

Faculty Senate Rules Committee
Response to Charge One
March 5, 2015

FACULTY SENATE CHARGE ONE

Charge 1: Consider whether Article VI, Section 8 of the Bylaws, explaining which curricular proposals come before Faculty Senate, needs to be clarified or modified.

Rationale: The Bylaws do not provide for Senate consideration of changes to requirements for specific degrees such as the B. A. or Senate consideration of modification of large programs such as General Education.

- Last year I received complaints when the changes in language requirements for the B. A. did not come before Senate for consideration. Under the current bylaws, such changes do not appear to be reviewed by Senate. CGEIP makes the final decision. Only if the change is appealed would it come before Senate. Is this appropriate given that changes to the B. A. would affect many departments across campus?
- Under the Bylaws as written, it does not appear that a significant amendment to General Education requirements would come before Senate. Yet a proposal by the English Department to amend General Education rules that restricted the number of General Education classes students could take with the same course code was voted on by Senate. Was this appropriate? Or is CGEIP the final decision making body on such changes, barring an appeal? Do we need to clarify what types of issues related to General Education come before Senate?
- These are merely two examples that arose last year. There may be other types of curricular proposals that ought to come before Senate but do not. Likewise, there may be other types of curricular proposals that have been coming before Senate without a clear rationale for that in the Bylaws.

RULES PROCESS FOR CHARGE ONE

The Committee accepted the charge and began the task by researching the two examples cited in the charge, curricular processes as prescribed by the Bylaws, challenge and appeals processes, and the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Faculty, the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate, and the Faculty Senate. The committee further investigated the differences between terms “council” and “committee” and the relationship to Faculty Senate by committees and councils identified as “standing committees of Faculty Senate”. This report focuses and recommends the following:

- Consider amending Article VI, Section 2 to include changes in degree policies and requirements and changes in General Education.
- Consider amending Article VI, Section 7: Responsibility of the Secretary of the Faculty to include faculty senators on the distribution list for approved curricular proposals at the beginning of the challenge period.
- Consider amending Article VI, Section 8: Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate to include additional powers of curricular review.
- Consider amending Article VI, Section 9: Responsibility of Faculty Senate Consider to include additional powers of curricular review.

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE ONE

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 2 Definitions and Structures in Curricular Process

- A For the purpose of this document curricular proposals are defined as:
- (1) New major or minor degree programs
 - (2) New options within an existing degree program
 - (3) New courses
 - (4) Substantive change in any of the above
-

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 7 Responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty

- B The approved curricular proposals shall be distributed to all college deans and department heads.
-

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 8 Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall have authority to recommend to departments or special academic programs, to college councils, to the graduate council, to the Professional Education Committee, to the Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs or to the Faculty Senate, new curricular programs or alterations (including deletion or addition) to existing courses or programs.

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 9 Responsibility of Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action only on those curricular proposals acted upon by the college councils, graduate council, Professional Education Committee, and Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs, and then appealed. The Faculty Senate shall also consider and take action on all proposals to add or delete academic programs.

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE ONE**REVISED LANGUAGE**

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 2 Definitions and Structures in Curricular Process

- A For the purpose of this document curricular proposals are defined as:
- (1) New major or minor degree programs
 - (2) New options within an existing degree program
 - (3) New courses
 - (4) Substantive change in any of the above
 - (5) Changes to degree policies and requirements**
 - (6) Changes to General Education**

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 7 Responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty

- B The approved curricular proposals shall be distributed to all college deans ~~and~~, department heads, **and faculty senators.**

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 8 Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate **issues final faculty approval on all curricular changes. This normally is a pro forma process; however, if within a challenge period any member of the committee determines that a curricular change warrants further review by the faculty then the committee has the right to bring the proposal to floor of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, the committee** shall have authority to recommend to departments or special academic programs, to college councils, to the graduate council, to the Professional Education Committee, to the Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs or to the Faculty Senate, new curricular programs or alterations (including deletion or addition) to existing courses or programs.

