Lindenwood University's Faculty Committees strongly influence the University's vision, strategies, and policies. These decisions, in turn, affect all levels of governance, function, and outcomes affecting not only the faculty, but students, academics, and campus culture as well.

This handbook details each of the seven committees’ purpose, function, processes, and agendas. Also listed are the names and contact information for committee members.

By working individually and together, as well as with administrators and students, these committees address the core academic and policy issues of Lindenwood University.
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Faculty Council

Communication: Jason Lively (11)  949-4696
Peter Carlos (10)  949-4513
Human Services: Debra Johnson (11)  949-4193
Pernell Witherspoon (10)  949-4987
Education: Ken Johnson (11)  949-4847
Janis Freeman (10)  949-4649
LCIE: Mark Lerman (11)  949-4506
Billi Patzius (10)  949-4511
Sciences: Jennifer Firestine (11)  949-4188
Deb Hopkins (10)  949-4720
Business: Jay Hardman (1)  949-4951
Doug Cannon (10)  949-4343
Humanities: John Bell (11)  949-4401
Michael Mason (10)  949-4825
Arts: Katrina Bennett (11)  949-4603
Grant Hargate (10)  949-4859
American Studies: David Knotts (11)  798-2166
VPHR/DOF: Rick Boyle  949-4477
VPAA/Provost: Jann Weitzel  949-4846

Governance Purpose and Function

The President has administrative authority over the University, such authority sustained and qualified by collegial support as represented in the faculty's position of shared responsibility. This responsibility is represented in the Faculty Council.

The principal responsibilities of the Lindenwood Faculty Council are to (1) evaluate make recommendations on faculty personnel matters (including faculty positions, candidates, promotions, hirings, initial ranks, professional responsibilities, and recognitions), (2) evaluate faculty personnel policies and procedures and recommend periodic revisions and improvements in those areas, (3) define and promote scholarly activities, (4) review and recommend policies and/or actions appropriate to address issues of concern submitted by faculty members, faculty committees, or the administration, and (5) participate in the review
and planning of University-wide initiatives. The Faculty Council is the faculty personnel committee, vested by the faculty members to represent them in discussions with the administration regarding the formulation of human resources policy and practices. In addition, Faculty Council serves as the representative of the faculty in regard to review, evaluation, and adoption of academic policies and procedures, including general education structure and advancement. The Faculty Council plans, calls, and runs all general faculty meetings and regularly scheduled general faculty workshops. The President, Provost, and Dean of Faculty have faculty rank and participate in faculty meetings *ex officio* without vote.

**Membership and Term of Service**

Two full-time faculty members from each academic school are elected by a majority vote of the full-time faculty members in each school to serve in staggered two-year terms. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as an employee with a regular faculty contract who teaches at least 18 hours per fiscal year or an employee who has a full-time contract to work in the doctoral program.

**Officers**

The membership of Faculty Council elects the chairperson and vice-chairperson, with the latter leading the meetings when the chairperson cannot attend. The Council chairperson appoints a reporter from Council membership to take minutes at each meeting and distribute those minutes to the committee members, the VPHR and Dean of Faculty (hereinafter referred to as “Dean of Faculty”), and the Provost and VPAA (hereinafter referred to as “Provost”).

**Frequency of Meetings**

The Faculty Council normally holds either regular or subcommittee meetings weekly during the academic year – except in December – and many times during the summer months, and more often if necessary to conduct all business in a timely fashion. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order. The Chairperson issues all meeting notices to Council membership, the Provost, and the Dean of Faculty. Both of the latter two administrators sit on the Council *ex officio* without vote. Both Dean of Faculty and the Council Chairperson have the authority to call special meetings at any time, but official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership.

**Agenda-Item Categories**

1. Formulation and revision of faculty committee structures and review of committee functions and operations in collaboration with the whole faculty, the Dean of Faculty, the Provost, and the Deans’ Council
2. Planning, scheduling, and conducting of regularly scheduled faculty meetings and workshops
3. Development of recommendations on policies and/or actions as appropriate to address issues of concern submitted by faculty members, the Deans’ Council, or other faculty committees
4. Collaboration with other standing faculty committees and task forces
5. Development of recommendations on faculty positions and candidates, in collaboration with the academic schools and the Dean of Faculty
6. Research, development, and implementation ideas and/or issues of concern presented by faculty members
7. Interviewing faculty candidates and make a recommendation on each to the President
8. Recommendations of initial faculty rank and evaluation and recommendations of nominations for promotions in faculty rank, based on submissions from the faculty and the Deans' Council
9. Selection of all regular faculty teaching and scholarship award recipients
10. Collaboration with other committees on matters that pertain to faculty personnel policy, procedure, and workload
11. Review and provide recommendations of revisions in the Faculty Handbook (a legal contractual document) and the Faculty Guidebook (an operational manual for academic employees)
12. Review and provide recommendations regarding faculty benefits
13. Review and provide recommendations of changes in criteria and procedures for evaluating faculty performance
14. Commissioning of special faculty task forces to study matters related to faculty duties and performance, including the structure and calendar of the academic terms and the calendar of faculty meetings and workshops
15. In collaboration with the Provost, serving as the liaison between the general faculty and the administration in the planning of academic, faculty, and campus-wide initiatives within Lindenwood’s annual strategic planning process

