

Faculty Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
Nov. 3, 2015

Present: David Alvarez, Bridget Gourley, Glen Kuecker, Marnie McInnes, Lori Miles, Pam Propsom, Scott Thede, Sheryl Tremblay

Updates from the chair. Pam has contacted all faculty members of the newly appointed Hubbard Center Task Force, the directly elected faculty members of the Strategic Planning Committee about attending the Board of Trustees meetings, Amity Reading regarding the OURSCA proposal, and invited VPAA Anne Harris and President Brian Casey to attend Governance Committee meetings once a month.

Approval of previous meeting minutes. Accepted without change.

Brief reports from committees. There were none.

Review Committee Discussion. We had received requests from the Review Committee to address two issues.

Appendix B job descriptions. Mark Kannowski's email indicates that detailed job descriptions include Winter Term responsibilities, but Winter Term obligations for faculty have been temporarily suspended. Another issue is that the Committee on Experiential Learning (CEL) is supposed to have oversight over Winter Term courses and review the program every year, but the CEL has ceased to exist in our new governance structure. When the faculty voted to make this change to Winter Term, there was a statement about it being re-evaluated in a few years. Finally, Mark asked "what are the Winter Term obligations for faculty?...who decides what faculty obligations are so that they can be included in the Detailed Job Descriptions..."

Action. Regarding Appendix B, for the moment, the reference to WT in Appendix B job description needs to be changed, perhaps to include something like: "This teaching obligation has been temporarily suspended as of..... until its review, and this requirement may change subject to further university action."

Regarding Review of WT, this seems appropriately delegated to the newly formed Hubbard Center Task Force. They can make a recommendation on mechanism (i.e., whom and how) for WT Evaluation.

Regarding faculty WT obligations—Although the Governance Committee does not have the authority to rewrite job descriptions and determine faculty workload, we would like the opportunity to weigh in on this decision and not have it totally determined by the administration.

Review of administrators. Review Committee is conducting a review of the Dean of the School of Music, which coincides with the conclusion of his term of appointment as stipulated in the appointment letter. This review of an administrator is an opportunity to create a clear, formal, transparent process for faculty involvement in selection and review of administrators. This is offered in the spirit of enhanced collaboration and shared governance between faculty and

administration, providing us with an opportunity to better understand and appreciate the good work that administrators do and to simultaneously hold them accountable. Our goal would be to write a policy recommendation for the Academic Handbook that we could take to the faculty at-large for approval.

This led to a discussion of potential faculty involvement in broader administrative reviews (e.g., growth in administration in Student Life; how is effectiveness evaluated?). We have little understanding of how administrative reviews are currently conducted. Is there an announcement when an administrator is reviewed (similar to the one for faculty review) so that faculty, students, and staff who have input can submit it? However, our primary interest is in the top administrative positions that have a direct impact on faculty: SOM Dean, VPAA, and President.

A related issue is the growth in administration, administrative structure, shifting of offices and reallocation of resources, especially with new president coming in. Would the Strategic Planning Committee be involved in this?

Action. Lori will inquire what the current administrative review process is. David will share the models of administrative review at other institutions (he sent us email links). Pam will resend document she put together regarding AAUP recommendations about faculty role in administrative hiring and review. She will also send a note to David Newman on the Strategic Planning Committee regarding the issue of administrative growth and structure.

Bridget and Lori are creating a Google Doc regarding other institutions' practices with faculty representation to the Board of Trustees.

Writing Committee. Rebecca Schindler had sent an email with a number of requests for the Writing Committee. Last week we discussed the committee membership issue. This week we addressed the other two issues regarding a name change and revision to its charge.

Name change--We agreed to change the name to the Writing Curriculum Committee. This will have to be proposed for a formal faculty vote.

Charge—The proposed modification adds one phrase (underlined): “Oversees all aspects of the writing program and writing curriculum, including supporting the W competency...and supports the Writing in the Major (WIM) programs ...and the curricular aspects of the first-year seminar program (FYS).” We had a discussion of the Writing Committee’s “ownership” of the FYS. Do they oversee *all* of FYS or only the *writing* portion of this course? Who approves FYS courses? At the moment it’s the Writing Committee, but should this be the purview of MAO/Course and Calendar Committee instead? S used to be a more significant portion of FYS and some of us would like to see it reintegrated. The Writing Committee charge also includes “reviewing guidelines and the (W) program more generally.” This led to a discussion about program evaluation/assessment. It seems like W is engaging in a variety of impressive assessments and we would love for the university as a whole to know more about this. In addition, when we established the FYS program, there was supposed to be an evaluation of this at some point. Is this the W Committee responsibility?

Action. Pam will talk with Rebecca to share our decisions and questions, and to brainstorm.