on the curricular

2256 E On all proposals affecting the structure of General Education. This includes but is not limited to:

2257 (1) Changes to the aims and goals of General Education

2258 (2) Changes to the learning outcomes of General Education

2259 (3) Changes to the focus areas of General Education

2260 (4) Changes to the credit hour requirements within General Education

2261 (5) Course additions to and deletions from General Education



**Charge # 3****Rules Committee Charge pertaining to EPPC**

The Rules Committee never acted on charge 18 from last year, which was to revise the EPPC membership criteria as proposed by **EPPC**. We did not act on this because EPPC never responded to a request from Rules despite multiple requests to the chair of EPPC. At issue is ART III, SEC 4, paragraph A. The second sentence in this paragraph describes the qualifications for teaching, supervising, and managing within the EPP, which is not Senate business. I recommend that this sentence be struck from the bylaws.

**Rules Committee's Considerations**

The Faculty Senate is properly concerned with the EPPC but not the EPP. The EPP is not a Faculty Senate institution. Accordingly, EPP membership requirements are their own business and should not be included in the *Constitution and Bylaws* of the Faculty Senate.

The EPP is encouraged to promulgate their own membership criteria.



**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS**

**Relevant Parts of the *Bylaws*:**

**Article III EDUCATION PREPARATION PROVIDER COUNCIL  
SEC 4 Membership of the Educator Preparation Provider Council**

A An EPPC member who represents the faculty must be a member of the EPP. Faculty/staff who teach one or more EPP courses, advise or supervise educator preparation students, or administer educator preparation academic departments/units\* or colleges must be members of the EPP.

(\*The term “unit” here refers to any group of faculty members who collectively controls the curriculum of one or more academic programs and resides outside of the administrative structure of any single academic department. The only educator preparation entity that fits this description is the MSED-Secondary Oversight Committee. If additional educator preparation units are formed which fit this description, they shall receive voting membership on the EPPC automatically without additional amendment to the Bylaws. The BSED-Secondary Oversight Committee does not fit this description because each of the BSED Secondary programs is controlled by its respective department.)

All faculty serving on EPPC must meet all Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) accreditation standards regarding members of the EPP. These standards include being actively involved in teacher education and having a five-year plan on file in the respective academic department and the EPP. This five-year plan must detail the faculty member’s direct and periodic involvement with the public schools

B 1 The EPPC shall include at least one EPP faculty member from each academic department, and from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>, that has one or more education programs. All departments are required to have at least one representative. Departments with more than 250 combined graduate and undergraduate teacher education majors have the option of electing one representative per 250 majors in teacher education. If an academic department or entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> has three or fewer EPP faculty members, then its head may serve as an *ex officio* EPPC member without voting privileges.

**Rules committee recommended change to the Bylaws (Article 3 Section 4):**

Additions in **bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [comments bracketed and italicized]

## SEC 4 Membership of the Educator Preparation Provider Council

- A An EPPC member who represents the faculty must be a member of the EPP. ~~Faculty/staff who teach one or more EPP courses, advise or supervise educator preparation students, or administer educator preparation academic departments/units\* or colleges must be members of the EPP.~~

~~(\*The term “unit” here refers to any group of faculty members who collectively controls the curriculum of one or more academic programs and resides outside of the administrative structure of any single academic department. The only educator preparation entity that fits this description is the MSED Secondary Oversight Committee. If additional educator preparation units are formed which fit this description, they shall receive voting membership on the EPPC automatically without additional amendment to the Bylaws. The BSED Secondary Oversight Committee does not fit this description because each of the BSED Secondary programs is controlled by its respective department.)~~

~~All faculty serving on EPPC must meet all Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) accreditation standards regarding members of the EPP. These standards include being actively involved in teacher education and having a five year plan on file in the respective academic department and the EPP. This five year plan must detail the faculty member’s direct and periodic involvement with the public schools.~~

- B 1 The EPPC shall include at least one EPP faculty member from each academic department, **or special academic program**, and from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>, that has one or more education programs. All departments, **or special academic programs**, are required to have at least one representative. Departments, **or special academic programs**, with more than 250 combined graduate and undergraduate teacher education majors have the option of electing one representative per 250 majors in teacher education. If an academic department, **special academic program**, or entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> has three or fewer EPP faculty members, then its head may serve as an *ex officio* EPPC member without voting privileges. **The BSED-Secondary Oversight Committee is not considered to be a special academic program and does not have separate representation on EPPC.**

