

**Issue: Start Date, Faculty Handbook Glossary**

**Rationale:**

Language revised to clarify expectations of faculty to be available for faculty obligations the week prior to the beginning of the academic semester.

**Faculty Handbook section referenced with new language in red and underlined:**

**Glossary:**

**Start date:** Date on which faculty are expected to be on campus for the beginning of work. Normally it is the Monday prior to the beginning of classes each Fall and Spring Semester.

**Start date:** Faculty are expected to be available to attend meetings and other events scheduled the week prior to the beginning of classes each fall and spring semester.

# Missouri State University

## General Education Assessment Plan

In 2013–2014, CGEIP reviewed, discussed, and developed an [annual report](#) and [four-year periodic review](#) processes. This assessment plan was later voted on and adopted by [Faculty Senate](#) in March 2015. Below are principles and purpose for the review of courses in General Education at Missouri State University.

### I. Principles for Course Review

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 council 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.

### II. Purpose of Course Review

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

### III. General Education Annual Report Process

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/annual report will be uploaded on a yearly basis (see below for exact due date for report). The annual report should not be lengthy (approximately three pages). These annual reports will be useful when it comes to preparing the periodic review. Course coordinators accumulate and review student learning per the course proposal that was submitted at the time of revising the General Education or adding the course into our current General Education (courses proposed reporting results to their department at a minimum annually on the applications).

## **Information that will be included in your Annual Report**

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

**Annual Reports are due on September 15<sup>th</sup>** (or the following Monday if this date falls on a weekend) each year. The annual report should reflect the previous academic year material. If examples of data or assessments would like to be submitted, email it to [Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs](#) with the subject containing Annual Report Attachment and the Course Code. A copy of the annual report will be provided to the course coordinator and department head after submission.

Annual Reports will be reviewed by CGEIP during their monthly meetings in the Fall semester (Timeline for annual report course review will be posted in April minutes each year).

## **IV. Periodic Review Process and Timeline**

As per Faculty Senate approved criteria: A general education course coordinator, with assistance from faculty who teach the course will document and assess student learning based upon the proposed general education plan. Documentation of an assessment/course review will be uploaded every four years (see Tentative Timeline below). Use of annual reports and CGEIP feedback from the annual reports will be useful in preparing the periodic review. The periodic review will take place every four years; however, course coordinators should follow their course review process as indicated in the original proposal approved for admission into the MSU Revised General Education (beginning Fall 2014).

## **Information that will be included in your Periodic Review**

- Reflection on each of the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) the course covers (reflection should include the following information and be approximately 250 words):
  - Level of success meeting Specific Learning Outcome

- Evidence used to assess
- How was the original proposal modified or refined?
- What items were chosen for action based on assessment?
- What actions did you take based upon your reflection of the assessment?
- *Optional:* Upload an assessment tool, assignment or other material that was used to assess student learning of general goal and specific learning outcome (to send these materials email it to [Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs](#) with the subject containing Periodic Review Attachment and the Course Code).
- Summary on how General Goals are met, based on the reflection of the SLOs (approximately 150 words).
- Syllabi for each instructor for the previous academic year (submitted as one PDF in an email attachment to [Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs](#) with the subject containing Periodic Review Syllabus and the Course Code).
- Enrollment data summary. Reflect on the enrollment data that is provided to the Course Coordinators and Department Heads since the last periodic review. Do you see this maintaining the same, decreasing, increasing? Explain your answer.

## Period Review Timeline

### Foundations area courses – Spring 2021

- First-Year Seminar, Written Communications & Information Literacy, and Oral Communication (**Due: February 15, 2021**)
- Quantitative Literacy and Written Communication & Integrative and Applied Learning (**Due: March 15, 2021**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Human Cultures – Spring 2018

- Social and Behavioral Sciences (**Due: January 15, 2018**)
- Humanities (**Due: February 15, 2018**)
- Arts (**Due: March 15, 2018**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Natural World – Spring 2019

- Life Sciences (**Due: January 15, 2019**)
- Physical Sciences (**Due: February 15, 2019**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Public Affairs – Spring 2020

- US & MO Constitutions/American History & Institutions (**Due: January 15, 2020**)
- Cultural Competence (**Due: February 15, 2020**)
- Public Issues (**Due: March 15, 2020**)

CGEIP will review the submitted material and discuss it in the month(s) following the due date of the periodic review. CGEIP will then provide the Course Coordinator and Department Head comments on their periodic review submission.

