**Report to MSU Faculty Senate regarding Missouri Association of Faculty Senates**

**(MAFS) Fall 2016 meeting**

Attendees: Pauline Nugent and Cynthia MacGregor

Date of Report: November 10, 2016

Highlights of meeting

- SB997 - Conversation with Zora Mulligan, Missouri Commissioner of Higher Education, regarding SB 997 which requires a 42-hour "core curriculum" across all public universities and community colleges in Missouri. This legislation calls for representative faculty from all affected institutions to meet during 2017 and develop said curriculum to be in place for students starting fall 2018. The discussion with the commissioner included statewide concerns about the inadequate timeline for implementation.

- Tuition Exchange Proposal – MAFS approved a recommendation that all family members of faculty and staff across the public universities and community colleges in Missouri be able to exchange students and receive 50% tuition reduction no matter where these family members attended. MAFS members were encouraged to take this proposal to their respective campuses for possible approval and implementation. At MSU, this proposal has been send to the newly formed Benefits Committee.

- A legislative liaison report to MAFS included information on the "campus carry" legislation that is likely to reemerge during the next legislative session. It is anticipated that this legislation will mandate university boards to create policy for campus carry, allowing faculty and staff with additional training, as required by their board, to carry guns on campus. MAFS previously passed a resolution articulating opposition to conceal and carry on campus.

- MAFS passed a recommendation that all participating universities elect a 3-year representative so as to provide continuity of membership. Typical membership on MAFS is the Chair and/or Chair-Elect of Faculty Senate (called "President" at most of the MAFS member institutions).

- MAFS is developing an "Info Card" that can be used to promote the economic value of faculty within the state of Missouri. An ROI model will be used in this info card so Missouri policy makers can see the economic benefit to the state for funding provided to employ faculty at public universities.

## *Faculty Senate Committee on Rules*
### Response to Charge Fifteen
### October 16, 2016

### FACULTY SENATE CHARGE FIFTEEN

**Charge:**  Consider eliminating from ART VI SEC 14D the reference to GEP 397.

**Rationale:**  The course no longer exists.

### PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGES FOR CHARGE FIFTEEN

### Original Language (comments in italics)

## ART VI  CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 14 Approval Process for Individual Sections of Variable Content Courses and Special Topics Courses

D   The procedures outlined in the Section do not apply to sections of GEP 397, for which a separate approval process is already established.  *[lines 2156-2157]*

### Proposed Changes
### (additions bold, omissions struck through, comments italicized)

## ART VI  CURRICULAR PROCESS

SEC 14 Approval Process for Individual Sections of Variable Content Courses and Special Topics Courses

~~D   The procedures outlined in the Section do not apply to sections of GEP 397, for which a separate approval process is already established.~~

## Resolution Conferring Honorary Doctorate Upon Sara Nell Lampe

**WHEREAS**, Sara Lampe has distinguished herself by her extraordinary contributions to the areas of education and public affairs; and

**WHEREAS**, she worked tirelessly throughout her tenure in the Missouri General Assembly holding leadership roles on the Budget, Appropriations – Education, Children and Families, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Utilities committees, sponsoring or co-sponsoring over 600 bills, mostly focused on helping children succeed, and was instrumental in obtaining the name change for this University to Missouri State University; and

**WHEREAS**, she advocated locally and nationally for awareness and stronger laws to protect students from bullying as well as championed the campaign against texting while driving; and

**WHEREAS,** she was co-creator of the WINGS premier services for gifted and talented students in Springfield Public Schools and is consulted nationally by school districts interested in creating responsive and thinking classrooms; and

**WHEREAS**, she chaired the Missouri Commission on Human Rights (by appointment from Governor Nixon), and was honored with a 2010 Evelyn Wasserstrom Award for "commitment to causes of freedom and justice for minorities and oppressed people"; and

**WHEREAS**, she continues to serve as the Deputy Director of Care to Learn, a local not for profit organization to provide students' and families' emergent needs in the areas of health, hunger, and hygiene so children can be successful in school; and

**WHEREAS**, she has worked diligently for the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, her local church, Missouri National Educators Association, and Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Missouri State University, meeting on this tenth day of November in the year two thousand sixteen, recommend to the Board of Governors of Missouri State University that the degree of Doctor of Public Affairs (A.P.D.) be conferred upon Sara Nell Lampe at the Commencement Ceremony in May two thousand seventeen in recognition of her extraordinary achievements in the areas of education and public affairs.