**Rules committee recommended final language for Section 4 a in its entirety and section B:**

## SEC 4 Membership of the Educator Preparation Provider Council

- A An EPPC member who represents the faculty must be a member of the EPP.
- B 1 The EPPC shall include at least one EPP faculty member from each academic department, or special academic program, and from each entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm>, that has one or more education programs. All departments, or special academic programs, are required to have at least one representative. Departments, or special academic programs, with more than 250 combined graduate and undergraduate teacher education majors have the option of electing one representative per 250 majors in teacher education. If an academic department, special academic program, or entity so identified in <http://www.missouristate.edu/facultysenate/entities.htm> has

three or fewer EPP faculty members, then its head may serve as an ex officio EPPC member without voting privileges. The BSED-Secondary Oversight Committee is not considered to be a special academic program and does not have separate representation on EPPC.

**Charge #4****Rules Committee Charge pertaining to Staff Representation on the Faculty Senate**

The bylaws state that the staff will provide two delegates to the Faculty Senate, one representing the "classified staff" and one representing the "professional staff". However, in recent years the staff senate has provided a single delegate. I am not sure the distinction between "classified" and "professional" staff even exists anymore. This should be investigated and the bylaws should be updated as needed. NOTE from T. Dicke: I spoke with Chair of Staff Senate those classifications are no longer used. His recommendation was to just leave it at two delegates.

**Rules Committee's Considerations**

First, it is important to note that Senate meetings are open meetings; all staff members are welcome to attend. Second, the delegates from students, graduate students and staff serve, in large part, as liaisons between Faculty Senate and their own representative bodies. That is, a staff delegate represents, in a sense, the Staff Senate, not a particular classification of staff. Accordingly, only one delegate is necessary. It is up to each of the representative bodies to ensure that all of their constituents are fairly represented and adequately informed. Moreover, the new language makes the representation consistent with a single delegate each from the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Senate.

**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS**

**Relevant Parts of the *Bylaws (Art I, Sec 2)*:**

138 There are two classes of membership in the Faculty Senate: Voting members (designated as senators) and non-voting  
 139 members (designated as delegates). The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following senators: the  
 140 Chair of the Senate; the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the Secretary of the Faculty; representatives of academic departments,  
 141 one senator from each academic department; one representative from the instructors; one from clinical faculty; and  
 142 representatives of the ranked faculty, one senator from each rank: (a) assistant professor, (b) associate professor; and (c) full  
 143 or distinguished professor. Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one  
 144 delegate from the Student Government Association and one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; one delegate from  
 145 the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff.

**Rules committee recommended change to the *Bylaws (Art I, Sec 2)*:**

Additions in **bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [*comments bracketed and italicized*]

138 There are two classes of membership in the Faculty Senate: Voting members (designated as senators) and non-voting  
 139 members (designated as delegates). The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following senators: the  
 140 Chair of the Senate; the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the Secretary of the Faculty; representatives of academic departments,  
 141 one senator from each academic department; one representative from the instructors; one from clinical faculty; and  
 142 representatives of the ranked faculty, one senator from each rank: (a) assistant professor, (b) associate professor; and (c) full  
 143 or distinguished professor. Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one  
 144 delegate from the Student Government Association, ~~and~~ one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; **and**  
 one delegate  
 145 ~~from the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff~~ **the Staff Senate.**

**Recommended Final Language (*Art I, Sec 2*)**

There are two classes of membership in the Faculty Senate: Voting members (designated as senators) and non-voting  
 members (designated as delegates). The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following senators: the  
 Chair of the Senate; the Chair-Elect of the Senate; the Secretary of the Faculty; representatives of academic departments,

one senator from each academic department; one representative from the instructors; one from clinical faculty; and representatives of the ranked faculty, one senator from each rank: (a) assistant professor, (b) associate professor; and (c) full or distinguished professor. Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one delegate from the Student Government Association, one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate, and one delegate from the Staff Senate.