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 9 Responsibility of Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action: ~~only on those curricular proposals acted upon by the college councils, graduate council, Professional Education Committee, and Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs, and then appealed. The Faculty Senate shall also consider and take action on all proposals to add or delete academic programs.~~

- A On all curricular matters forwarded to it by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate.**
- B On all appeals of curricular proposals forwarded to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate by the college councils, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Senate Actions on appeals must be resolved before the curricular process may advance. If the appeal is approved, then the curricular proposal is rejected and the curricular process ends. If the appeal is denied, then the curricular proposal moves to the floor of Faculty Senate to be voted upon.**

- C On all proposals to add or delete academic programs.**
- D On all proposals to change degree policies and requirements.**
- E On all proposals affecting the structure of General Education. This includes but is not limited to:**
 - (1) Changes to the aims and goals of General Education**
 - (2) Changes to the learning outcomes of General Education**
 - (3) Changes to the focus areas of General Education**
 - (4) Changes to the credit hour requirements within General Education**
 - (5) Course additions to and deletions from General Education**

PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE ONE
FINAL LANGUAGE

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 2 Definitions and Structures in Curricular Process

- A For the purpose of this document curricular proposals are defined as:
- (1) New major or minor degree programs
 - (2) New options within an existing degree program
 - (3) New courses
 - (4) Substantive change in any of the above
 - (5) Changes to degree policies and requirements
 - (6) Changes to General Education
-

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 7 Responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty

- B The approved curricular proposals shall be distributed to all college deans, department heads, and faculty senators.
-

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 8 Responsibility of Executive Committee of Faculty Senate

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate issues final faculty approval on all curricular changes. This normally is a pro forma process; however, if within a challenge period any member of the committee determines that a curricular change warrants further review by the faculty then the committee has the right to bring the proposal to floor of the Faculty Senate. Furthermore, the committee shall have authority to recommend to departments or special academic programs, to college councils, to the graduate council, to the Educator Preparation Provider Council, to the Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs or to the Faculty Senate, new curricular programs or alterations (including deletion or addition) to existing courses or programs.

ART VI CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 9 Responsibility of Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate shall consider and take action:

- A On all curricular matters forwarded to it by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate.
- B On all appeals of curricular proposals forwarded to the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate by the college councils, Graduate Council, Educator Preparation Provider Council, and Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs. Senate Actions on appeals must be resolved before the curricular process may advance. If the appeal is approved, then the curricular proposal is rejected and the curricular process ends. If the appeal is denied, then the curricular proposal moves to the floor of Faculty Senate to be voted upon.
- C On all proposals to add or delete academic programs.
- D On all proposals to change degree policies and requirements.

- E On all proposals affecting the structure of General Education. This includes but is not limited to:
 - (1) Changes to the aims and goals of General Education
 - (2) Changes to the learning outcomes of General Education
 - (3) Changes to the focus areas of General Education
 - (4) Changes to the credit hour requirements within General Education
 - (5) Course additions to and deletions from General Education

The Course Change form is attached separately in a PDF file.

The Course Deletion form is attached separately in a PDF file.

The New Course form is attached separately in a PDF file.

Proposal for the Periodic Review of General Education Courses

The Committee on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs (CGEIP) applauds the efforts of the campus community in the success of our new general education program. From 2013-2014, CGEIP reviewed, discussed, and developed an annual report, and four-year periodic review process.

The committee kept the following principles in mind:

1. General education assessment should be meaningful and useful to those teaching the course.
2. General education assessment should be ongoing and cyclical.
3. General education assessment is collaborative and should not fall on the shoulders of one faculty member or department head but should promote conversations about student learning.
4. General education courses submitted an assessment plan with the course proposal. The committee understands that assessment plans may need to be modified and streamlined to promote the use and efficacy of the process.
5. Assessment of student learning is broadly defined to include both qualitative and quantitative, and both direct and indirect measures of student learning.

The following describes the proposed periodic review process, includes a tentative timeline and answers to anticipated frequently asked questions. The committee welcomes feedback.

Non-Purpose of the General Education Review

The purpose of this review is not to:

- Evaluate faculty
- Add more work to a course coordinator's or department's schedule

Purpose of the Review of a General Education Course

The purpose of reviewing a course is to:

- Assess the course on the basis of Specific Learning Outcomes
- Find out if students are providing evidence that they have met our approved Specific Learning Outcomes
- Provide useful and meaningful information for the instructors of a general education course
- Offer evidence that student learning has been looked at in a thoughtful way
- Share successes of student learning, areas for improvement, and document the process of assessment changes

Tentative Timeline for Review

Course coordinators accumulate and review student learning per the course proposal (most departments proposed reporting annually).