## V. Review Process 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.

### 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 text boxes 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 head.

# Missouri State University

## General Education Assessment Plan

In 2013–2014, CGEIP reviewed, discussed, and developed an [annual report](#) and [four-year periodic review](#) processes. This assessment plan was later voted on and adopted by [Faculty Senate](#) in March 2015. **The Assessment Plan was revised and voted on and the revised General Education Assessment Plan was adopted by Faculty Senate in February 2018.** Below are principles and purpose for the review of courses in General Education at Missouri State University.

**Courses in the General Education Program may be exempt from course review if prerequisite/co-requisite is a general education course in that same area of study. [Exempt courses](#) have all been approved by CGEIP and Faculty Senate and include MTH 181, MTH267, MTH287, BIO 111, BMS 101, BMS 111, CHM 108, and CHM 117.**

### I. Principles for Course Review

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 council 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.

### II. Purpose of Course Review

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

### III. General Education Annual Report Process

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/annual report will be uploaded on a yearly basis (~~see below for exact due date for report~~ **except those course that will be submitting periodic reviews that academic year**). The annual report should not be lengthy (approximately three pages). These annual reports will be useful when it comes to preparing the periodic review. Course coordinators accumulate and review student learning per the course proposal that was submitted at the time of revising the General Education or adding the course into our current General Education (courses proposed reporting results to their department at a minimum annually on the applications).

#### Information that will be included in your Annual Report

- ~~Time~~, Date, and a list of faculty who participated in the course review
- Data discussed (student work, scores, a common question, etc.) **for the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) chosen to assess.**
- **Reflection on the level of success in meeting the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) chosen to assess (reflection should be approximately 250 words).**
- Conclusions ~~reached regarding the next steps for the course~~ **and items chosen by faculty for action. Discuss specific follow-up plans for the course.**
- ~~Items chosen by the faculty for action~~
- ~~Follow up plans and action regarding the course~~
- Recommendation for items that need action at higher levels than the department.

**Annual Reports are due on September 15<sup>th</sup>** (or the following ~~Monday~~ **day classes are in session** if this date falls on a weekend/**holiday**) each year. The annual report should reflect the previous academic year material. ~~If examples of Data or assessments would like to~~ **can** be submitted **if desired by** email ~~it~~ to Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs with the subject containing Annual Report Attachment and the Course Code. A copy of the annual report will be provided to the course coordinator and department head after ~~submission~~ CGEIP review.

Annual Reports will be reviewed by CGEIP during their monthly meetings in the Fall semester (Timeline for annual report course review will be posted ~~in April minutes each year~~ **on the CGEIP website**).

#### Annual Report Form

Click on the link below to take you to the annual report form in order to complete and submit it by September 15<sup>th</sup> ~~each year~~ (NOTE: to login, use your MSU username@MissouriState.edu and not your official MSU email).



## IV. Periodic Review Process and Timeline

As per Faculty Senate approved criteria: A general education course coordinator, with assistance from faculty who teach the course will document and assess student learning based upon the proposed general education plan. Documentation of an assessment/course review will be uploaded every four years (see Tentative Timeline below). Use of annual reports and CGEIP feedback from the annual reports will be useful in preparing the periodic review. The periodic review will take place every four years; however, course coordinators should follow their course review process as indicated in the original proposal approved for admission into the MSU Revised General Education (beginning Fall 2014).

