Report of the Committee of Past Senate Chairs

Committee Charge

"Refer to the Committee of Past Chairs to present Faculty Senate representation options ranked to the Senate for a vote and distribute the report via email to all Senators by the end of day on October 11th."

Membership of the Committee of Past Senate Chairs

Per the Bylaws of the Faculty, ART 1, SEC 9, 12(b)(aa), the membership of the Committee of Past Senate Chairs includes the "Faculty Senate Chair, Faculty Senate Chair Elect, and Prior Senate Chairs who are full-time or emeritus faculty… unless they hold current administrative appointments at or above head level of an academic department." Since the first Faculty Senate meeting in 1962, there have been (14) chairs from COAL, (5) from COBA/COB, (5) from COE, (7) from CHHS, (7), from CHPA, (15) from CNAS, and (1) from DARR. The Committee included the following members identified by service year and their current college, which may differ from their college during the year in which they served:

- Mr. Micheal Foster (Committee Chair, RCASH, FS Chair 2016/17)
- Dr. Elizabeth Walker (DARR, Current FS Chair)
- Dr. Scott Zimmerman (MCHHS, Current FS Chair-Elect)
- Dr. Michael Hudson (MCHHS, FS Chair 2022/23)
- Dr. Cameron Wickham (CNAS, FS Chair 2020/21)
- Dr. Saibal Mitra (CNAS, FS Chair 2019/20)
- Dr. Thomas Dicke (RCASH, FS Chair 2018/19)
- Dr Cynthia MacGregor (MCHHS, FS Chair 2017/18)
- Dr. Stephen McIntyre (RCASH, FS Chair 2014/15)
- Dr. Terrel Gallaway (COB, FS Chair 2011/12)
- Dr. Rebecca Woodard (MCHHS, FS Chair 2010/11)
- Dr. Margaret Weaver (RCASH, FS Chair 2009/10)
- Dr. Thomas Kane (MCHHS, FS Chair 2007/08)

Investigation

The Committee sought to answer two questions in presenting its recommendations. First, what system best maintains the faculty authority over curriculum? Second, what system best presents faculty voice in university matters? These questions are founded on the principle of faculty ownership of the curriculum, which is defined in ART III of the Constitution of the Faculty where it states, "The Faculty Senate shall have the power to establish policy in the areas of authority assigned to the faculty in the Bylaws of the Board of Governors and for such other areas or problems as may be assigned to it by the president of the university or the Board of Governors." ART XI, SEC 2 (h) of the Bylaws of the Board of Governors of Missouri State University grants the faculty the power to, "Develop the necessary curriculum or alterations in existing curriculum within each discipline to implement all University programs approved by the Board, subject to approval by the President of the University and the Board."

The Committee defined the term "faculty" as a singular term that represents the whole of a group of full-time employees at Missouri State University whose primary work responsibilities are teaching and/or research. Per the Faculty Handbook, the faculty include the following ranks: tenure track faculty (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Distinguished Professor), non-tenure track faculty (Instructor and Senior Instructor), visiting faculty (Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor) Artist-In-Residence, Practitioner-In-Residence, Executive-In-Residence, Research Faculty (Research Associate, Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor), and Clinical Faculty (Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor).

The Committee investigated best practices and/or best models for the equitable representation of the will of the faculty and determined that there are two primary models of representation. One is a senate model where units of the organization have equal representation regardless of size, and the other is a structure where representation is based on the total population of a unit. Our current Faculty Senate structure follows a senate model and generally recognized "departments" as being the organizational unit from where representation was derived. Ultimately, the restructuring of the university away from departments is why the Faculty Senate must reconsider how it will represent the will of the faculty moving forward.