**From:** Bob Pavlowsky (GGP) Chair, Faculty Senate Budget and Priorities Committee

**Date:** November 1, 2016

**To:** Beth Hurst, Secretary Faculty Senate RE: Budget implications for proposed Accelerated MS in Early Childhood and Special Education

Over email, the Faculty Senate Budget and Priorities Committee discussed the proposal to develop an Accelerated MS program in Early Childhood and Special Education sponsored by Early Childhood and Special Education. As proposed, the program aims to enhance and utilize current program offerings to meet the demand for specialists for jobs in Missouri school districts.  The estimated budget includes a graduate assistant to help with practicums and laboratory teaching and a per course teacher in year 3 to help fill in for a required course as program numbers grow.  The anticipated student demand is 8 in the first year growing to >25 in the fifth year, with both full-time and part-time students.

The Committee reports the following findings:

1) Increased tuition revenue is expected to keep pace with additional program costs.

2) The anticipated student demand seems realistic given the numbers of anticipated specialists needed by public schools in the future. The proposal makes a very strong case for the demand for graduates from the new program and their importance for societal benefits in general.

3) The risk of "underfunding" problems and the lack of resources to adequately advise and administer the program is low.  These courses are already being taught by MSU and classroom capacity does not appear to be a problem.

4) Additional resources are not needed to provide for instructors or space for new courses since students will be taking courses that are already being offered in the present schedule.

5) There was no information in the proposal to indicate whether or not additional costs to the library were considered in the analysis to determine budget implications.

6) CONCLUSION:   The B&P Committee did not find any negative budget implications for the proposed Accelerated MS program in Early Childhood and Special Education. The proposed budget is reasonable, students pay tuition as they complete the program so funds should be available to cover additional resources if needed, and no new instructors/courses are required to supply the degree program. It is not clear what additional library costs may be incurred.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert T. Pavlowsky Chair, B&P Committee Distinguished Professor, GGP

**Senate Action**
**Leadership Assessment Practices**

History

In 2007, the Senate and University President agreed that it was in the best interest of the University to design a leadership assessment process to support Department Head and College Dean performance management and merit allocations.

The Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee (LPAC) comprised of representatives from the Provost Office, Academic Council, Department Head Council, the Academic Development Center, and six additional faculty members, was charged by President Nietzel to:

1) Develop a leadership assessment instrument that generates constructive feedback for professional development and that is useful for identifying concerns to be addressed through effective leadership.
2) Detail a process of delivering the assessment, collecting and managing data, and analyzing the results.
3) Develop a mechanism that ensures that the results are used to promote the individual development of administrator/leaders, strengthen university leadership at large, and resolve problems experienced at the departmental, college, and university levels.

The LPAC was formed, completed its charge, and the evaluation was put in place, including the use of the IDEA assessments for department heads and college deans. However, with the turnover that occurred in upper University Administration and in Senate Leadership, the summative review and evaluation processes have not been fully implemented or followed. As well, the sharing of University-level data with the Faculty Concerns Committee and the implementation of the Department Conditions Assessment has not been fully followed as well.