### Information that will be included in your Periodic Review

- **Data discussed (student work, scores, a common question, etc.) for the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) chosen for the course**
  - ***Optional:* Upload an assessment tool, assignment or other material that was used to assess student learning of general goal and specific learning outcome (to send these materials email it to Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs with the subject containing Periodic Review Attachment and the Course Code).**
- Reflection on **the level of success in meeting** each of the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) the course covers (reflection should ~~include the following information~~ and be approximately 250 words).
  - ~~Level of success meeting Specific Learning Outcomes~~
  - ~~Evidence used to assess~~
  - ~~How was the original proposal modified or refined?~~
- ~~What items were chosen for action~~ changes did you make to the course ~~based on assessment?~~ **What actions did you take based upon your reflection of the assessment? How was the original proposal modified or refined?**
- ~~Summary on~~ **Discussion of** how General Goal(s) are met, based on the reflection of the SLOs (approximately 150 words).
- Syllabi for each instructor for the previous academic year (submitted as one PDF in an email attachment to Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs with the subject containing Periodic Review Syllabus and the Course Code).
- Enrollment data summary. Reflect on the enrollment data that is provided to the Course Coordinators and Department Heads since the last periodic review. Do you see this maintaining the same, decreasing, increasing? Explain your answer.

### Periodic Review Form

Click on the link below to take you to the periodic review form in order to complete and submit it by your due date in the Timeline listed below.

## Period Review Timeline

### Foundations area courses – Spring 2021

- First-Year Seminar, Written Communications & Information Literacy, and Oral Communication (**Due: February 15, 2021**)
- Quantitative Literacy and Written Communication & Integrative and Applied Learning (**Due: March 15, 2021**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Human Cultures – Spring 2018

- Social and Behavioral Sciences (**Due: January 15, 2018**)
- Humanities (**Due: February 15, 2018**)
- Arts (**Due: March 15, 2018**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Natural World – Spring 2019

- Life Sciences (**Due: January 15, 2019**)
- Physical Sciences (**Due: February 15, 2019**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Public Affairs – Spring 2020

- US & MO Constitutions/American History & Institutions (**Due: January 15, 2020**)
- Cultural Competence (**Due: February 15, 2020**)
- Public Issues (**Due: March 15, 2020**)

CGEIP will review the submitted material and discuss it in the month(s) following the due date of the periodic review. CGEIP will then provide the Course Coordinator and Department Head comments on their periodic review submission.

## V. Review Process 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.

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 text boxes 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 head.

# Missouri State University

## General Education Assessment Plan

In 2013–2014, CGEIP reviewed, discussed, and developed an [annual report](#) and [four-year periodic review](#) processes. This assessment plan was later voted on and adopted by [Faculty Senate](#) in March 2015. The Assessment Plan was revised and voted on and the revised General Education Assessment Plan was adopted by Faculty Senate in February 2018. Below are principles and purpose for the review of courses in General Education at Missouri State University.

Courses in the General Education Program may be exempt from course review if prerequisite/co-requisite is a general education course in that same area of study. [Exempt courses](#) have all been approved by CGEIP and Faculty Senate and include MTH 181, MTH267, MTH287, BIO 111, BMS 101, BMS 111, CHM 108, and CHM 117.

### VI. Principles for Course Review

6. General education assessment should be meaningful and useful to those teaching the course.
7. General education assessment should be ongoing and cyclical.
8. 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.
9. General education courses submitted an assessment plan with the course proposal. The council understands that assessment plans may need to be modified and streamlined to promote the use and efficacy of the process.
10. Assessment of student learning is broadly defined to include both qualitative and quantitative, and both direct and indirect measures of student learning.

### VII. Purpose of Course Review

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

## VIII. General Education Annual Report Process

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/annual report will be uploaded on a yearly basis (except those course that will be submitting periodic reviews that academic year). The annual report should not be lengthy (approximately three pages). These annual reports will be useful when it comes to preparing the periodic review. Course coordinators accumulate and review student learning per the course proposal that was submitted at the time of revising the General Education or adding the course into our current General Education (courses proposed reporting results to their department at a minimum annually on the applications).