**Processes**

**Receipt of issues, questions, or proposals**

Issues, questions, proposals, and tasks may be conveyed to the Faculty Council by the faculty as a whole, a colleague, a department, a school, the Deans’ Council, the chief academic officer, the chief personnel officer, the President or another committee or task force. The Faculty Council normally will also originate some of its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agendas and considering requests from other sources.

1. Requests for new faculty positions normally originate with the academic departments and associated academic deans but may be submitted as a result of the Faculty Council’s review of faculty workload and teaching and advising needs in different disciplines and schools after consultation with the appropriate dean(s).
2. Candidates for approved faculty positions are recommended by the faculty
members of the affected disciplines, based on their reviews of applicants’
credentials and preliminary interviews that the departmental faculty conducts with
position aspirants.

3. Recommendations for initial faculty ranks and promotion in rank normally originate
in the academic schools (but may be broached by any faculty member or the
Faculty Council) and are submitted to the Dean of Faculty.

4. Proposals and suggestions for revisions of faculty personnel policy or procedure
may originate in academic departments or schools, general faculty meetings, the
Deans' Council, the executive-administration offices, or the Faculty Council itself.

5. Annually, the Dean of Faculty requests that the Faculty Council review and propose
changes to the Faculty Guidebook (an operational manual for academic employees)
and the Faculty Handbook (a legal document).

6. Any faculty performance problem that is not resolved through normal prior efforts
of the responsible dean and the Dean of Faculty, or is of an extraordinarily severe
nature, especially if termination of a faculty member is a likely outcome, the Dean
of Faculty may refer the matter to the Faculty Council.

Development of responses, solutions, or recommendations

1. The department, school, or Faculty Council (as outlined above) will recommend
faculty positions to the Dean of Faculty and then are vetted by the (academic)
Deans' Council and Faculty Council, either of which may offer further suggestions
and recommendations as to desirable candidate qualifications and staffing
priorities. The Dean of Faculty then reviews the personnel recommendations with
the President and Provost in the context of the University’s mission, the strategic
plan, program growth, and budget considerations. The President approves the
recommendations, and the Dean of Faculty implements the job announcement and
associated advertising.

2. The President authorizes formal interviews after reviewing the credentials of
faculty applicants. All positions are advertised through HERC/Higher Education
Recruitment Consortium and the Chronicle of Higher Education. Specific job
postings may be sent to professional organizations and publications. The Dean of
Faculty schedules a sequence of face-to-face interviews of the authorized
candidates, starting with any additional sessions requested by the department’s
professors and the supervising dean and proceeding through interviews with the
Faculty Council and the Deans' Council. If the various Lindenwood constituents –
including the pertinent academic department, the Deans' Council and the Faculty
Council – endorse a candidate as the leading prospect, the Dean of Faculty brings
that candidate to the President with the recommendation of a job offer. Hiring
authority rests with the President, acting as the agent of the Board of Directors.

3. Initial faculty ranks of newly hired professors are recommended to the Faculty
Council by the appropriate academic dean. Faculty Council then develops its own
recommendation on the starting rank to the Deans' Council. If in agreement, the
Deans’ Council forwards the recommendation to the President, who presents the
proposed rank to the Board of Directors for ratification. If the Deans' Council does not concur with the Faculty Council, the Dean of Faculty calls a joint session of the Faculty Council and Deans' Council to resolve the discrepancy and arrive at a consensus. The President then reviews and makes a decision on the recommendation on rank, and the Board of Directors ratifies (but has the right to reverse) the President's decision.