LPAC Committee members:
Chuck Barke'
Gary Brinker
Chris Craig
Tim Knapp
Janice Greene
Tom Kane
Pete Richardson
Carol Shoptaugh
Roger Sell
Lorene Stone

**Senate Action**
**Leadership Assessment Practices**

**Whereas**, in 2008, the President's Leadership Priorities and Assessment Committee (LPAC) completed its charge to develop assessment protocols for department heads and college deans by completing the Academic Leader Assessment Manual (ALAM);

**Whereas**, the LPAC was constituted to represent the university community and was comprised of six faculty, the Faculty Senate Chair, a department head, a college dean, and Associate Provost;

**Whereas**, ALAM procedures, including the annual on-line IDEA assessments of department heads, IDEA assessments of college deans, and department head summative reviews were implemented by the university after the committee culminated its work;

**Whereas**, the ALAM assessment protocols include commitments to be made by the university to the Faculty Concerns Committee to share university level data;

**Whereas**, turnover in Provost Office administration and senate leadership left some of the procedures and data-sharing prescribed by the LPAC unfulfilled;

**Whereas**, the values driving this assessment were constructed by the joint contributions of faculty and University Administration at all levels:

> *Effective leaders in organizations and universities:*
>
> - *Foster a shared vision that, if accomplished, strengthens their respective units;*
> - *Create alignment of their units with broader institutional goals that lead to the success and growth of the institution;*
> - *Build commitment among personnel and other organizational leaders to pursue the common mission of the unit, to work hard, and to improve over time.*
>
> *In performing these functions at Missouri State University, academic leaders creatively synthesize university objectives, the collective input of unit personnel, and accessible resources to establish compelling direction and improve the efficiency and strength of academic units. They advance a climate of cooperation and mutual trust that engages participation and commitment toward improving University services in the form of educated students, scholarly products, and services to the local and state communities. Effective academic leaders draw their power and influence via ethical, trustworthy and just conduct; operate according to values of transparency and shared governance; and work hard to improve working conditions that support the morale, commitment, and productivity of faculty, staff and other leaders.*

**Be it resolved**, that Missouri State University institute the summative review processes for department heads and college deans as defined in the Academic Leader Assessment Manual;

**Be it further resolved**, that the data-sharing agreements between the Provost Office and Faculty Concerns Committee be re-instituted for the next leadership assessment performed by the Faculty Concerns Committee.

**Be it further resolved**, that a good faith effort is put forth to conduct the Biennial Department Conditions Evaluation, that departments receive the results of that data, and that departmental discussion ensue as prescribed in the ALAM.

**Be it further resolved**, that changes in the way that the University evaluates department heads and college deans is communicated to the Faculty Senate.

# Academic Leader Assessment Manual

### Purpose of Assessment

Effective leaders in organizations and universities:

- Foster a shared vision that, if accomplished, strengthens their respective units;
- Create alignment of their units with broader institutional goals that lead to the success and growth of the institution;
- Build commitment among personnel and other organizational leaders to pursue the common mission of the unit, to work hard, and to improve over time.

*In performing these functions at Missouri State University, academic leaders creatively synthesize university objectives, the collective input of unit personnel, and accessible resources to establish compelling direction and improve the efficiency and strength of academic units.*  They advance a climate of cooperation and mutual trust that engages participation and commitment toward improving University services in the form of educated students, scholarly products, and services to the local and state communities.  Effective academic leaders draw their power and influence via ethical, trustworthy and just conduct; operate according to values of *transparency and shared governance*; and work hard to improve working conditions that support the morale, commitment, and productivity of faculty, staff and other leaders.

Assessments of a*cademic leaders* provide **feedback** that can be used to strengthen the quality and impact of academic units over time.  The assessment tools, survey procedures, data reporting, and performance appraisal/feedback processes described within this *Academic Leader Assessment Manual* were designed to attain this purpose.

### Philosophy of Leadership Development at Missouri State University

Academic leaders at Missouri State University develop when the following takes place:

- They work with units to construct and pursue *challenging yet realistic unit objectives*,
- They receive constructive *feedback* about successes and challenges associated with the attainment of unit objectives, and
- They receive sufficient *support* for developing leadership skills, obtaining resources, and constructing quality leadership strategies.