### Information that will be included in your Annual Report

- Date, and a list of faculty who participated in the course review
- Data discussed (student work, scores, a common question, etc.) for the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) chosen to assess Reflection on the level of success in meeting the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) chosen to assess (reflection should be approximately 250 words).
- Conclusions and items chosen by faculty for action. Discuss specific follow-up plans for the course.
- Recommendation for items that need action at higher levels than the department.

**Annual Reports are due on September 15<sup>th</sup>** (or the following Monday if this date falls on a weekend/holiday) each year. The annual report should reflect the previous academic year material. Data or assessments can be submitted if desired by email to [Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs](#) with the subject containing Annual Report Attachment and the Course Code. A copy of the annual report will be provided to the course coordinator and department head after CGEIP review.

Annual Reports will be reviewed by CGEIP during their monthly meetings in the Fall semester (Timeline for annual report course review will be posted on the CGEIP website).

### Annual Report Form

Click on the link below to take you to the annual report form in order to complete and submit it by **September 15<sup>th</sup>** (NOTE: to login, use your MSU [username@MissouriState.edu](#) and not your official MSU email).

## IX. Periodic Review Process and Timeline

As per Faculty Senate approved criteria: A general education course coordinator, with assistance from faculty who teach the course will document and assess student learning based upon the proposed general education plan. Documentation of an assessment/course review will be

uploaded every four years (see Tentative Timeline below). Use of annual reports and CGEIP feedback from the annual reports will be useful in preparing the periodic review. The periodic review will take place every four years; however, course coordinators should follow their course review process as indicated in the original proposal approved for admission into the MSU Revised General Education (beginning Fall 2014).

## Information that will be included in your Periodic Review

- Data discussed (student work, scores, a common question, etc.) for the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) chosen for the course
  - *Optional:* Upload an assessment tool, assignment or other material that was used to assess student learning of general goal and specific learning outcome (to send these materials email it to [Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs](#) with the subject containing Periodic Review Attachment and the Course Code).
- Reflection on the level of success in meeting each of the Specific Learning Outcomes (SLOs) the course covers (reflection should be approximately 250 words).
- What changes did you make to the course based upon your reflection of the assessment? How was the original proposal modified or refined?
- Discussion of how General Goal(s) are met, based on the reflection of the SLOs (approximately 150 words).
- Syllabi for each instructor for the previous academic year (submitted as one PDF in an email attachment to [Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs](#) with the subject containing Periodic Review Syllabus and the Course Code).
- Enrollment data summary. Reflect on the enrollment data that is provided to the Course Coordinators and Department Heads since the last periodic review. Do you see this maintaining the same, decreasing, increasing? Explain your answer.

## Periodic Review Form

Click on the link below to take you to the periodic review form in order to complete and submit it by your due date in the Timeline listed below.

## Period Review Timeline

### Foundations area courses – Spring 2021

- First-Year Seminar, Written Communications & Information Literacy, and Oral Communication (**Due: February 15, 2021**)
- Quantitative Literacy and Written Communication & Integrative and Applied Learning (**Due: March 15, 2021**)

### Breadth of Knowledge: Human Cultures – Spring 2018

- Social and Behavioral Sciences (**Due: January 15, 2018**)

- Humanities (**Due: February 15, 2018**)
- Arts (**Due: March 15, 2018**)

### **Breadth of Knowledge: Natural World – Spring 2019**

- Life Sciences (**Due: January 15, 2019**)
- Physical Sciences (**Due: February 15, 2019**)

### **Breadth of Knowledge: Public Affairs – Spring 2020**

- US & MO Constitutions/American History & Institutions (**Due: January 15, 2020**)
- Cultural Competence (**Due: February 15, 2020**)
- Public Issues (**Due: March 15, 2020**)

CGEIP will review the submitted material and discuss it in the month(s) following the due date of the periodic review. CGEIP will then provide the Course Coordinator and Department Head comments on their periodic review submission.