**Charge #5****Rules Committee Charge pertaining to the Committee on Judicial Review**

*The bylaws provide no guidelines for handling reports from the Committee on Judicial Review. In the past, decisions rendered by the Judicial Review have been treated as the “final word,” but this may be in violation of Robert’s Rules, and certainly violates the spirit of shared governance. As a standing committee on the Faculty Senate, Judicial Review should submit its reports to the Senate and its recommendations should not become Senate Actions (or Internal Actions) until there has been an affirmative vote in the Senate. Rules should then research the issue and propose language that will clarify the bylaws.*

**Rules Committee Considerations.**

The Rules Committee agreed with the chief concern expressed within the *Charge pertaining to Committee on Judicial Review (JRC)*. That is, historically, the JRC had been charged to interpret the Senate’s Constitution and Bylaws and deliver its report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate. According to the current *Bylaws*, reports of the JRC could be reviewed by the Chair, who could immediately charge the Rules Committee to act according to the JRC decision without informing the Senate body.

In the interest of transparency and shared governance, the Rules Committee concluded that the charge submitted to the JRC, conclusions reached by the JRC, and subsequent charges from the Chair of the Faculty Senate to the Rules Committee should be communicated to the Faculty Senate in a timely manner. At that point, the Faculty Senate would have opportunity to consider the actions of the JRC and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

The Rules Committee’s language specifies that the Chair of the Faculty Senate should “ensure the report of” JRC relevant information. This language provides the Senate Chair an option of either directly reporting to the Faculty Senate or inviting the JRC to deliver a report.

**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS**

**Relevant Parts of the *Bylaws* (Art 1, Section 9B (6) and Art I Sec 5 (10)):**

843 (6) Committee on Judicial Review

845 (a) Purpose

847 (aa) Shall adjudicate in questions of interpretation of the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty.

849 (bb) Shall consider questions originating from any faculty member when presented through the  
Chair of the Faculty Senate.

852 (cc) Shall serve as a panel of election judges in the annual primary and annual general elections  
for Faculty Senate membership.

855 (b) Membership

857 Shall be composed of the three next most immediate past chairs of the Faculty Senate who do not hold full time administrative positions. The most immediate past chair of the Faculty Senate who is serving on this committee shall serve as chair of the committee.

Section 5-A-(10) Duties of the Officers and Past Chair of the Faculty Senate [lines 421-3]

A. The Chair of the Faculty Senate

(10) Shall review all decisions of the Judicial Review Committee to determine if any decisions may require a revision to the bylaws of the Faculty and, if so, shall issue a charge to the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules.

**Rules committee recommended change to the Bylaws 5-A-10 (mostly added language):**

Additions in **bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, [*comments bracketed and italicized*]

(10) Shall review all decisions of the Judicial Review Committee ~~to determine if any decisions may require a revision to the bylaws of the Faculty and, if so, shall issue a charge to the Faculty Senate Committee on Rules.~~ **(JRC) and ensure the report of the following to the Faculty Senate within two meetings following a decision: 1) the initial charge considered by the JRC; 2) the determination reached by the JRC; 3) any resulting charge(s) from the Faculty Senate Chair to the Rules Committee emanating from a JRC decision. In addition, the Senate Chair should remind the Faculty Senators of their right to propose action relevant to the determination reached by the JRC.**



**Rules committee recommended final language *Art I Sec 5 (10)***

(10) Shall review all decisions of the Judicial Review Committee (JRC) and ensure the report of the following to the Faculty Senate within two meetings following a decision: 1) the initial charge considered by the JRC; 2) the determination reached by the JRC; 3) any resulting charge(s) from the Faculty Senate Chair to the Rules Committee emanating from a JRC decision. In addition, the Senate Chair should remind the Faculty Senators of their right to propose action relevant to the determination reached by the JRC.

**Charge #6****Rules Committee Charge pertaining to CGEIP**

Unlike Graduate Council and EPPC, CGEIP is not empowered to propose modifications to those portions of the Bylaws (ART IV) that guide its operation. CGEIP has expressed the desire to re-structure so as to better leverage both faculty interest and experience. Rules should work with CGEIP to update the text of ART IV, and should consider adding a provision allowing CGEIP to directly propose future modifications.