Peer Examples

To help guide the Committee in its work and in an effort to not "reinvent the wheel", the Committee sought out institutions similar in scope, size, and mission to Missouri State University whose governance structures could serve as models for investigation as to what would/could work best for our needs. Links to those models are provided below:

- St. Louis University; St. Louis, MO (Bylaws ART II, SEC 2)
- University of Iowa; Iowa City, IA (Constitution ART II, SEC 2)
- Morehead State University; Morehead, KY (Faculty Senate Constitution ART II, SEC 1)
- Pennsylvania State University; State College, PA (Senate Constitution ART II, SEC 1-4)

Proposals

In accordance with the charge from Faculty Senate and using both peer examples and suggestions from the faculty to determine a model that allows for the equitable representation of the full will of the faculty, the Committee makes the following proposals to the Faculty Senate in ranked order.

Proposal #1: Grandfather

This proposal is a grandfather clause that locks Faculty Senate representation into its current model for two more academic years to allow: (1. The university to complete its realignment process (2. The Senate time to react and respond to the realignment. The Committee does not believe that this is a long-term solution because of the expansiveness of academic realignment and therefore recommends that by the October session of the 25/26 Faculty Senate, the Senate must determine a new representative model and have rewritten the appropriate Bylaws necessary for the effective governing of the Faculty Senate.

The Committee prefers this option as it has heard from numerous colleagues across all parts of the campus who feel disenfranchised by reorganization and now wonder how they fit into the greater vision of this university because of the hastiness with which the academic realignment plan seems to have been delivered. The Committee feels strongly that the will of the faculty must be heard and voiced, and that knee-jerk reactions by the Senate to respond to a reorganization plan that to its constituents feel impulsive and haphazard is the incorrect way to proceed. Any plan to restructure Faculty Senate must be measured, deliberative, and best represent the ideals, goals, and will of the faculty.

PROS:

- Allows time for completion of restructuring.
- Allows time for deliberation on determining permanent Senate structure.
- Continues current level of faculty representation.

The Committee does, however, recognize that there are administrative challenges with this proposal, namely the process by which senators are elected. In the past, department heads conducted elections of their faculty to serve on Faculty Senate. Because of academic realignment, at least 26 departments have been reorganized in some way. If this proposal is approved by Faculty Senate, it will have to determine how best to administrate the election of new senators from units that have been realigned.

CONS:

- Cannot be a permanent solution.
- Election process unclear given the reorganization of former departments into various schools and colleges.
- Representation for units that have been split apart.
- Administrative challenges within curricular process.

The Faculty Senate roster for this proposal is identified below. All units listed would have only one representative, and total representation equal to 56. Units with a superscript have been realigned in some way and would need special consideration by Senate to determine how best to administrate elections.

- Rank Representatives (6)
- Library Representative
- Art & Design
- Communication[1]
- English
- Media, Journalism, & Film[1]
- World Languages and Cultures[2]
- Music
- Theatre & Dance
- Accountancy
- Merchandising & Fashion Design[3]
- Finance & Risk Management[4]
- Information Technology & Cybersecurity
- Technology & Construction Management[3]
- Management
- Marketing
- Childhood Education & Family Studies
- Counseling[6], Leadership & Special Education[5]
- Greenwood Lab School
- Reading, Foundations & Technology[5]
- Anesthesia
- Biomedical Sciences[8]
- Comm Sciences & Disorders[7]
- Kinesiology[8]
- Nursing
- Occupational Therapy[7]
- Physical Therapy[7]
- Physician Assistant Studies[7]
- Psychology[6]
- Public Health & Sports Medicine[8]
- Social Work[6]
- Criminology
- Defense & Strategic Studies
- Economics[4]
- History
- Philosophy[9]
- Political Science[9]
- Religious Studies[2]
- Sociology & Anthropology
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Computer Science
- Geography, Geology & Planning
- Hospitality Leadership[10]
- Mathematics
- Physics, Astronomy, and Materials Science
- Agricultural Business[10]
- Animal Science[11]
- Plant Science & Natural Resources[11]