Leading others in the pursuit of challenging, yet realistic, objectives stretches the skills of academic leaders and stimulates the development of leadership capacities among all who reside within academic units.  Constructive feedback provides information about the impact that unit decisions, policies, and actions have on unit personnel and desired objectives.  From such feedback, academic leaders learn about successes and challenges relevant to leading units, collaboratively devise ways to overcome obstacles, and identify professional development goals.  Provided in various forms, support includes training, internal and external professional development opportunities, supervisor mentoring and counseling, discourse about common experiences and challenges with peers, and a variety of other resources that assist the professional development of academic leaders.

## Academic Leader Assessments

Assessment activities in the performance evaluation process include *The Department Conditions Evaluation; the Department Head Assessment Process; and the College Dean Assessment Process.*

# Part I. Biennial Department Conditions Evaluation

## Overview

Consistent with the LPAC's assessment philosophy, the biennial *Department Conditions Evaluation* (DCE) is designed to: 1) help departments (department heads and faculty) identify strengths/challenges facing their departments; 2) stimulate joint planning among faculty and academic leaders for strengthening departments; and 3) provide data so that conditions that support department effectiveness can be reviewed over time.

## Development of the Department Conditions Evaluation

Before generating DCE items, the LAPC developed written statements about the assessment purpose, a philosophy of leadership development, and the idealized role of academic leaders at Missouri State University (see page one).  These statements framed the generation and selection of survey items, the development of an assessment plan, and the construction of policy for analyzing, distributing, and using assessment results.

The LPAC developed a list of department conditions with the intent of describing an optimal environment that supports department effectiveness.  A draft conditions list was generated by the committee from various sources, including prior administrator assessment instruments used by deans, job analyses data collected on department heads (from a prior project), assessment instruments implemented by faculty, and documents provided by the Office of the Provost.  A draft list of conditions

was circulated to academic and administrative councils and the Faculty Concerns Committee for feedback.  Based on that feedback, survey items were developed and additional feedback from department heads, deans, and faculty was solicited.

**Structure of the Survey**

The *Department Conditions Evaluation* assesses seven groupings of department conditions that support department effectiveness (see Table 1).   In addition to the seven conditions, the evaluation also contains an eighth set of questions that assesses faculty motivation, job satisfaction, commitment to Missouri State, and turnover pressures, which were selected from organizational surveys validated in other settings.  Procedures for protecting respondent confidentiality were approved by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

_____

Table 1. Departmental Condition Categories

_____

1. Quality Direction & Planning
2. Motivation and Work Satisfaction
3. Appreciation and Support of Diversity
4. Effective Conflict Resolution
5. Support for Students and Majors
6. Effective Day to Day Administration
7. Faculty Development and Productivity
8. Commitment, Collaboration, and Cohesion

_____

**Use of Data**

The *Department Conditions Evaluation* enables administrators and faculty to jointly discuss conditions that exist within departments at least once every two years.  The data are analyzed at the university level to produce customized *Departmental Conditions Reports (DCR)* for each department*,* which are distributed to the focal department's faculty, department head, college dean, and the Provost Office. The *DCRs* only include summary statistics; whereby, interpretations of the data occur in department meetings.  Department heads are expected to convene a meeting among all department faculty to discuss the *DCR* report, identify department strengths and areas to improve, generate goals for improving departmental conditions, and discuss future department initiatives.  The goals, priorities, or plans that result from these discussions are recorded to produce the *Department Futures Summary (DFS)*.  This summary may be presented as a formal report drafted by the department head or faculty committee, or the DFS may be the documented departmental discussion that are recorded in the minutes of department meeting. The DFS is to be reviewed and approved by majority vote of ranked faculty and full-time instructors in the department.

The *DCR* and *DFS* will help college deans identify challenges and strengths that are common across college departments. Such data are collected to stimulate college-level dialogue related to strengthening departments and department leadership. Also, a university level report will be generated by the Faculty Concerns Committee to track the perceived strength of university conditions across time.

It is important to stress that the *Department Conditions Evaluation* is not designed to assess *department heads*. Rather, its purpose is to assess a variety of conditions in departments that emerge from interacting factors, including, college policy, university policy, university budget, external conditions that affect academic disciplines, the composition of departmental personnel, and factors within and outside the direct control of departmental faculty and academic leaders.