**Rules Committee recommendations and considerations**

The committee consulted with CGEIP leadership and concluded that the necessary changes are so substantive and involved that an *ad hoc* committee appointed to look into the issue would better serve the university. The recommendations of that committee could then help inform a charge to Rules next year. We also believed it was be a good idea to notify the Chair of the Faculty Senate immediately, rather than wait for our final report, so that he could form an ad hoc committee if he agreed it was appropriate to do so.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

**Charge #7**

**Rules Committee Charge pertaining to a glossary for the Bylaws**

Consider generating a **glossary** of terms used in the Bylaws.

**Rules Committee recommendations and considerations**

The Committee believes a glossary would be helpful. However, instead of appending the glossary to the Constitution and Bylaws, the Committee felt it would be more appropriate to maintain the glossary as a separate document. To ensure that the Glossary is helpful to future committees, an electronic copy of it should be placed in the Rule's Committee's Electronic archives, in the Faculty Senate Office, and on The Faculty Senate's website.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

**Charge #8****Rules Committee Charge pertaining to a Senior Instructors**

Consider the desirability of adding Senior Instructor to the rank representatives and propose language to define the eligibility and election process.

Rationale: Under our current system Instructors and Senior Instructors share a Representative. There are currently about 90 Instructors and 60 Sr. Instructors. Although the concerns and conditions of both groups overlap, there are also significant differences. At least on the surface, the numbers seems to indicate this could be a useful change.

**Rules Committee's Considerations**

The Committee agrees that Instructors and Senior Instructors should have their own representative. First, it was instructors and senior instructors themselves who initially raised this issue. We give much weight to their concerns that they could be better represented separately. Moreover, the distinction between these two groups is a meaningful one with each group having different concerns, perspectives, and time horizons. Finally, it should be noted that the promotion to senior instructor has never lived up to what was originally promised and intended. Ideally, separate representation in the Faculty Senate could serve as an initial step in rectifying that problem.

However, creating a separate representative for Senior Instructors would require a substantive change to the Constitution as well as a change in the Bylaws. Appropriately, changing the Constitution is a more difficult task and involves a vote of the entire ranked faculty. It is the Committee's belief that such an undertaking would work better if the faculty had more information about Instructors' and Senior Instructors' concerns as well as more to time consider this issue. Accordingly, the Committee believes this issue should be addressed in the next academic year. The new Chair of the Faculty Senate, if they so decide, can give the Committee on Rules a new charge at that time.

No related changes to the *Constitution and Bylaws* are recommended at this time.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Compensation Attachment 2 is a Power Point document in a separate link.

***Senate Resolution with an Internal Senate Action Regarding Doctoral program guideline revisions***

**Whereas**, Doctoral programs are likely to be an increasingly important part of Missouri State's future, and,

**Whereas**, current university requirements for Doctoral programs have not been reviewed or revised for a number of years, and,

**Whereas**, the ad hoc Committee to Review Doctorial Program Guidelines carefully reviewed the existing guidelines and made several suggestions for improvement,

**Be it Resolved**, that the Faculty Senate requests that the administration of Missouri State University adopt the minimum guidelines for Doctoral programs described below and that the Committee on Rules review and recommend revision of the *Bylaws* to reflect the routing of Doctoral Program described below.

## **Report of the Committee to Review Doctoral Program Guidelines**

### **Charge:**

The ad hoc Committee to Review Doctoral Program Guidelines will review the current Doctoral program guidelines and recommend improvements to Faculty Senate. The committee should also suggest proper routing for such program proposals, specifically the committee should consider if Doctoral program proposals, whether for new programs or revisions, should be approved by the Committee on Budget and Priorities and/or the Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs before consideration by Faculty Senate.

### **Suggested Changes to the Doctoral Program Guidelines:**

The committee suggests the following changes. The original language to the policy is immendaitely below. The recommended final language without markup follows after.

#### **Original language with revisions:**

Additions are bolded, deletions are indicated by strikethrough.