[1]Communication and Media, Journalism, & Film have merged into one academic unit.
[2]World Languages and Cultures and Religious Studies have merged into one academic unit.
[3]Merchandising & Fashion Design has merged into Technology & Construction Management.
[4]Finance & Risk Management and Economics have merged into one academic unit.
[5]Leadership & Special Education and Reading, Foundations & Technology have merged into one academic unit.
[6]Counseling, Psychology, and Social Work have merged into one academic unit.
[7]Comm Sciences & Disorders, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Physician Assistant Studies have merged into one academic unit.
[8]Biomedical Sciences, Kinesiology, and Public Health & Sports Medicine have merged into one academic unit.
[9]Philosophy and Political Science have merged into one academic unit.
[10]Hospitality Leadership and Agricultural Business have merged into one academic unit.
[11]Animal Science, Plant Science & Natural Resources have merged into one academic unit.

Proposal #2: College Based Senate Model

This proposal is a senate model where all colleges, regardless of total faculty numbers within that college, have the same number of representatives. The Committee believes that this representative model best reflects the current ideals of Faculty Senate whereby all units receive equal voice, and since all academic units on campus are at the very least organized into colleges, and the college structure one that has the best likelihood to exist long-term beyond realignment (as opposed to departments, schools, or other nomenclature), the Committee believes that a senate structure is a strong means for faculty to evolve through any kind of "continuous agility process" while maintaining its autonomy and authority over curriculum.

PROS:

- True to the traditional structure of a Senate.
- Organizing at the level of the Colleges prevents changes as departments and programs change.
- Pushes the representation for all graduate and undergraduate curriculum to the level of the College Councils.
- Makes the work of the Graduate Council redundant.

The Faculty Senate Roster for this proposal is identified below. Numbers expressed parenthetically represent the number of senators allocated to each constituency. The Committee landed on a total of seven senators per college because the total number of senators in this proposal (49) would be roughly equal to the total number of senators in our current structure (55). The breakdown of representation would be as follows:

- Rank Representatives (6)
- Library Representative (1)
- College of Business (7)
- College of Education (7)
- College of Natural and Applied Sciences (7)
- Darr College of Agriculture (7)
- McQueary College of Health and Human Services (7)
- Reynolds College of Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (7)

The Committee recognizes that a distinct concern with a senate representative model is the perceived inequity between the colleges since representation would be a flat number rather than based on a demographic proportion. Therefore, to assuage some of these concerns, the Committee further recommends, should Faculty Senate accept this proposal, that the memberships of College Councils be based upon degree programs rather than departments (see Addendum A for a list of degree programs and how degree programs are defined). Programmatic representation on the Councils will give more voices an opportunity to be heard, specifically as it regards curricular matters since curriculum is the primary purpose of the College Councils (see ART II, SEC 2 of the Bylaws of the Faculty). In accordance with this line of action, the Committee recommends eliminating all language in ART II that says "discipline-based undergraduate college council" and changing it to "degree program-based college council". As is current practice, degree programs would be entitled to representation, but not obligated to provide representation.

CONS:

- Perceived inequality of voice for all faculty.
- Pushes representation to the level of the College Councils.
- Ability of small Colleges to elect enough Senators.

The Committee also recommends eliminating ART V: Graduate Council altogether since the work of the Graduate Council will be subsumed into the work of the College Councils. While this might sound radical, the whole purpose of "realignment" has been to create pathways for academic units to collaborate more effectively. It is the Committee's belief that if College Councils are revised per this recommendation, then representatives of graduate programs will have the same opportunity as all other programs to have their voices heard and in doing so, more representatives will have access to all curricular actions and movements within their own colleges. Furthermore, the main body of the curricular work of the Graduate College is done within the scope of the six academic colleges and only houses three programs (Individualized Studies [graduate certificate], Interdisciplinary Studies [master's degree], and Professional Studies [graduate certificate and master's degree]). Should curricular actions need to change within these three programs, curricular proposals can be filed by the administrator of the graduate college and go directly to the Secretary of the Faculty for Review then to the Senate floor for vote, thereby expediting the entire process.