***Faculty Senate Committee on Rules***  
**Response to Charge Eight**  
**1 February 2018**

**Rules Committee members:** John Heywood (chair), Terrel Gallaway, Stephen Haggard, Tom Kane, Mike Hudson (*ex officio*), Beth Hurst (*ex officio*)

**CHARGE EIGHT**

**Charge:**

The Chair, Chair-Elect, and the Secretary of the Faculty have voting rights in the Senate, but the Chairs of the Senate Committees do not have voting rights (unless they are also their department's or faculty's elected representative). With the proposed new Committee on Policy Review consisting of the Chair and Chair-elect of Faculty Senate, should we have a special rule or some other clarification to make it consistent on how committee reports and recommendations are moved to the Senate floor? If chairs of standing committees have the right to make motions they can bring motions from reports to the floor. But as delegates (*ex officio* without vote) they cannot vote on motions. As part of this charge, please review the Committee on Faculty Benefits, the Study Away Advisory Committee, and the Committee on Honorary Degrees, specifically the possible inclusion of these chairs in ART I SEC 2 of the Bylaws.

**Findings, part 1 (Delegates):**

1. History of the "Delegate" designation:
  - When the current Constitution and Bylaws were adopted (1988) there was one undergraduate student Senator and one graduate student Senator. There were no Delegates.
  - By 1995 these student representatives were identified as non-voting Delegates, and two staff Delegates had been added.
  - In 2002, the chairs of Graduate Council, CGEIP, and EPPC were added to the list of Delegates.
  - In 2003, the chairs of Faculty Concerns, Academic Relations, Budget and Priorities, and Rules were added to the list of delegates (SA 10-02/03). Neither the written charge to Rules nor the resulting Senate Action includes a justification for this change. However, at the time there were three additional standing committees (CASL, University Awards, and College Awards), so it clearly was not the intent that all committee chairs should be designated as Delegates.
2. The rights and functions of Delegates to the Senate:

- All members of the University community may attend sessions of the Faculty Senate (ART I SEC 6B), and anyone in attendance may speak with the consent of the Senate Chair (ART I SEC 6E-2). Consequently, the only special right granted to Delegates is the right to introduce motions.
- Delegates from the student and staff organizations provide input from these bodies and inform discussions within the Senate. These Delegates are expected to regularly attend Senate meetings to provide for the needed interaction between the Senate and whatever body the Delegate represents.
- Most Delegates do not regularly attend Senate meetings, and some only attend when they are delivering a report (Table 1, attached). There is no reason for committee/council chairs to be in regular attendance since they are not representing a body external to the Senate. It would appear that, in most cases, the only justification for identifying a committee/council chair as a Delegate is to allow them to move resolutions to the floor. This right is not restricted to proposals contained within committee reports and may therefore be broader than is appropriate.

**Findings, part 2 (resolutions coming from committees):**

1. Of the eleven standing committees, there are two for which the chair is a voting member of the Senate (FSEC and Policy Review), four for which the chair is a Delegate to the Senate, and five for which the chair is neither a voting member nor a Delegate to the Senate. All but three of these committees have an *ex officio* member who is a voting member of the Senate. See the Table 1 (attached) for details.
2. Any member of a committee may present a committee report to the Senate, although normally the committee chair will do so. The individual presenting the report need be neither a Senator nor a Delegate (RONR p. 506); they simply need to be recognized by the Senate Chair. Thus, for reporting purposes, there is no need for committee chairs to be Delegates to the Senate.
3. If a committee report contains recommended actions, then the resolution(s) must be moved to the floor after the report has been presented. The reporting member of the committee may do so if she/he is a Senator or Delegate to the Senate. If the reporter is not a Senator or Delegate, then a member of the assembly must move the resolution to the floor (RONR p. 507). Thus, it is convenient, though not necessary, for a committee chair to be a Delegate if the committee routinely brings resolutions to the floor of the Senate.
4. The chair of CGEIP will on occasion introduce proposed changes to the General Education Program. As a Senate Delegate, the chair of CGEIP can make the motion him/herself. Otherwise a Senator or the Senate Chair would need to make the motion.
5. As an alternative to identifying committee and council chairs as Delegates, a special rule of order could grant these individuals the right to move resolutions to the floor when they are contained within a report from the committee or council. This would prevent committee/council chairs from making motions in other contexts.