<p>Spring 2015</p>	<p>CGEIP will finalize the Proposal document and send to Faculty Senate for approval/vote.</p> <p>CGEIP will contact each department head to update the course coordinator in case a new course coordinator has been assigned.</p> <p>CGEIP will contact all course coordinators to remind them of approved assessment of the SLOs and General Education Goals and determine whether changes need to occur to the assessment plan or course.</p> <p>CGEIP will seek courses that wish to participate in a pilot review process</p>
---------------------------	--

	<p>Sample course periodic review materials will be uploaded by the end of Spring 2015</p>
<p>Fall 2015</p>	<p>CGEIP will work with the courses that have volunteered to pilot.</p> <p>CGEIP will review the documents.</p> <p>CGEIP will contact each department head to update the course coordinator.</p> <p>CGEIP will contact all course coordinators to review their approved assessment plan of the SLOs and General Education Goals and to determine whether changes need to occur to the assessment plan or course</p>
<p>Spring 2016</p>	<p>Pilot courses will submit their reports in January 2016 to CGEIP for review</p> <p>CGEIP will work with courses scheduled for periodic review in the following academic year</p>
<p>Fall 2016/Spring 2017</p>	<p>Courses in Foundations will participate in Periodic Review</p>
<p>Fall 2017/Spring 2018</p>	<p>Courses in Breadth of Knowledge: Human Cultures will participate in Periodic Review</p>
<p>Fall 2018/Spring 2019</p>	<p>Courses in Breadth of Knowledge: Natural World will participate in Periodic Review</p>

Fall 2019/Spring 2020	Courses in Breadth of Knowledge: Public Affairs will participate in Periodic Review
------------------------------	---

Annual Report

A general education course coordinator, with assistance from faculty who teach the course, will document and assess student learning based on the proposed general education plan. Documentation of an assessment/course review will be uploaded on a yearly basis. The annual report can be up to three pages. These annual reports will be useful in preparing the periodic review.

The annual report will include the following information:

- a. Time, date, and a list of faculty who participated in the course review
- b. Data (student work, scores, a common question, etc.) discussed; conclusions reached regarding the next steps for the course
- c. Items chosen by the faculty for action
- d. Follow-up plans and action regarding the course
- e. Recommendation for items that need action at higher levels than the department.

Periodic Review of General Education Courses

The periodic review will take place every four years; however, course coordinators should follow their course review process as indicated in the original proposal.

1. Reflection on each of the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) the course covers (250 words).

The reflection should include the following information:

- a. Level of success meeting Specific Learning Outcome
- b. Evidence used to assess
- c. How was the original proposal modified or refined?

- d. What items were chosen for action based on assessment? What actions did you take?
 - e. *Optional*: Upload an assessment tool, assignment or other material that was used to assess student learning of general goal and specific learning outcome.
2. Summary on how General Goals are met, based on the reflection of the SLOs (150 words)
 3. Syllabi for each instructor for the previous academic year (submitted online)
 4. Enrollment data (automatically populated through the Banner System)

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

1. What do I need to do prior to my periodic review date?

Course coordinators should carry on the assessment plan as it was proposed or amended. This includes the assessment/course review as defined in the course proposal. This may include modifications of the original course assessment plan. The course coordinators and department head will be reminded in January that the yearly review material needs to be uploaded to the CGEIP website.

2. When should I begin the assessment process?

Assessment is an ongoing process. The assessment plan submitted with the proposal specified when and how information relative to the assessment plan will be shared. That plan should be followed as soon as the course is offered.

3. What will the new form look like?

You will complete an online report similar to the general education proposal form. Each course will report on Specific Learning Outcomes and discuss changes you've made to the course and changes you've made to the assessment plan.

4. Who do I ask for help?

There are two college representatives on CGEIP. Talk to your college rep for more information and with questions.

5. Do I have to assess all Specific Learning Outcomes each semester? Each year?

At the point of the periodic review, all of the course's learning outcomes should have been assessed and analyzed. This does not mean that each outcome needs to be reviewed each year. The assessment of learning outcomes does not require collecting data every semester. You might, for example, collect data in the Fall of a given year for discussion and analysis during the Spring.

6. What's the role of a general education course coordinator?

General education course coordinators should not do all of the assessment work. Each course has committed to sharing regularly as identified in the course proposal. It's the role of the coordinator to help the instructors get together on a consistent basis. The coordinator organizes the review process and communicates with the instructors from all of the sections the results of the analysis of course assessments. General Education course coordinators will submit on behalf of the course a short report annually. These short reports will lead toward cumulative data and a report at the end of three years.

7. How is this process different than the old process? Are we starting all over? I just got used to the old process. Is this completely different?

Unlike the old general education that was paper-based, this is automated. Banner will automatically populate enrollment data. You will no longer have to collect it.