4. In the case of faculty promotion in rank, the nominee and his or her dean prepare a file listing documented accomplishments, teacher evaluations, and three or more letters of endorsement from faculty colleagues. The file is reviewed by Faculty Council, which makes a recommendation on the candidate to the Deans' Council. If the Deans' Council concurs with the Faculty Council, the Dean of Faculty presents the recommendation to the President for approval. If the Deans' Council does not concur with the Faculty Council, the Dean of Faculty calls a joint session of the Faculty Council and Deans' Council to resolve the discrepancy and arrive at a consensus. The President then reviews and makes a decision on the recommendation on rank, and the Board of Directors ratifies (but has the right to reverse) the President's decision. Finally, the President notifies the candidates of the Board's action.

5. The Faculty Council may review faculty personnel policies and procedures at any time. The Dean of Faculty presents the recommendations to the Deans' Council, which makes a recommendation to the President for acceptance or declination. Any recommended changes that would affect the policies and procedures in the Faculty Handbook must be approved by the Board of Directors.

6. Each fall, the Dean of Faculty asks the Faculty Council to formally review the Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Guidebook. Any resultant recommendations concerning the Faculty Guidebook must be approved by the Deans' Council and the President. Recommendations affecting the Faculty Handbook must be approved by the Board of Directors as well as the administration.

7. Any faculty discipline or performance problem is first addressed by the department chair and/or the dean of the appropriate academic school. Protracted or intractable faculty discipline or problems are advanced to the Dean of Faculty, who works with the faculty member and the responsible academic dean to resolve the problem. If the problem remains unresolved or is of an extraordinarily severe nature, especially if termination of a faculty member is a likely outcome, the Dean of Faculty may consult with the Faculty Council for advisement.

8. The Dean of Faculty may present a recommendation for termination to the President for review and decision. Any faculty member terminated for cause – but not for financial exigency or elimination of a faculty position – may appeal to and receive a hearing before the Board of Directors, in accordance with procedures described in the Lindenwood University Faculty Handbook.

9. The Faculty Council receives proposals for new academic programs, policies, and
procedures from the standing committees of the faculty and submits recommendations on all such proposals to the Deans' Council for review, acceptance, declination, or further examination and refinement.

Submission of committee’s report/recommendation

At regularly scheduled faculty meetings, the Faculty Council may bring any non-confidential issues or recommendations to the general faculty for discussion and vote, at its discretion, and will report to the faculty on any agenda items undertaken by the Council but not brought before the whole faculty for consideration. By a simple majority vote, the faculty may place any non-confidential Faculty Council matter on the table for discussion and possible vote at a regularly scheduled meeting of the whole faculty. The general faculty must have a quorum of more than 50% of full-time faculty members in order to conduct an official vote. All decisions and recommendations of the Faculty Council are included in the minutes of Council meetings, copies of which are sent to the Dean of Faculty and the Provost. The results of all votes of the general faculty are recorded in the minutes of the faculty meetings, copies of which are sent to the Dean of Faculty and the Provost. All business at general faculty meetings is conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order.

Approval/Revision Process

The Faculty Council submits directly to the Deans’ Council its recommendations on faculty positions, initial faculty ranks, promotion in faculty rank, teaching and scholarship awards, changes in faculty personnel policies and procedures, and most new academic programs, policies, and procedures. It may also request a meeting with the President or the Deans’ Council at any time to present recommendations on other matters. Both the Deans’ Council and the President may return a proposal or recommendation to the Faculty Council for further consideration or revision. Any of the parties may request that a faculty task force be commissioned to resolve issues or questions before a remitted recommendation is reconsidered.

Relationship to other committees or task forces

Subject to approval by the general faculty, the administration, and the Board of Directors, the Faculty Council reviews and, proposes the establishment new standing faculty committees or revision of the scope and/or duties of existing standing faculty committees. The Council also collaborates with other committees and task forces on matters that pertain to faculty personnel policy and procedure. Representing the Lindenwood faculty, the Council also evaluates proposals from standing committees affecting academic programs, policies, and procedures and makes recommendations on these matters to the Deans’ Council.
Assessment Committee

Committee Members

Institutional Research  Don Heidenreich  949-4414
Music  Joe Alsobrook  949-4164
Education  Cynthia Bye  949-4618
Nonprofit Administration  Gerald Blasi  949-4601
Philosophy  David Brown  949-4411
Political Science  Joe Cernik  949-4810
English  Mike Fetters  949-4121
Mathematics  Wojciech Golik  949-4701
Dance  Janet Strzelec  949-4306
Art  John Troy  949-4856
Foreign Language  Betty Heyder  949-4824
CMS  Steve House  949-4889
Social Work  Mike Jacobsen  949-4391
Sociology  Ray Scupin  949-4730
Psychology  Bruce Kelly  949-4732
LCIE  Rita Kottmeyer  949-4523
Religion  Michael Mason  949-4825
Biology  Paige Mettler-Cherry  949-4710
Counseling  Jan Munro  949-4529
Business  Annette Najjar  949-4876
Criminal Justice  Gene Overall  949-4407
Chemistry  Tammi Pavelec  949-4454
Earth Science  Edward Perantoni  949-4705
Theatre  Larry Quiggins  949-4850
Psychology  Chris Scribner  949-4707
Communications  Deb Nicolai  949-4112
Communications  Curt Billhymer  949-4888
Governance Purpose and Function

The principal responsibility of the Assessment Committee is to give guidance to the University assessment officer in the conduct of the assessment program. It also acts as a forum for the discussion of University assessment issues.