~~The completion of a doctoral program indicates the attainment of the highest possible training and intellectual development in one's discipline. As such, t~~The rigor of a doctoral degree program is necessarily higher than that of a master's degree program, and is set above the level that an average student would generally be able to attain. Because the requirements for completion of a doctoral degree are discipline-specific, and often linked to national accreditation standards, some programs may have higher/additional requirements. Nonetheless, minimal university-wide standards include:

1. All students ~~must~~ complete the stated courses and minimum number of required credit hours for the program. Keep in mind that courses taken for undergraduate credit may not be used on the Program of Study for a doctoral degree.
2. Complete at least one-half of the minimum semester hours in courses with no undergraduate parallel course.
3. No more than 49% of the required semester hours may be fulfilled by combining senior permission (up to 12 hours), courses taken prior to admission to the program (up to 30%), transfer (up to 30%), and assessment of prior learning.
4. Attain a grade point average of at least 3.0 on all graduate work utilized in the degree program that includes Missouri State University and transfer courses.
5. All students must complete a doctoral research project, to be directed by a faculty member from their discipline with Graduate Faculty in Research status.
6. In addition, each project will be supervised by a Doctoral Research Committee. Each will consist of at least two (2) additional faculty members with Graduate Faculty status (research, ~~clinical/practitioner,~~ or **professional**). For doctoral students who are completing a doctoral thesis, their committee will also have a fourth member from outside the department who has Graduate Faculty status in Research.
7. Presentation of the research results (thesis or project) at a forum approved by the department (~~except in Doctor of Nursing Practice~~).
8. A minimum cumulative GPA of 3.00 in all course work associated with the degree.
9. Satisfactory completion of a comprehensive exam, ~~as specified by the department (except in Doctor of Nursing Practice)~~ or another cumulative assessment of student learning.
10. Students must complete all degree requirements within an eight-year period (excluding time spent in the United States Armed Forces).
11. Students must meet all program-specific degree requirements (including research, practicum, comprehensive examination, etc).

### **Doctoral Degree Requirements [recommended final language]**

#### *Op3.19-2 Doctoral Degree Requirements*

The rigor of a doctoral degree program is necessarily higher than that of a master's degree program and is set above the level that an average student would generally be able to attain. Because the requirements for completion of a doctoral degree are discipline-specific, and often linked to national accreditation standards, some programs may have higher/additional requirements. Nonetheless, minimal university-wide standards include:

1. All students must complete the stated courses and minimum number of required credit hours for the program. Keep in mind that courses taken for undergraduate credit may not be used on the Program of Study for a doctoral degree.

2. Complete at least one-half of the minimum semester hours in courses with no undergraduate parallel course.
3. No more than 49% of the required semester hours may be fulfilled by combining senior permission (up to 12 hours), courses taken prior to admission to the program (up to 30%), transfer (up to 30%), and assessment of prior learning.
4. Attain a grade point average of at least 3.0 on all graduate work utilized in the degree program that includes Missouri State University and transfer courses.
5. All students must complete a doctoral research project, to be directed by a faculty member from their discipline with Graduate Faculty in Research status.
6. In addition, each project will be supervised by a Doctoral Research Committee. Each will consist of at least two (2) additional faculty members with Graduate Faculty status (research or professional). For doctoral students who are completing a doctoral thesis, their committee will also have a fourth member from outside the department who has Graduate Faculty status in Research.
7. Presentation of the research results (thesis or project) at a forum approved by the department.
8. A minimum cumulative GPA of 3.00 in all course work associated with the degree.
9. Satisfactory completion of a comprehensive exam or another cumulative assessment of student learning.
10. Students must complete all degree requirements within an eight-year period (excluding time spent in the United States Armed Forces).
11. Students must meet all program-specific degree requirements (including research, practicum, comprehensive examination, etc).

### **Routing of Program Proposals and Changes:**

The committee proposes that the routing of doctoral program be changed.

The current process is as follows: Department, Graduate College Council, Senate.

The ad-hoc committee proposes the following: Department, Graduate College Council, Senate Budget and Priorities, Senate.