The goals and Specific Learning Outcomes are different. The logic is the same.

The course review cycle is every four years. The committee will ask for an annual report.

8. Can I change my Specific Learning Outcomes?

No, you would need to go through the review process again to add or delete Specific Learning Outcomes. You CAN modify assessment tools or evidence that you will collect to assess Specific Learning Outcomes.

9. The text box only allows us to write 250 words. It doesn't seem like enough.

There will be separate textboxes for each Specific Learning Outcome.

10. Our program has a new general education course coordinator who was not here during the proposal process, can she make changes?

CGEIP and college reps can work with you to help. You can change evidence and tools, but you cannot change Specific Learning Outcomes without going through the review process.

11. If there are concerns identified during the review process, what happens?

The course will be put on a probationary status for one year and will resubmit their materials in the following year for a new review.

12. Will the courses that participate in the pilot program be allowed to skip their first review year?

Courses that participate in the pilot program will be reviewed during their regularly scheduled academic year.

13. Will specific criteria be developed which will be utilized during the review process and be shared prior to the beginning of the review process?

The pilot course process will include the development of specific criteria which will allow CGEIP to refine the criteria that will be utilized during the review process. The course coordinators of the courses in the pilot program and CGEIP committee members will work together to develop a set of criteria for the review process. These criteria then will be disseminated to the course coordinators and department heads.

The Faculty Handbook Revision Committee is recommending the following revisions to the Faculty Senate (2/24/2015).

1. The issue: Colleges as Cost Centers have basically fixed summer school teaching budgets; minimum course enrollment plays a role in faculty compensation; there is currently no written university-wide definition on what this means; “Minimum enrollment guidelines” appears in sections 5.8, 5.9, and 14.3. in relation to faculty compensation and salary adjustments if minimum enrollments are not met. Since there is great variability as to what minimum enrollment can mean in colleges and departments, the FHRC proposes the following definition to be inserted into the Faculty Handbook Glossary.

Minimum enrollment guidelines: for undergraduate and graduate courses, shall be determined by the Department Head in consultation with the respective college Dean as aligned with any applicable written college and/or departmental policy

FH Glossary after inclusion of definition (page 108).

Joint faculty appointment: Appointment in which a faculty member has responsibility to, and review by, more than one Department.

Minimum enrollment guidelines: For undergraduate and graduate courses, shall be determined by the Department Head in consultation with the respective college Dean as aligned with any applicable written college and/or departmental policy

Missouri Campus Compact: A statewide coalition of university and college Presidents that is designed to help students develop the values and skills of civic participation through involvement in public service.

2. In FH, Section 4.7.2., Grounds for a PPC Appeal, there is no time frame specified to determine when an appeal must be filed with the Associate Provost. Since the Provost’s Office announces promotion and tenure decisions in March, the FHRC suggests that the timeframe to file an appeal should occur during that same semester as specified below. This gives the Provost’s Personnel Committee time to deliberate prior to the end of the spring semester.

(Current version)

4.7.2. Grounds for a PPC Appeal

Appeals based on denial or granting of promotion, tenure or reappointment shall be filed with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, and shall proceed to the Provost’s Personnel Committee. ...

(Version with possible timeframe inserted)

4.7.2. Grounds for a PPC Appeal

Appeals based on denial or granting of promotion, tenure or reappointment shall be filed with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs **no later than 35 business days after notification of the decision**, and shall proceed to the Provost’s Personnel Committee. ...

(Final version)

4.7.2. Grounds for a PPC Appeal

Appeals based on denial or granting of promotion, tenure or reappointment shall be filed with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs no later than 35 business days after notification of the decision, and shall proceed to the Provost’s Personnel Committee. ...

3. To be consistent with the timeframe specified in Section 4.7.2. as shown above, Section 4.7.3.1. would include the same timeframe.

(Current Version)

4.7.3.1. Appeal Related to Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion

An appeal or claim related to reappointment, granting of tenure or promotion decisions shall be initiated with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and filed in the Faculty Senate Office. ...

(Version with timeframe inserted)

4.7.3.1. Appeal Related to Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion

An appeal or claim related to reappointment, granting of tenure or promotion decisions shall be initiated with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and filed in the Faculty Senate Office **no later than 35 business days after notification of the decision.** ...

(Final Version)

4.7.3.1. Appeal Related to Reappointment, Tenure, or Promotion

An appeal or claim related to reappointment, granting of tenure or promotion decisions shall be initiated with the Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs and filed in the Faculty Senate Office no later than 35 business days after notification of the decision. ...