Membership and Term of Service

The membership of the Assessment committee consists of department/school assessment officers representing the majors at the University, thus also representing each academic school. In most cases, department chairs remain members of the assessment committee as long as they hold the position.

Officers

The Dean of Institutional Research serves as the chairperson of the Assessment Committee. The members of the Assessment committee appoint a reporter who keeps the minutes of each meeting and forwards those minutes to all committee members for their review prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Frequency of Meetings

The Assessment committee meets once per semester during the academic year, or more often is required. The meeting date is set based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the Assessment committee sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

Agenda-Item Categories will include but are not limited to

1. Guidance in the areas to be assessed
2. Guidance in methods used to assess
   a. General education
   b. All University majors
   c. All graduate majors
d. All University programs (i.e. student life)
3. Review of nationally normed survey instruments (NSSE/BCSSE)
4. Assessment of programs at all levels (bachelor's, master's, doctorate)
5. Assessment of programs at all sites, including the heritage campus and extended sites
6. Compilation of the yearly assessment reports
7. Continued expansion of capstone classes
8. Assessment of online courses as the number of such classes is expanded

Processes

Issues, questions, and tasks may be conveyed to the Assessment Committee by the faculty as a whole, a colleague, a department, a school, the Deans' Council, the VPAA/Provost, the President, or another committee or task force. The Assessment Committee may also originate its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agenda and considering requests from other sources. When issues are submitted to the Assessment Committee, those items are added to the agenda. At a subsequent Assessment meeting, the issue is addressed by the membership and one of three steps will be taken:

1. discuss the issue and vote
2. discuss the issue and assign members to do background research and report back at the next meeting
3. discuss the issue and assign members to speak to their academic schools and ring a consensus of opinion to the next meeting.

Submission of committee’s report/recommendation

The annual product of the Assessment committee is the Assessment Report. The Dean of Institutional Research works with departments individually to ensure that general education courses are being assessed and that major area courses are being assessed. The departments submit their reports to the Dean of Institutional Research in May of each year, and the Dean works to compile the reports and write summaries of each area. The report is then reviewed and printed in the fall. It is also posted on a SharePoint in the University's internal computer network for review by all members of the faculty and staff.
Council of Teacher Education (CTE)

Governance Purpose and Function

The principal responsibility of the Council of Teacher Education is to review the assessment benchmarks of teacher education candidates to ensure that candidates have the knowledge, skills, and disposition to work as professional educators in schools.

Membership and Term of Service

Content area representation includes one full-time faculty member who is elected/selected by the membership of each academic school to serve in staggered two-year terms.

School of Education representation includes all full-time faculty members who teach in the Department of Teacher Education Program. There is to be at least one full-time faculty representative from Department of Educational Leadership, Department of Counseling, Department of Health and Fitness Sciences, Local School District, and Student Educational Association at the graduate and undergraduate level. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as an employee with a regular faculty contract who teaches at least 18 hours per fiscal year. School of Education representation includes all Teacher Education full-time faculty.

A representative of the Assessment Committee will also sit on the CTE.

Officers

The membership of the CTE elects the chairperson and vice-chairperson, with the latter leading the meetings when the chairperson cannot attend. The CTE also appoints a reporter who keeps the minutes of each meeting and forwards those minutes to all committee members for their review prior to the next scheduled meeting. Minutes are also forwarded to the VPAA.

Frequency of Meetings

The CTE holds regular meetings at least once per semester during the academic year. However, when the agenda is particularly busy, two meetings per semester are common. The day of the
month on which the meetings will be held is set at mid semester, based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the CTE sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order.