## Part II: Department Head Assessment Process

**Sources of Data used by Deans for Department Head Annual Review**

**Department Chair Feedback System**. Part of the Department Head Annual Review employs the *Department Chair Feedback System* managed at Kansas State's IDEA Center. The assessment is administered to all full-time faculty and, in addition, staff considered by college deans to be in a position to provide relevant feedback about the department head's job-related activities. Five parts of the assessment include: 1) Department Head Responsibilities; 2) Department Head Leadership Capacities; 3) Department Head Activities, 4) Obstacles Impeding the Effectiveness of the Department Head; and 5) Qualitative Comments.

**Dean's Observations**. The college dean's observations of department head leadership are generated from a variety of sources including professional interactions with department heads; discussions with department staff, faculty and students; communication with relevant community members; and other sources relevant to the professional activities of department heads.

**Department Futures Summary**. The DFS is a record of the goals, priorities, initiatives, and/or plans developed as a result of the *Department Conditions Report* discussed in a departmental meeting or meetings.

**Annual Department Report**. As part of the *Annual Department Report,* department heads submit additional evidence of personal scholarship and leadership effectiveness. Evidence may differ by college or the unique duties of individual department heads, but can include recorded progress toward departmental goals, initiatives, or priorities; department productivity indicators; actions taken to strengthen departmental conditions; professional and leadership development experiences; evidence of personal scholarship; and teaching effectiveness. Department heads also submit personal professional development goals and department priorities as part of the Annual Department Report for discussion with college deans.

**Department Head Annual Review Process**

The Department Head Annual Review is conducted by the supervising college dean in the Spring Semester.  Department heads complete the Annual Department Report within five weeks after receiving the *IDEA Department Chair Feedback System* report in the spring semester.  Other requirements for the department head's annual review are to be determined by policy constructed in specific colleges.

The discussion between department heads and college deans during the Department Head Annual Review is expected to be a participative process that culminates in the identification of priorities or goals for improving departments and/or the department head's professional development.  Yearly goals are documented, and progress toward attaining yearly goals is reviewed in subsequent years.  The dean documents the Department Head Annual Review meeting and sends a copy of that documentation to the department head for his/her review and signature. A copy of the Department Head Annual Review is placed in the department head's personnel file.  **Department Head Five-Year Summative Review Process**

Information for a multi-year summative review is gathered from departmental faculty, departmental staff, and external constituencies identified by the department head and dean.   These external constituencies might include an advisory board, alumni, employers, or people within the professional community.

The department head's summative review is conducted by the Department Head Summative Review Committee (DHSRC).  This committee includes at least three faculty members, one from each rank in the department when possible (i.e., professor, associate, assistant, and instructor), selected by the dean from two nominees at each rank elected by the faculty.  Additional members placed on the committee should reflect the diversity of department programs.  The committee is chaired by a senior faculty member or the department head, appointed by the dean, from another department in the college.

The department head being reviewed prepares summary materials that include, for the prior four years, Department Head Annual Reviews, Annual Department Reports, a summary of major accomplishment over the prior four years, and written departmental goals relevant to leadership objectives for the next 5-year review cycle.

The DHSRC oversees data collection, including the use of the *Department Head Feedback System* instrument conducted by the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) at Kansas State University.  The IDEA *Feedback System* involves the collection of faculty feedback and the generation of a feedback report.  Other information may be collected by the DHSRC from faculty, staff, and external constituencies.  The committee reviews and summarizes the information gathered to prepare a report for the dean.  The report is provided to the department head and the dean only.

The dean will review all materials, consult with the provost and make a determination as to reappointment.  A memo prepared by the dean reporting the outcome of the review will be distributed to department faculty and staff.