**Rationale for change:** The review process for doctoral programs must consider academic rigor, potential conflicts or overlaps with existing programs, and new resource requirements. While the Graduate College Council is well positioned to review doctoral programs for academic rigor and for any potential conflicts/overlaps with existing programs, questions of resource allocation and budget priorities fall outside of its remit. The Senate Budget and Priorities committee is specifically charged with reviewing “major initiatives with possible budgetary implications” and so the ad-hoc committee felt that the Budget and Priorities Committee should be charged with reviewing the resource requirements of new doctoral programs and those changes to existing doctoral programs that require significant new resources. The committee does not recommend that the Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (CGEIP) be involved in the regular review process of doctoral programs. The committee felt that the Graduate College



Council offered sufficient review of academic rigor and potential conflicts/overlaps with other programs.

The Handbook Master Copy is in a separate link.

## **Faculty Handbook Revisions and Rationales for March Faculty Senate Meeting**

### *3.8.1. Stopping the Tenure Clock*

Notwithstanding the above, the probationary period may be extended at the request of the faculty member for reason of medical condition, to accommodate important family care issues, or military service for a period **typically** not to exceed two additional years. Such extension will be based upon the recommendation of the Department Head/School Director, Dean, and with approval by the Provost in consultation with Human Resources.

**Rationale:** It was suggested at the February Faculty Senate meeting that the period of two years be removed. However, the FHRC felt this signified that the extension could go on indefinitely. The word typically was added to signal that the extension is not always for two years. Since the DH and Dean must approve extensions, with approval by the Provost, any additional time on extensions would be part of this process. Restarting the tenure clock was also suggested, but an extension is better for the faculty member. Restarting the tenure clock would wipe out any tenure items already accrued.

### *14.5.1. Dismissal Procedures*

The President of the University will initiate formal dismissal proceedings by addressing a written communication to the faculty member informing him or her of the statement of charges and that he or she will be dismissed as of a date specified in the written communication, but in no case less than 30 business days from the date of delivery of the communication. The faculty member will also be notified by the President that he or she may file a formal grievance within 15 business days from the date of the delivery of the communication. If a grievance is filed, it will follow the APGP process. If no grievance is filed, the dismissal will take effect as indicated in the written communication specified above.

Pending final decision of termination under Section 14.5.1 the faculty member will be suspended, or assigned to other duties in lieu of suspension, only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by continuance. Before suspending a faculty member, pending an ultimate determination of the faculty member's status through the grievance process, the administration will consult with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee concerning the propriety, the length, and the other conditions of the suspension. Salary will continue during the period of the suspension. The faculty member may request review by the Board of Governors of the dismissal, as provided in Section 174.150, RSMo

### *14.5.2. Dismissal for Job Abandonment*

The President of the University may initiate formal dismissal proceedings, under this section in situations where, without administrative approval, a faculty member has engaged in a pattern of behavior by failing to perform his or her University duties by being absent from University

classes, department meetings or other required activities, to the extent that the faculty member may reasonably be deemed to have abandoned his or her job duties. Such proceedings will begin by informing the faculty member that the University considers the faculty member in abandonment of his or her job duties, and that the faculty member will be dismissed as of a date specified in the written communication, but in no case less than ten calendar days from the date of delivery of the communication. The faculty member will also be notified by the President that he or she may file a formal grievance within 5 business days from the date of the delivery of the communication. If a grievance is filed, it will follow the APGP process, and the faculty member will continue to receive his or her full salary and employee benefits during the conduct of the APGP process. If no grievance is filed, the dismissal will take effect as indicated in the written communication specified above. For purposes of clarity, termination under this section shall be limited to those situations where a faculty member has not been physically present to perform his or her duties for the University, and this absence is unplanned, not excused, and disruptive to the University. Scheduled absences, or arranged hiatus from University duties will not rise to the level of dismissal under this section.

**Rationale:** Section 14.5.2 was added to the Handbook to identify this particular type of dismissal. In response to Faculty Senate requests from February, this new section clarifies that a pattern of behavior in failing to be physically present to perform duties is required. It also addresses the question raised on the timeline and process of the dismissal proceedings.

*Change in Glossary - Senior Instructor:* Faculty member who has, while in an Instructor position, demonstrated excellence in Teaching and Service at Missouri State University for at least five years. **See Sections 3.5.2 and 4.6.5.3**

**Rationale:** Sections 3.5.2 and 4.6.5.3 were referenced to clarify description of senior instructor as an earned rank and not a title conferred merely by receiving 5 years of demonstrating teaching and service excellence.