**Agenda-Item Categories**

1. Approve entrance of students into the Teacher Education Program  
2. Approve teacher education candidates to student teach  
3. Review, plan, and approve changes to the Teacher Education Program that affect other academic schools  
4. Discuss issues regarding those who participate in the School of Education Program in order to maximize the learning experiences of candidates  
5. Link with Lindenwood University School of Education Advisory Council to maximize learning experiences of candidate and P-20 students  
6. Research Praxis in order to better align programs to candidates needs for optimal scoring potential  
7. Coordinate with secondary subject areas to ensure certification courses are being offered as required by DESE  
8. Communicate changes in teacher education requirements across all affected academic schools

**Processes**

Issues, questions, proposals, and tasks may be conveyed to the CTE by a department, a school, the Deans’ Council, the VPAA, the President, or another committee or task force. The CTE may also originate its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agenda and considering requests from other sources. When issues are submitted to the CTE, those items are added to the agenda. At a subsequent CTE meeting, the issue is addressed by the membership and one of three steps will be taken:

1. discuss the issue and vote  
2. discuss the issue and assign members to do background research and report back at the next meeting  
3. discuss the issue and assign members to speak to their academic schools and bring a consensus of opinion to the next meeting.

All approved changes are incorporated into the Lindenwood University Teacher Education Program.
Educational Policies Committee (EPC)

Committee Members (two-year term; one rep per division):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Ed Perantoni</td>
<td>949-4705</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mira Ezvan</td>
<td>949-4830</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Daniel Plate</td>
<td>949-4362</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>Joseph Lovell</td>
<td>798-2005</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Debbie Nicolai</td>
<td>949-4112</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Gerald Blasi</td>
<td>949-4601</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Terry Stewart</td>
<td>949-4656</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>John Troy</td>
<td>949-4856</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>James Horstmeier</td>
<td>949-4504</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>Barry Finnegan</td>
<td>949-4455</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Jann Weitzel</td>
<td>949-4846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance Purpose and Function

The principal responsibility of the Educational Policy Committee is to review, formulate, and propose academic policies and educational goals of the University. The committee works to create consistent policy, increase academic integrity, standardize the curriculum, and assist in developing smooth administration of University policy and curriculum.

Membership and Term of Service

One full-time faculty member is elected by the faculty of each academic school to serve in staggered two-year terms. Committee-member elections take place no later than May 31 for the next academic year. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as an employee with a regular faculty contract who teaches at least 18 hours per fiscal year or an employee who has a full-time contract to work in the doctoral program. The VPAA, the Dean of Academic Services, and the assessment officer also serve on the EPC without vote.
Officers

The membership of the EPC elects the chairperson and vice-chairperson, with the latter leading the meetings when the chairperson cannot attend. The EPC also appoints a reporter who keeps the minutes of each meeting and forwards those minutes to all committee members for their review prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Frequency of Meetings

The EPC holds regular meetings once per month during the academic year. However, when the agenda is particularly busy, additional meetings may be called. The day of the month on which the meetings will be held is set at the beginning of each semester, based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the EPC sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

Agenda-Item Categories

1. In collaboration with the Deans’ Council, initiate or consider proposed changes in the educational program including the creation, merger, or abolition of departments and programs and to make recommendations to the faculty regarding such changes

2. Based on proposals of the faculty, create or abolish policy related to
   a. graduation requirements
   b. transfer regulations
   c. academic requirements for granting academic credit
   d. admissions requirements
   e. grading system
   f. withdrawals from classes/re-enrollments/stoping out
   g. academic freedom policy

Processes

Issues, questions, proposals, and tasks may be conveyed to the EPC by the faculty as a whole, the Faculty Council, a colleague, a department, a school, the Deans’ Council, the VPAA, the President, or another committee or task force. The EPC may also originate its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agenda and considering requests from other sources. When issues are submitted to the EPC, those items are added to the agenda. At a subsequent EPC meeting, the issue is addressed by the membership and one of three steps is taken:
1. discuss the issue and vote
2. discuss the issue and assign members to do background research and report back at the next meeting
3. discuss the issue and assign members to speak to their academic schools and bring a consensus of opinion to the next meeting.

**Submission of committee’s report/recommendation**

After a proposal has been approved by the EPC, that proposal is taken to the Faculty Council by the VPAA. The Faculty Council may

1. vote in favor of the proposal
2. if the proposal would make fundamental changes in the University's educational policies, present it to the faculty for review and vote at the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting
3. send the proposal back to the EPC for revision
4. reject the proposal

The general faculty must have a quorum of more than 50% of full-time faculty members in order to conduct an official vote on a matter of educational policy.

The EPC may request a joint meeting with the Faculty Council to seek consensus on a rejected proposal.

**Approval/Revision Process**

If the proposal is approved by the Faculty Council or the faculty, the VPAA will present the proposal to the Dean's Council.