Proposal #3: Representative Model

This proposal is a tiered representative model based on the number of faculty in an academic unit that follows the principle of the "lowest organization of the faculty." The lowest level of organization of the faculty has been defined by the Committee as any academic unit, be it a department, school, or otherwise, with a full-time administrator who is the first level of reporting (i.e., the first administrator who signs off on tenure and promotion) for their faculty.

PROS:

- Representation more equivalent across units.

The Committee believes that there are significant disadvantages with this model primarily because it is locked in and aligned to how the university decides to organize academically and therefore runs the risk of needing to be re-imagined when/if the university decides to reorganize and/or add academic units. Under the university's "continuous agility plan", the Committee feels confident that current programs, departments, and/or academic units may be moved or dissolved at anytime at the discretion of administration and therefore a model of this nature may not have the nimbleness necessary to process intact through these kinds of changes.

CONS:

- Would have to be reassessed with each change in unit size or any further reorganization.
- Representation linked to units that are relatively easy to change compared to colleges.
- The Senate would have to conduct an accurate census each year.

Should this proposal be approved, the Committee recommends to Faculty Senate the establishment of dates to conduct a census of the faculty and of academic units. The census would need to be conducted annually and within enough time for faculty to approve the census, determine revised representation if necessary, and send ballots to the academic units for election of senators.

To determine the specifics of representation, a formula was created to proportionately distribute representation based on an academic unit's total number of faculty. The formula is:

# of Faculty in the Unit	# of Representatives
18 or Fewer	1
19 – 25	2
26 – 35	3
36 – 50	4
51 - 75	5
76 and higher	6

Total representation may vary depending on total numbers of faculty; however, based on current faculty numbers to total number of senators would be 68.

Addendum B identifies the lowest level units, and parenthetically identifies the number of faculty in those units and the equivalent number of senators the unit would be entitled to based on the formula above.

Proposal #4: Program Based Senate Model

This proposal is a program-based senate model that identifies degree programs as the lowest organization of the faculty. The Committee believes that programmatic representation best aligns with the current Faculty Senate model of departmental representation and allows for voices to be heard across a wide spectrum of the university faculty. It also is a model that remains nimble regardless of university organization because it does not rely on academic unit to determine the organizational structure of Faculty Senate.

PROS:

- Principally is more aligned with current Faculty Senate structure.
- Can weather reorganization more stably.
- Allows for a wide range of faculty voices.
- Streamlines curricular process by eliminating College and Graduate Councils.
- More accountability of college level curricular actions to the whole of Faculty Senate.

While a proper census would need to be taken, based on the findings of the Committee, the Senate could have total representation of 183 senators which includes a representative from each degree program, five rank representatives, and one library representative. As is current practice, degree programs would be entitled to representation, but not obligated to provide representation. Please refer to Addendum A for a list of degree programs.

The Committee recognizes that the adoption of this model has the potential to make Faculty Senate too unwieldy and cumbersome and could by its very size reduce the full voice of the faculty which at present totals around 700. A solution to this could be to group similar degree programs together; however, the committee did not move forward with this line of thought because it did not feel that it had the appropriate expertise to make those conclusions. The Committee also understands that academic units because of the number of degree programs they offer, could be significantly over or under-represented. Using the current Faculty Senate roster as comparison, Senate currently has 1 senator for about 13 faculty members whereas this model would have 1 representative for about 4 faculty members.

CONS:

- Increased bureaucracy within Faculty Senate.
- Significant over/under representation.
- Complete rewrite of Bylaws of the Faculty

Should this proposal be selected, the Committee further recommends eliminating ART II: College Councils and ART V: Graduate Council altogether since the work of both would be subsumed into the work of the full Senate. In lieu of College Councils the committee recommends adding Faculty Senate subcommittees based on the colleges. For example, all senators from degree programs from the College of Education as identified in Addendum A would also be charged to sit on the College of Education subcommittee. Since this subcommittee would also have members from each college's various graduate programs, the curricular work of the Graduate Council becomes redundant and therefore would be eliminated altogether.

