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.

In 2011, a second campus, Lindenwood University-Belleville, was approved by the Illinois Department of Higher Education. Both campuses currently have or will have a complementary faculty committee structure. However, the number of academic programs, full-time faculty members, and the make-up of the campus community dictates which committees will be created in Belleville as the campus grows.
Faculty Council

Faculty Council members can serve two consecutive two-year terms for a total of four years, after which they must take a year off before serving again.

Faculty Council (two-year term; two reps per school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Rep 1</th>
<th>Rep 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Lively (15)*</td>
<td>A. Smith (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Bobo (14)</td>
<td>Corbin (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Weir (15)</td>
<td>Thouvenot (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Holden (15)</td>
<td>Horstmeier (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Menniga (15)</td>
<td>Cawly (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Ezvan (15)</td>
<td>Brickler-Ulrich (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Green (15)</td>
<td>K. Smith (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Strzelec (14)</td>
<td>Jones (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>Lovell (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Parker (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP-HR</td>
<td>Ayres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP-AA</td>
<td>Weitzel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 VP-HR and Dean of Faculty (hereinafter referred to as “Dean of Faculty”), and the Provost and VP-AA (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 Committees

Chair - Jeanie Thies
Members - TBD

Lindenwood has two distinct levels of Assessment Committees

1) School Assessment committees
2) University Assessment Committee

The University Assessment Committee will have oversight of the assessment process within each school, and coordinate submission of assessment program reports. School assessment committees will include representatives from each department within the School, and be convened by the University Assessment Committee representatives as needed.

University Assessment Committee

The University Assessment Committee is composed of
• one full-time faculty member from each school, who will chair the school assessment committee (selected by the dean),
• one student may be chosen by LSGA or department chair (optional)
• the Dean of Institutional Research,
• the Dean of Student Services.

The committee’s composition is sent annually to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The chair, vice chair, and recorder are members of the committee. The committee meets at least once semester, with additional meetings scheduled as needed. Minutes are sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The duties include but are not limited to the following:

• Ensure that schools are in compliance with deadlines for submitting assessment plans, reports, and other relevant documents to the Dean of Institutional Research
• Provide guidance to schools on best practices in assessment
• Help ensure University assessment reflects best practices in assessment, and recommend modifications to the assessment and reporting process as necessary
• Review of assessment plans
• Giving guidance and/or advice in the creation of assessment plans and tools to school
• Review of assessment reports

School Assessment Committees


• One faculty member from each department/program/major (the dean of the school will
A student member may be selected by the LSGA or recommend by the dean (optional)

The Dean of Institutional Research is an ex officio member of each school committee.

The committee’s composition is sent annually to the Office of Institutional Research. Each committee has its own chair and recorder. Minutes from meetings are submitted to the Office of Institutional Research.

The committees meet at least once semester, with additional meetings scheduled as needed. The duties include but are not limited to the following:

Review all new programs to ensure that there are clear Student Learning Outcomes, methods in place for assessing these, and clear timeframes for when assessment takes place.

Preparation and or review of program assessment reports.

Department representatives will ensure all reports are submitted to the Assessment Committee representatives from the respective schools.

Provide guidance to departments on best practices in assessment
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 VP-AA.

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 Lindenuod 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 VP-AA, 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 Lindenuod University Teacher Education Program.
Educational Policies Committee (EPC)

Educational Policies Committee (two-year term; one rep per school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Wintz</th>
<th>Term Expires May 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Heidenreich</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>Lovell*</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Patzius</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Weir</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine &amp; Perf. Arts</td>
<td>Herrell</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Ball</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Kiel</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>Term Expires May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>Finnegan, B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Weitzel</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 polices 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 VP-AA, 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/stopping 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 VP-AA, 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 VP-AA. 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 VP-AA will present the proposal to the Dean’s Council.

If the proposal is approved by the Deans' Council, the VP-AA 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)

General Education Committee (two-year term; one rep per school, except for Humanities and Sciences, each of which have two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>K. Johnson</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Nicolai</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Shostak</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Klar</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Bednarski</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scribner</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>M. Carper</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomason, A*</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>Mike Wiggins</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMS</td>
<td>Ulrich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Weitzel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Thies</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 VP-AA/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 VP-AA/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 VP-AA/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 VP-AA/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>Category</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Beane (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Coker (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Leavitt (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td>Trawick (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Fournier (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Beckerle (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Balogh (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Cooper (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Taylor (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Parisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>Hannar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Abbott</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 VP-AA/Provost (hereinafter referred to as the VP-AA) 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 VP-AA 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 work load 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 VP-AA, 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 VP-AA for review and action.