If the proposal is approved by the Deans' Council, the VPAA will take the proposal to the President for his approval. At any time, a task force of EPC members may be appointed to do further research into the issue.
General Education (GE)

Committee Members (two-year term; one rep per division):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>William Blackburn</td>
<td>949-4842</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Ben Scholle</td>
<td>949-4166</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Charlene Engleking</td>
<td>949-4507</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Gene Overall</td>
<td>949-4407</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>John Troy</td>
<td>949-4856</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Christopher Scribner</td>
<td>949-4707</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Robert Allen</td>
<td>949-4736</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Kris Smith</td>
<td>949-4775</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS</td>
<td>Adam Ulrich</td>
<td>949-4978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Jann Weitzel</td>
<td>949-4846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Don Heidenreich</td>
<td>949-4414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance Purpose and Function

The principal responsibility of the General Education Committee is to maintain consistency of course requirements that lead to a well-rounded liberal arts education. The members of the GE committee will monitor the implementation and integrity of the general education program across the academic schools on the heritage campus as well as on all extended campuses and for both the traditional day program and the evening program.

Membership and Term of Service

One full-time faculty member is elected by the membership of each academic school to serve in staggered two-year terms. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as an employee with a regular faculty contract who teaches at least 18 hours per fiscal year or an employee who has a full-time contract to work in the doctoral program. The VPAA/PROVOSTAA, a representative for the Academic Services office, and the assessment officer also serve on the General Education committee without vote.
Officers

The membership of the GE committee elects the chairperson and vice-chairperson, with the latter leading the meetings when the chairperson cannot attend. The GE committee also appoints a reporter who keeps the minutes of each meeting and forwards those minutes to all committee members for their review prior to the next scheduled meeting.

Frequency of Meetings

The GE committee holds regular meetings once per month during the academic year. However, when the agenda is particularly busy, additional meetings may be called. The day of the month on which the meetings will be held is set at the beginning of each semester, based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the GE committee sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order.

Agenda-Item Categories

1. Annual review of the general education program on the heritage campus as well as on all extension campuses and for the traditional day program as well as for the adult education program.
2. Annual review of general education syllabi to ensure that all general education classes are in line with the GE philosophy and objectives
3. Formulation of recommendation for consideration by the Faculty Council and Deans’ Council
4. Consider proposals submitted by any faculty or staff member that relates to the general education program of the University
5. Consider proposals submitted by any faculty or staff members that relates to the cross-cultural program of the University
6. Balance concerns of a traditional liberal arts education with changing needs of the students/society
7. Develop consistent reporting mechanisms between the integrated database (CAMS) and the academic schools

Processes

Issues, questions, proposals, and tasks may be conveyed to the GE committee by the faculty as a whole, a colleague, a department, a school, the deans’ council, the VPAA/PROVOSTAA, the President, or another committee or task force. The GE committee may also originate its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agenda and considering requests from other
sources. When issues are submitted to the GE committee, those items are added to the agenda. At a subsequent GE meeting, the issue is addressed by the membership and one of four options will be taken:

1. discuss the issue and vote  
2. discuss the issue and assign members to do background research and report back at the next meeting  
3. discuss the issue and invite the sponsor of the proposal to further explain the proposal at the next meeting  
4. discuss the issue and assign members to speak to their academic schools and bring a consensus of opinion to the next meeting

Submission of committee’s report/recommendation

After a proposal has been approved by the GE committee, that proposal is taken to the Faculty Council by the VPAA/Provost. The Faculty Council may

1. vote in favor of the proposal  
2. if the proposal would make fundamental changes in the University's educational policies, present it to the faculty as a whole for review and vote at the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting  
3. send the proposal back to the EPC for revision  
4. reject the proposal

The general faculty must have a quorum of more than 50% of full-time faculty members in order to conduct an official vote on a matter of educational policy.

The GE Committee may request a joint meeting with the Faculty Council to seek consensus on a rejected proposal.

Approval/Revision Process

If the proposal is approved by the Faculty Council or the faculty, the AA will present the proposal to the Deans' Council for final review.