Conclusion

It is the Committee's sincerely held belief that there is no one method or style of representation that is perfect, nor one system that perfectly addresses the dual concerns of faculty authority over curriculum and faculty voice in university matters. Beyond debate and discussion of a representative model, the Committee also recognizes that any implementation of a new model will by its very nature require substantive changes to some, most, or all of the Bylaws of the Faculty, changes which should not be hurried for the sake of expediency or as a reaction to administrative changes. Therefore, the Committee supports Proposal #1 primarily because it gives Faculty Senate more time to discuss and debate these issues and to determine for itself, with appropriate deliberation and consideration, which path is best.

Addendum A: List of Degree Programs

For the purposes of Proposal #2 and #4, "degree programs" are defined as any undergraduate major, any master's degree, and any doctoral degree. Minors, certificates (undergraduate or graduate), specializations, or other programs that do not grant degrees are not considered degree programs in this model. The numbers expressed parenthetically are the total number of degree programs in that college.

Reynolds College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities (50)

- Anthropology
- Applied Second Language Acquisition (Masters)
- Art
- Art Education
- Communication (Masters)
- Communication Studies
- Criminology and Criminal Justice
- Criminology and Criminal Justice (Masters)
- Dance
- Defense and Strategic Studies (Masters)
- Defense and Strategic Studies (Doctoral)
- Design
- Digital Film and Television Production
- Dramatic Writing (Masters)
- Electronic Arts
- English
- English (Masters)
- English Education
- Film and Media Studies
- Gerontology
- Global Studies
- History
- History (Masters)
- History Education
- International Affairs (Masters)
- Journalism
- Literature
- Modern Language
- Music
- Music (Masters)
- Music Education
- Musical Theatre
- Philosophy
- Political Science
- Professional Writing
- Public Administration (Masters)
- Public Relations
- Religious Studies
- Religious Studies (Masters)
- Secondary Education: English Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: History Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Social Science Emphasis (Masters)
- Sociology
- Speech Education
- Theatre
- Theatre and Dance
- Theatre Education
- Visual Art and Culture
- Visual Studies (Masters)
- Writing (Masters)

College of Business (22)

- General Business
- Accountancy (Masters)
- Accounting
- Business Administration (Masters)
- Business Education
- Construction Management
- Cybersecurity (Masters)
- Data Analytics
- Economics
- Entertainment Management
- Entrepreneurship
- Finance
- Health Administration (Masters)
- Human Resource Management
- Information Technology
- Information Technology (Masters)
- Interior Design
- Management and Leadership
- Merchandising and Fashion Product Development
- Project Management
- Risk Management and Insurance
- Supply Chain, Logistics and Operations Management

College of Natural and Applied Sciences (33)

- Biology
- Biology (Masters)
- Biology Education Pathway
- Chemistry
- Chemistry (Masters)
- Chemistry Education Pathway
- Civil Engineering
- Community and Regional Planning
- Computer Science
- Computer Science (Masters)
- Earth Science Education Pathway
- Electrical Engineering
- Geography
- Geography and Geology (Masters)
- Geology
- Geospatial Sciences
- Materials Science (Masters)
- Mathematics
- Mathematics (Masters)
- Mathematics Education
- Mechanical Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering Technology
- Natural and Applied Science (Masters)
- Natural Resources
- Physics
- Physics Education Pathway
- Secondary Education: Biology Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Chemistry Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Earth Science Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Geography Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Mathematics Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Natural Science Emphasis (Masters)
- Secondary Education: Physics Emphasis (Masters)

McQueary College of Health and Human Services (39)

