

November 13, 2013

Faculty Governance Forum

Members from the ad-hoc committee present: Sharon Mutter and Jim Berger

SEC members: Jill Brown (notes), Margaret Crowder (notes), Mark Reeves, Beverly Siegrist

5 other faculty in attendance; plus one online faculty member

Opening Comments: Margaret Crowder

Q -Can a faculty member serve on both documents on the same time, then can they do it?

A - There is nothing in the document that says they can't, but it would be a lot of work for the person who wants to.

Q – Explain the history behind the document, the charge from the previous senate

A – Started in 2010 with the senate and the UCC to evaluate the faculty government structure – look to see how it is working – survey conducted in 2010 of faculty who had served on senate and other related committees to reflect on their government structure – people surveyed said they didn't think the governance was working very well – Structure was looked at specifically – The ad hoc committee looked at different types of faculty governance – the majority of faculty was in favor of a two body governance structure – The charge to the ad hoc committee was to explore the idea of going back to a two structure governance system.

Q – explain briefly why we went from a two part structure to a one part structure, and what is the rationale for going back

A – back then many faculty felt the two part structure was working well (no survey), but there was some mutterings of the two part structure being inefficient – The Fisher Report was mentioned regarding faculty governance – one of the faculty present mentioned that the two party system was inefficient. The faculty senate was underpowered with its relationship to the university and administration and underrepresented. His question is will this be useful or beneficial to faculty?

Q - It looks like most items go to Academic Quality and not to Faculty Senate. There are some gray areas, who handles the gray areas? Book ordering example. What is the delineation of powers?

A - Some issues will go to both branches. There is a mechanism in the document in which there is a communication between the two bodies. They looked at benchmark universities & other forms of faculty governance

Q – Each one requires a department representative? There seems to be a weak link between the two branches. Too many faculty necessary?

A – We have heard that before. They require each department to have two representatives. The committee would like to see more faculty involvement. By dividing the university senate in two bodies, then it may relieve some of the burden from the faculty members who are on the senate.

Q – There are too many people who stayed for a long time. What about the no term limits? Please speak to that.

A – The department selects their rep. If the department lets the same person represent, then they must be happy with the representation.

Comment – There were some people on one of the old branches who slowed down the process by being nitpicky.

A – Institutional memory was important – by having three year terms with no term limits, then it creates the institutional memory. Without the term limits, the people that really want to do it can do it and work hard. The administrative assistant will catch the errors.

Q – How do you know you will have the right amount of undergraduate and graduate representatives?

A – The at-large representatives will make up for this. The standing committees will have reps from each college.

Q – Graduate faculty representatives - How can we ensure that there will be graduate faculty represented for membership on the graduate committee?

A – Graduate faculty only on the graduate curriculum committee.

Q – Need reassurance that there will be enough graduate faculty in the faculty governance.

A – Tried to keep the qualifications pretty open. Everyone needs to have representation on faculty governance. The election for the at-large could ensure that there is enough graduate representatives. Many different types of faculty need to be represented.

Q – Needs to be looked at again.

Q – Why was the executive committees structured with chairs of the standing committees, rather than having representation from each representatives? Why not representation from each college, like the SEC has now?

A – College representation will be through the standing committees rather than the through the executive committee. Executive committee is tasked differently than the current SEC.

Q – Instructional Council? What is the function of the Instructional Council, which is all administrative? Seems problematic to formalize the role of administration into a created body within faculty governance.

A – It is an advisory committee that was part of the old academic council. This was taken from the old two part governance system. – Role is in regard to the resources, and other necessities. They will not be voting. If there is a conflict over a proposal or issue, then they can provide assistance with that. They would advise regarding matters that are more administrative. They informally do this already; this formalizes their work. This was at the recommendation of the Provost.

Q – The Faculty Governance Administrative Assistant – Is it a position that already exists?

A – We have been assured that the position would be made available through the Provost Office.

Q – Instructional Council – How many extra people might be appointed?

A – Although they are not sure who extra might be appointed, they reassured us that it would be advisory only. Advise us on how to do things.

Proposals will go through more quickly because more people look at items earlier in the process. It is more formalized.

Comment – The president or a representative should attend all the meetings, the university-wide meetings, not the subcommittees.

The provost should have to respond within the 30 days or the proposal is passed. Put this clause in the document. (No pocket veto allowed)

Written in the bylaws that the agenda has to be sent to all of the faculty. Sent through e-mail. Should be communicated to the faculty through e-mail.

Comment – can do that now.

Q – Changing the structure at the same time as switching to the Colonnade program – Has anyone thought about how that will impact the faculty?

A – The guidelines are drawn out and more detailed than the last time there was change.

Comment – Not having term limits is unhealthy. There needs to be some changes. The stagger will help with institutional memory, whether there is term limits or not.

Q – Electoral math question

A - Each dept would have a representative and at-large would make up the population differences

Q – There would be about 66 people on each body

A – That sounds high, but we don't have the numbers.

A – Having two bodies will contribute to more people being involved who want to be involved.

Q – It seems like there will be some double dipping. There will be faculty on both bodies. (1/2 to ¾ of the faculty will be on both bodies.)

A – One person could be on two bodies, but it would be a lot of work.

Comment – “Not convinced by the efficiency argument.”

A – Efficiency will come over time. For example a course proposal could go through the UCC and the Colonnade in parallel.

Comment – Even if this proposal does not go through, then it would be good to increase the number of people on the senate.

Formula for the new proposal and the way it is done now is not adequate.

A – Every department, no matter what size needs to have representatives. They tried several different percentages and numbers for representation.