If the proposal is approved by the Deans' Council, the VPAA/Provost will take the proposal to the President for his approval. At any time, a task force of GE members may be appointed to do further research into the issue.
Academic Standards and Process Committee (ASPC)

Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic School</th>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>John Cawly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>949-4679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Chryssa Sharp</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>949-4410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Sherrie Wisdom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>949-4478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td>Larry Quiggins</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>949-4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Rift Fournier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>949-4604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Julie Turner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>949-4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Keith Russell</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>949-4641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Angela Holden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>949-4551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Don Heidenreich</td>
<td></td>
<td>949-4414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Christine Hannar</td>
<td></td>
<td>949-4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAA</td>
<td>Jann Weitzel</td>
<td></td>
<td>949-4846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance Purpose and Function

The principal responsibility of the Academic Standards Committee is to provide advice and counsel to the University’s faculty and administration on matters related to adherence to the stated academic standards of the University. Further, the committee reviews and audits the procedures being used to ensure quality as well as the results of those procedures and renders recommendations and solutions to the VPAA/Provost (hereinafter referred to as the VPAA) for particular cases in which interpretation of academic policy is needed. The ASPC complements the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) by monitoring and ensuring implementation of the academic quality guidelines formulated by the EPC and suggesting changes in academic policy and practices to the EPC.

Membership and Term of Service

One full-time faculty member is elected by the membership of each academic school to serve in staggered two-year terms. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as an employee with a regular faculty contract who teaches at least 18 hours per fiscal year or an employee who has a full-time contract to work in the doctoral program. Members of the ASPC should have a minimum
of three years of full-time faculty experience at a college or University. The VPAA and the Dean of Institutional Research (IR) also serve *ex officio* on the ASC without vote. Either the Registrar or the Dean of Academic Services will attend each meeting without vote.

**Officers**

The membership of the ASPC elects the chairperson and vice-chairperson, with the latter leading the meetings when the chairperson cannot attend. The ASPC also appoints a reporter who keeps the minutes of each meeting and forwards those minutes to all committee members for their review prior to the next scheduled meeting.

**Frequency of Meetings**

The ASPC holds regular meetings twice per month during the academic year. However, when the agenda is particularly busy, meetings may be called more frequently. The days of the month on which regular meetings will be held is set at the beginning of each semester, based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the ASPC sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

**Agenda-Item Categories**

1. Empirical grading practices relative the University's grading policies
2. Procedures used by academic schools to ensure control of quality and improvement
3. Requirements for offering contract degrees or independent study classes
4. Review of, and recommendations concerning, applications for contract degrees
5. Review and recommendations regarding the transferability of courses from institutions not accredited by regional agencies
6. Audit of adherence to the academic honesty policy
7. Review and recommendations regarding the validity of requests for cross-listed courses (across BA/MA lines)
8. Requirements for and assessment of online coursework and adherence of standards of student achievement verification
9. Review and recommendations regarding cases in which there is a question about the appropriateness of the credentials of adjunct teachers
10. Recommendations regarding the standardization of the need for prerequisites and workload at various levels of coursework
11. Review of and recommendations to the faculty and academic administration procedures relating to admissions policy, the granting of academic credit for practica, internships, and critical life experience, and probation, suspension, and readmission policies
12. Review of the academic programs of Lindenwood University for the purpose of establishing and maintaining consistent and appropriate academic standards across all delivery formats and at all sites and venues

Processes

Issues, questions, proposals, and tasks may be conveyed to the ACS by the Faculty Council, the Deans’ Council, the Dean of IR, the Dean of Academic Services, the Registrar, the VPAA, the President, or another committee or task force. The ASPC may also originate its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agenda and considering requests from other sources. When issues are submitted to the ASPC, those items are added to the agenda. At a subsequent ASC meeting, the issue is addressed by the membership and one of three steps will be taken:

1. discuss the issue and vote
2. discuss the issue and assign members to do background research and report back at the next meeting
3. designate a special task force to gather information on the issue and report to the committee

Submission of committee’s report/recommendation

After a case or a proposal dealing with a specific student, faculty member, student applicant, or incident has been evaluated by the ASPC, the committee's disposition is submitted to the VPAA for review and action.

Any general standards evaluations or proposals for modification of academic policy or criteria are reported to the VPAA, the Faculty Council, and Educational Policies Committee. The Faculty Council will review and refer any such evaluations or proposals, along with its disposition or recommendations, to the Deans’ Council for review and possible vote.

If a proposal would make fundamental changes in the University's educational policies or procedures, the Faculty Council may present it to the faculty for review and vote at the next regularly scheduled faculty meeting. The general faculty must have a quorum of more than 50% of full-time faculty members in order to conduct an official vote on a matter of educational policy.