- Exercise and Movement Science
- Nurse Anesthesia Practice (Doctoral)
- Nursing
- Nursing (Masters)
- Nursing Practice (Doctoral)
- Nursing-completion (BSN-C)
- Nutrition and Dietetics
- Nutrition and Dietetics (Masters)
- Occupational Therapy (Masters)
- Pharmacy (Doctoral)
- Physical Education
- Physical Therapy (Doctoral)
- Physician Assistant Studies (Masters)
- Post-Professional Doctor of Occupational Therapy (Doctoral)
- Psychology
- Psychology (Masters)
- Psychology (Doctoral)
- Public Health (Masters)
- Radiography
- Recreation, Sport and Park Administration
- Respiratory Therapy
- Secondary Education: Physical Education Emphasis (Masters)
- Social Work
- Social Work (Masters)
- Speech-Language Pathology (Masters)
- Sports Medicine
- Athletic Training (MATC)
- Athletic Training (MS)
- Audiology (Doctoral)
- Behavior Analysis and Therapy (Masters)
- Biomedical Sciences
- Biomedical Sciences (Masters)
- Clinical Laboratory Sciences-Medical Technology
- Communication Sciences and Disorders
- Counseling (Masters)
- Entry-level Doctor of Occupational Therapy (Doctoral)
- Health Promotion and Wellness Management (Masters)
- Health Services
- Kinesiology (Masters)

College of Education (18)

- Child and Family Development
- Child Life Studies (Masters)
- Early Childhood and Family Development (Masters)
- Early Childhood Education
- Early Childhood Special Education (Masters)
- Educational Administration (Masters)
- Educational Technology (Masters)
- Elementary Education
- Elementary Education (Masters)
- Family and Consumer Sciences Education
- Literacy (Masters)
- Middle School Education
- Secondary Education: Family and Consumer Sciences (Masters)
- Special Education (Masters)
- Special Education/Cross Categorical Education
- Student Affairs in Higher Education
- Teaching (Masters)
- Teaching and Learning (Masters)

Darr College of Agriculture (12)

- Agricultural Business
- Agricultural Communications
- Agriculture (Masters)
- Agriculture Education
- Animal Science
- Environmental Plant Science
- Equine Science
- General Agriculture
- Hospitality Leadership
- Plant Science
- Secondary Education: Agriculture Emphasis (Masters)
- Wildlife Conservation and Management

No Affiliated College (3)

- General Studies
- Interdisciplinary Studies
- Professional Studies

Addendum B: Faculty Representation for Proposal #3

- Rank Representatives (6)
- Library Representatives (1)
- School of Accountancy (11 = 1)
- Department of Finance, Economics, and Risk Management (20 = 2)
- Department of Info Technology and Cybersecurity (19 = 2)
- Department of Management (14 = 1)
- Department of Marketing (16 = 1)
- Department of Technology and Construction + Merchandising & Fashion Design (14 = 1)
- School of Special Education, Leadership and Professional Studies (34 = 3)
- School of Teaching, Learning and Developmental Sciences (25 = 2)
- Greenwood Lab School (?? = 1)
- School of Geography, Geology, and Planning (10 = 1)
- Department of Biology (20 = 2)
- Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry (18 = 1)
- Department of Computer Science (14 = 1)
- Department of Mathematics (16 = 1)
- Department of Physics, Astronomy, and Materials Science (11 = 1)
- School of Hospitality Leadership and Agribusiness, Education, and Communications (11 = 1)
- School of Animal Science And Environmental Plant Science and Natural Resources (13 = 1)
- School of Anesthesia (6 = 1)
- School of Nursing (21 = 2)
- School of Biomedical Sciences, Kinesiology, and Public Health and Sports Medicine (30 = 3)
- School of Mental Health and Behavioral Sciences (44 = 4)
- School of Everything (52 = 5)
- School of Criminology and Criminal Justice (13 = 1)
- School of Defense and Strategic Studies (1 = 1)
- Department of Art & Design (26 = 3)
- Department of Music (34 = 3)
- Department of Theatre & Dance (18 = 1)
- Department of Communication, Media, Journalism, and Film (31 = 3)
- Department of English (34 = 3)
- Department of History (21 = 2)
- Department of Political Science and Philosophy (20 = 2)
- Department of Languages, Cultures, and Religions (29 = 3)
  Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Gerontology (16 = 1)