Any general standards evaluations or proposals for modification of academic policy or criteria are reported to the VP-AA, 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 VP-AA will take the proposal to the President for approval or declination.
# Institutional Review Board (IRB)

**Institutional Review Board (two-year term; one/two reps per division)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Member(s)</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Nohara-LeClair and Welsh</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Najjar</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>Henderson-Lee</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Kania-Gosche</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devore</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>Y. Ford</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highley</td>
<td>May 2015</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 VP-AA.
**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**

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).
Study Abroad Committee (SAC) Overview

Governance Purpose and Function

The principle responsibility of the Study Abroad Committee is to maintain the integrity of all study abroad programs offered at Lindenwood University. The members of the Study Abroad Committee will monitor the implementation and integrity of the study abroad programs, both short term and semester, across all academic schools on the Lindenwood University – St. Charles campus; Lindenwood – Belleville students will also be able to participate in these programs. The SAC will also promote study abroad among the faculty and students. The SAC has the same responsibility for oversight of course-related travel within the United States.

Membership and Term of Service

One full-time faculty member is chosen from each academic school to serve at the discretion of the school. “Full-time faculty member” is defined as faculty with a full-time faculty contract. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, representing the Academic Affairs office, will also serve on the SAC, as will the Director of Study Abroad. In addition, invited members with special expertise may serve on the SAC as well. All members will be voting members of the committee.

Officers

The Director of Study Abroad, whether or not that person is faculty, will chair the SAC. The SAC will choose an acting chair if necessary. The SAC will 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. The minutes will be posted to the J-Drive with other committee minutes.

Frequency of Meetings

The SAC will meet once a month during the academic year. Issues arising between scheduled meetings will be handled by email if possible. However, if necessary, an additional meeting or 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 SAC will send reminders to members prior to each meeting along with an agenda for that meeting. A quorum of 50% is required to have a vote on policy; email voting is acceptable if one is unable to attend the meeting or if we have business that cannot wait for a regularly scheduled meeting.

Agenda-Item Categories

1. Review all study abroad proposals, make recommendations, approve or not
2. Promote study abroad to current and future students
3. Formulate recommendations for consideration by the Faculty Council and Deans’ Council
Processes

Issues, questions, proposals, and tasks may be conveyed to the Study Abroad Committee by the faculty as a whole, a colleague, a department, a school, the Deans’ Council, the VPAA, the President, or another committee or task force. The SAC may also originate its own tasks and initiatives in the course of setting its agenda and considering requests from other sources. The SAC may take one of many steps on a study abroad proposal submitted to it:

1. discuss the proposal or issue and vote
2. discuss the issue and assign members to do research or to consult with the sponsor of the proposal
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 Recommendation

After a proposal has been acted on by the Study Abroad Committee, the proposal is taken to the Deans’ Council by the VPAA. The deans may

1. vote in favor of the proposal
2. table the proposal
3. reject the proposal

After the proposal has been acted on by the Deans’ Council, the proposal is taken to the Faculty Council by the VPAA. The Faculty Council may

1. vote in favor of the proposal
2. table the proposal
3. reject the proposal

After the proposal has been acted on by the Faculty Council, the VPAA will take the proposal to the President for his approval.

Continuing Programs

Short-term programs that have already been approved need to submit a renewal form (found on the J-Drive), an updated syllabus, and a cost sheet to the SAC before they can be offered a second time. This will enable us to address any issues that may have arisen, encourage a combination of travel if too many faculty intend to go to the same destination, and keep a record of costs. While we anticipate that these renewals would be no-brainers, we do reserve the right to recommend against a program should previous editions of the program not have been appropriate.
The Director of Study Abroad should be notified of changes to semester programs when they occur, but currently those programs will not need to re-apply each year. A cost sheet will be submitted to the Director of Study Abroad every semester that students participate in these programs.

**Study Abroad Requirements, Rationales, and Criteria**

The Study Abroad Committee is to
- encourage and promote study abroad
- maintain the integrity of study abroad programs
- help faculty set up good study abroad programs
- apply all of this to study away programs as well

Study Abroad Philosophy towards all Courses
- Travel should offer real opportunities for students to change their attitudes about other parts of the world, including broadening their knowledge base
- Travel should be clearly integrated into the course and its importance to the course objectives should be clear
- Usually, short term study abroad courses will be 10000- or 20000- level courses; however, an upper-level course may be approved if the scope and workload are appropriate

The Study Abroad Committee looks at the following things as it evaluates proposals:

- **Semester Abroad**
  - Is it an accredited school?
  - How do the courses add to the program (major, elective, gen ed)?
  - Does the program require specific preparation (language requirements, self-discipline, etc.) for students to be successful? If so, do we try to ensure that they have that preparation?

- **J-Term Course Requiring Travel Abroad**
  - What are the objectives of the course?
  - How does this travel add to the course?
  - What “work” will students do to evaluate how the objectives are met?
  - What are they doing so that this isn’t just a vacation?

- **Summer Course Requiring Travel Abroad**
  - What are the objectives of the course?
  - How does this travel add to the course?
  - What “work” will students do to evaluate how the objectives are met?
  - What are they doing so that this isn’t just a vacation?