**Conclusions:**

1. If the sole purpose for identifying a committee/council chair as a Delegate is to allow him/her to make motions, this seems like an unnecessary complication. Rather than identifying all (or some) committee/council chairs as Delegates, it would be simpler to establish a Special Rule of Order whereby all resolutions contained within a committee/council report are automatically moved to the floor.
2. The status of “Delegate to the Senate” should be limited to individuals who represent an external group with which the Senate desires to maintain close communications. Currently, this includes the representatives from the Staff Senate, Graduate Student Senate, and the Student Government Association. Communication between the Senate and its committees and councils is maintained via FSEC members who are *ex officio* members of those committees and councils.

**Summary of Proposed Changes to the Bylaws:**

1. Add a Special Rule of Order allowing proposed motions contained within committee/council reports to move automatically to the floor of the Senate after the report has been delivered.
2. Eliminate the “Delegate” designation for chairs of standing committees and councils of the Senate.

TABLE 1. ATTENDANCE RECORDS OF FACULTY SENATE DELEGATES SINCE SEPTEMBER 2015. THE MAY SESSIONS HAVE NOT BEEN INCLUDED IN THE DATA BECAUSE SOME DELEGATES ARE NOT IN PLACE AT THAT TIME.

Delegate	Attendance rate
CGEIP	33%
EPPC	71%
Graduate Council	67%
Academic Relations	86%
Rules	100%
Faculty Concerns	38%
Budget & Priorities	29%
SGA	52%
Graduate Student Senate	52%
Staff Senate	79%

TABLE 2. MEMBERS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS WITH SENATE PRIVILEGES.

Committee or Council	Members with Senate voting rights	Committee chair is member of Senate
College Council	(Chair of Senate)	
EPPC	Secretary of the Faculty	Delegate
CGEIP	Chair-Elect of Senate	Delegate
Graduate Council	Chair of Senate	Delegate
Executive Committee	Chair of Senate Chair-Elect of Senate Secretary of the Faculty	Chair of Senate
Faculty Concerns	Chair-Elect of Senate	Delegate
Academic Relations	Chair-Elect of Senate	Delegate
University Budget and Priorities	Chair-Elect of Senate	Delegate
Rules	Secretary of the Faculty	Delegate
Judicial Review		
Citizenship and Service Learning	Chair-Elect of Senate	
Honorary Degrees		
Faculty Benefits	Chair-Elect of Senate	
Study Away		
Policy Review	Chair of Senate Chair-Elect of Senate	

**PROPOSED SENATE ACTION TO AMEND THE BYLAWS****Original Language***[comments bracketed and italicized]***ART I FACULTY SENATE****SEC 2 Membership of Faculty Senate [line 134]**

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. The following chairs of Faculty Senate standing committees who have not been elected as voting members of the Senate shall be non-voting delegate members of the Senate: the Chair of the Graduate Council; the Chair of the Educator Preparation Provider Council; the Chair of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs; the Chair of the Academic Relations Committee; the Chair of the Rules Committee; the Chair of the Faculty Concerns Committee; the Chair of the Budget and Priorities Committee. Other non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one delegate from the Student Government Association and one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; one delegate from the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff.