The ASPC may request a joint meeting with the Faculty Council to seek consensus on a rejected proposal.
Approval/Revision Process

If an ASPC proposal is approved by the faculty/the Faculty Council and the Deans’ Council, the VPAA will take the proposal to the President for approval or declination.
Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Michael Stein</th>
<th>949-4733</th>
<th>Term Expires May 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ralph Wiedner</td>
<td>949-4737</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Hollis Heyn</td>
<td>949-4854</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Tim Poetner</td>
<td>949-4855</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Bob Wigginton</td>
<td>949-4761</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Jeanie Thies</td>
<td>949-4689</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Susan Isenberg</td>
<td>949-4709</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Rankins</td>
<td>(618)222-1050</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Sherblom</td>
<td>949-4759</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Cindy Manjounes</td>
<td>949-4522</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Don Heidenreich</td>
<td>949-4414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixa</td>
<td>Sherry DeVore</td>
<td>(417) 881-0009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance Purpose and Function

The principal responsibility of the Institutional Review Board is to protect the safety, privacy, and rights of human subjects recruited to participate in research performed by students, faculty, and staff at Lindenwood University.

Membership and Term of Service

At least one full-time faculty member is elected/selected by the membership of each academic school to serve in staggered two-year terms. Because the majority of research proposals come from the sciences and education, it is typical for two full-time faculty members from those schools to serve on the IRB. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as an employee with a regular faculty contract who teaches at least 18 hours per fiscal year or an employee who has a full-time contract to work in the doctoral program. The assessment officer also serves on the
IRB. Members of the IRB often choose to serve back-to-back terms due to the complexity of the process; experience working with research or research proposals is beneficial.

**Officers**

The membership of the IRB elects the chairperson and vice-chairperson with the latter leading the meetings when the chairperson cannot attend. The IRB also appoints a reporter who keeps the minutes of each meeting and forwards those minutes to all committee members for their review prior to the next scheduled meeting. The minutes are also forwarded to the VPAA.

**Frequency of Meetings**

The IRB holds regular meetings twice per month during the academic year, although weekly meetings may be held if the number of proposals warrants additional meetings. The day and weeks of the month on which the meetings will be held is set at the beginning of each semester, based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the IRB sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

**Agenda-Item Categories**

1. Review all research proposals to ensure that the proposed research poses minimal risks to the subjects, relative to the expected benefits
2. Review all research proposals to ensure that the proposed research is scientifically sound
3. Serve as an educational tool for students, staff, and faculty regarding the ethical pursuit of research involving human subjects
4. Create and maintain a user-friendly webpage about the IRB submission process and publish all submission deadlines
5. Education of IRB membership about various research approaches

**Processes**

Proposals may be conveyed to the IRB by a faculty member or a student. When a proposal application is received, it is added to the agenda for a subsequent meeting. The name of the submitter is removed from the application, and the application is emailed to the IRB for review prior to the meeting. When the next meeting of the board is convened, a discussion is held on each of the following aspects:

1. Safety of subjects
2. Methodology
3. Hypothesis
4. Originality of the research, i.e. leading to new information
5. Logic and organization of the research

After a proposal has been approved by the IRB, the proposal is returned to the submitter as

1. Approved
2. Approved with revisions
3. Denied (submitter may choose to rewrite and resubmit)

If a proposal meets the requirements for expedited review, the IRB chair only reviews the proposal and returns as approved, approved with revisions, or denied (to revise and resubmit)

The IRB holds regular meetings twice per month during the academic year, although weekly meetings may be held if the number of proposals warrants additional meetings. The day and weeks of the month on which the meetings will be held is set at the beginning of each semester, based on the teaching schedules of the members. The chairperson of the IRB sends reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. Official business cannot be conducted unless there is a quorum of more than 50% of the voting membership. All business is conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

Agenda-Item Categories

6. Review all research proposals to ensure that the proposed research poses minimal risks to the subjects, relative to the expected benefits
7. Review all research proposals to ensure that the proposed research is scientifically sound
8. Serve as an educational tool for students, staff, and faculty regarding the ethical pursuit of research involving human subjects
9. Create and maintain a user-friendly webpage about the IRB submission process and publish all submission deadlines
10. Education of IRB membership about various research approaches

Processes

Proposals may be conveyed to the IRB by a faculty member or a student. When a proposal application is received, it is added to the agenda for a subsequent meeting. The name of the submitter is removed from the application, and the application is emailed to the IRB for review prior to the meeting. When the next meeting of the board is convened, a discussion is held on each of the following aspects:

1. Safety of subjects
2. Methodology
3. Hypothesis
4. Originality of the research, i.e. leading to new information
5. Logic and organization of the research

After a proposal has been approved by the IRB, the proposal is returned to the submitter as

1. Approved
2. Approved with revisions
3. Denied (submitter may choose to rewrite and resubmit)

If a proposal meets the requirements for expedited review, the IRB chair only reviews the proposal and returns as approved, approved with revisions, or denied (to revise and resubmit).
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