## Part III: College Dean Assessment Process

**Sources of Data Used by Provost for Dean Annual Review**

**Dean Feedback System.**  Deans are evaluated with the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System* (IFDS) managed by the IDEA Center at Kansas State University.  The IFDS is administered to all faculty members, department heads, and other personnel deemed relevant by the provost to evaluate the college dean.  The five parts of the assessment include: 1) The College's Major Programs; 2) Developing Resources for the College; (3) Attention to Organizational Matters; (4) Program Leadership; and (5) Personnel Management.

**Provost's Observations.**  The provost's observations of a dean's leadership are generated from a variety of sources including professional interactions with the dean; discussions with college department heads, staff, faculty and students; communication with relevant community members and alumni; and other sources relevant to the professional activities of deans.

**College Annual Report.**  The College Annual Report should be a part of the dean's performance review and used for setting objectives for the upcoming academic year(s).

**Dean Annual Performance Review Report.**  Based on the dean's performance evaluation conducted by the provost in the preceding year, the deans prepare summary materials to document activities, progress, and achievements related to college goals, desirable college outcomes, and professional development goals.  Data from the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System* and *College Annual Report* can be used as evidence where applicable.

**Dean Annual Review Process**

The yearly performance review of deans is conducted by the provost in the Spring Semester.  Prior to the review, deans write a *self-assessment* within five weeks after the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System* report is received in the Spring Semester.

In preparation for the annual review conducted by the provost, the dean uses a variety of data sources to write self-assessments that focus on: 1) college leadership, 2) college accomplishments, and 3) professional development.  Data sources may include, but are not limited to the *IDEA Feedback for Deans System, College Annual Report*, college performance data collected annually, and evidence of activities, progress, or accomplishments in relation to goals set during performance reviews from prior years.  As a function of the Dean Annual Review, goals for the following year are set by the dean for college leadership, college planning, and professional or leadership development.  A final evaluation report is written by the provost and presented to the dean for his or her review and signature.

**Dean's 5-Year Summative Review**

Information for a multi-year summative review is gathered from the associate dean, department heads, faculty, and staff in the college, other deans, and external constituencies as desired by the dean and provost.  These external constituencies might include an advisory board, alumni, employers, or people within the professional community.

The dean's summative review is conducted by the Dean Summative Review Committee (DSRC).  This committee includes a tenured faculty member from each department in the college, selected by the provost from two nominees from each department elected by the faculty.  The committee also includes at least three department heads in the college and the associate dean.  At the provost's discretion, other committee members may be appointed.  The committee is chaired by a senior faculty member or a department head.

The dean being reviewed prepares summary materials that include, for the prior four years, Dean Annual Reviews, Annual College Reports, a summary of major accomplishments over the prior four years, and written college goals relevant to leadership objectives for the next 5-year review cycle.

The DSRC oversees data collection, including the use of the *Dean Feedback System* instrument conducted by the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) at Kansas State University.  The IDEA *Feedback System* involves the collection of faculty and department head feedback and the generation of separate feedback reports.  Other information may be collected by the DSRC from faculty, staff and external constituencies.  The committee reviews and summarizes the information gathered to prepare a report for the provost.  This report will be provided to the dean and the provost only.

The provost reviews all materials, consults with the president, and makes a determination as to reappointment.  A memo prepared by the provost summarizes the outcome of the review, which  is distributed to college faculty and staff.


# Part IV: University Leadership Report

The Faculty Concerns Committee is responsible for preparing the biennial *University Leadership Report* for presentation to the Faculty Senate and distribution to the university community and the Missouri State University Board of Governors.  Early in the Spring of even-numbered calendar years, the Provost Office shares data aggregated at the university level with the Faculty Concerns Committee.  The Faculty Concern's *University Leadership Report* contains summary statistics of the assessment data, data from the President and Provost Leadership Assessments, summary statistics collected from prior years, and a summary of leadership strengths and concerns based on deliberations within committee.  The report is distributed to the Faculty Senate and Provost Office prior to the April Faculty Senate Meeting.  The Faculty Concerns Committee presents the report at the April Faculty Senate meeting.