**Proposed Changes****Additions in bold**, deletions ~~struck through~~, *[comments bracketed and italicized]***ART I FACULTY SENATE****SEC 2 Membership of Faculty Senate [line 134]**

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. ~~The following chairs of Faculty Senate standing committees who have not been elected as voting members of the Senate shall be non-voting delegate members of the Senate: the Chair of the Graduate Council; the Chair of the Educator Preparation Provider Council; the Chair of the Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs; the Chair of the Academic Relations Committee; the Chair of the Rules Committee; the Chair of the Faculty Concerns Committee; the Chair of the Budget and Priorities Committee.~~ **Other** Non-voting members of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the following delegates: one delegate from the Student Government Association and one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; one delegate from the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff.

## SPECIAL RULES OF ORDER *[line 2459]*

These special rules of order supersede the parliamentary authority but yield to the Constitution and Bylaws. A special rule of order may be suspended by a motion to *Suspend the Rules*. See the parliamentary authority for procedures by which these special rules of order may be amended.

*[Special Rules 1-5 omitted for brevity]*

### **6. Proposed actions and resolutions contained within reports from councils and committees**

**Proposed actions and resolutions contained within reports from councils and committees of the Faculty Senate will automatically move to the floor after the report has been presented to the Senate by a member of the council or committee. Such motions do not require a second.**

#### **Final Language**

*[comments bracketed and italicized]*

## **ART I FACULTY SENATE**

### **SEC 2 Membership of Faculty Senate *[line 134]***

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 and one delegate from the Graduate Student Senate; one delegate from the classified staff and one delegate from the professional staff.

## SPECIAL RULES OF ORDER *[line 2459]*

These special rules of order supersede the parliamentary authority but yield to the Constitution and Bylaws. A special rule of order may be suspended by a motion to *Suspend the Rules*. See the parliamentary authority for procedures by which these special rules of order may be amended.

*[Special Rules 1-5 omitted for brevity]*

### **6. Proposed actions and resolutions contained within reports from councils and committees**

Proposed actions and resolutions contained within reports from councils and committees of the Faculty Senate will automatically move to the floor after the report has been presented to the Senate by a member of the council or committee. Such motions do not require a second.

**The CRM 220 General Education Proposal is in a separate document.**

**Resolution Opposing Proposed Changes to Faculty Workloads at  
Missouri State University West Plains**

**Whereas**, quality teaching and advising is of paramount importance at all Missouri State Campuses; and

**Whereas**, The Administration at Missouri State University West Plains under the direction of Chancellor Drew A. Bennett is petitioning the Board of Governors of the Missouri State system to raise the teaching loads of full time faculty; and

**Whereas**, The Administration at Missouri State University Springfield under the direction of President Clifton M. Smart III has knowledge of the proposal but has remained silent; and

**Whereas**, the Faculty at the West Plains campus will have their teaching loads raised by 25% (3 credit hours per semester); and

**Whereas**, the West Plains proposal does not address any reductions in faculty workload, such as in professional development, scholarship/creative activity and service requirements; and

**Whereas**, increased teaching loads lead to less time to meet with students, less time for advising, less time to keep current in the field, and less time to do and publish research;

**Whereas**, the West Plains proposal does not address any form of compensation for extra work; and

**Whereas**, increased teaching loads with no extra compensation will negatively impact faculty morale, impacting student learning, and lower the quality of life for faculty and potentially students; and

**Whereas**, successful West Plains students often transfer to the Springfield campus, and therefore student success on both campuses is vitally linked;

**Whereas**, increased teaching loads with no extra compensation make it more difficult to attract and retain highly qualified and diverse candidates; and

**Whereas**, if other areas of the university (e.g., administration) are not asked to reduce salaries by 25% or be required to work 25% more hours at the university, then the burden of sacrifice for these budget cuts falls unfairly on the West Plains Faculty; and

**Whereas**, this Action is unfair to the Students and Faculty of the West Plains campus; and

**Whereas**, before such an unwise and damaging policy is implemented that all other avenues for budget reductions or revenue production be exhausted; therefore

**Be it resolved**, that the Faculty of Missouri State University request in the strongest possible terms that the Board of Governors not approve this unfair and damaging change to the learning and working conditions at Missouri State University West Plains.