

Faculty Governance Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
April 12, 2016

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Lori Miles, Jim Mills, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede

Minutes. Approved minutes of our Feb. 23, March 8, March 15, and April 5 meetings. Before we approve our minutes from our meeting with Mark McCoy we will share the draft minutes with him to check for accuracy and whether he is willing to have them shared with the Review Committee (given that both Governance and Review are addressing some common issues). Committee members discussed and concluded that it is acceptable to share minutes between committees on common issues (e.g., Governance and Review Committees regarding process issues).

Shared governance. Glen shared copies of the governance book that Mark McCoy suggested. Pam will bring copies of the governance book Brian Casey suggested to share at the next meeting.

Draft document on faculty involvement in administrative hiring and review. Thanks to David Alvarez for starting a document. In our next meeting with Anne Harris we will have questions about how people in administrative positions with direct relevance to faculty work (e.g., Dean of Faculty) are currently reviewed (if they are) and the schedule for their appointments. Should these be “split reviews:” faculty evaluate individuals on elements relevant to faculty; administrators evaluate individuals on elements relevant to administration? For example, in recent review of Dean of the School of Music (DSOM), Review Committee evaluated faculty component; HR did administrative component. Or should this be integrated in some way so that everyone knows the complete info on performance, everyone’s voice and input has been heard in the decision-making?

Most of these positions are not defined in the Academic Handbook. Some university handbooks are much more detailed (e.g., defining roles, reporting structures). It would be really nice to have an organizational chart so we can understand these positions better. Complicated with SOM being a “separate” entity on campus: what is its relationship to College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and our joint governance structure? What does it mean if it is “autonomous?” Seems too small to be completely autonomous and have its own governance structure. Lack of equivalency between positions in CLA and SOM (e.g., VPAA is not the same as Dean of SOM; what is the relationship between the two?). Could Dean of Faculty position be renamed Dean of CLA?

What would the review process for administrators be like? A full Review Committee-like review with the candidate putting together a file, etc.?

The Academic Handbook guides faculty action. The administration makes decisions about organizational structure, but the faculty role would be to write a “position paper” and discuss/negotiate any proposed changes with the administration. We want a clear, accurate Handbook, but then there’s a challenge of it being potentially too detailed and not allowing any administrative flexibility to respond to changes on the ground. We are still discussing this issue.

Regarding the size of the faculty, the faculty *has grown*, but we have not *continued* to grow. What about administrative growth? Another budgetary feature is that the faculty is old (and that’s costly). VPAA job description is overwhelming and workload seems unsustainable. Do we need Dean of Sciences, Dean of Arts, etcetera, but then that further bloats the administration?

Goal is “periodic structured review of administrators with faculty input.”

**Action.** Pam will share the draft document with Anne and ask for her input, responses to our questions for discussion at our next meeting with her. Continue to think about how to translate David’s draft document into language consistent with DePauw organizational structure.

Draft document on confidentiality. Thanks to Glen for this document. A useful distinction is made between governance’s *representative* versus *evaluative* function. Our challenge is when, for example, Review Committee reviews SOM Dean it is using its representative function, not its “professional expertise,” but this also seems like a *personnel* issue. When Review interviews departmental faculty members, they are told that nothing said will be attributed to an individual, but they are not given strict confidentiality that their information will not be shared with anyone outside the committee. One difference between review of an individual faculty member and DSOM is the power dimension, the latter having *a lot* of power. Does this mean that there is a greater need to share the outcome information more widely?

Do we “review” department chairs (which is stated in the Handbook)? Review Committee interviews department members prior to a chair’s appointment or reappointment. Was the review of DSOM similar to the “review” or interview for department chairs? Glen responded that it was; Mark McCoy did not submit a file, but Review Committee members interviewed faculty in SOM.

What about looking at confidentiality from a “need to know” perspective in terms of sharing information between committees? (Perhaps too open to interpretation.)

At other institutions, at the end of the year each committee writes a 1-2 page summary of what it did, what’s still on its plate, what the committee should be thinking about 5 years out.

Review Committee has been told that they can't go back to previous year's minutes on active issues because of "confidentiality." Is this problematic or an appropriate protection?

**Action.** Pam will contact Curriculum and Student Life chairs, asking them to approve meeting minutes and send to Terry Bruner to post on the Faculty Governance website. Will also ask Review Committee for "digestible" version of its minutes.

**Next week.** Faculty appointments to committees. Continue discussion regarding confidentiality and faculty role in administrative hiring and review. Bridget suggested that we think about two things: are we attempting to write "guiding principle" language or actual Handbook language? What does it mean that the faculty can "meet" without administrators present?