

Faculty Priorities and Governance Committee Minutes September 23, 2016

Howard Brooks chairing the meeting as Kuecker is in Tucson for Border Studies Advisory Board Meeting.

Attending: Francesca Seaman, Pam Propsom, Bob Hershberger, Howard Brooks, Bryan Hanson, Tim Good

Convene at 146pm

Minutes approved from last week Sep 16

Chair update (written notes from Kuecker)

- Committee members emailed with report on chair's conversations with several protagonists in Spring 2016 process leading to formation of Class Dean system. Chair spoke with VPAA (part of discussion about committee agenda), Rebecca Schindler (member of SAL and placed on "ad hoc" group that wrote report), David Guinee (Chair of Curricular). Chair of SAL was contacted, but no reply.
- Chair spoke with Jacob Hale, chair of Advising Committee. He reported that Advising was approached by administration (VPAA and maybe Dean of Academic Life) in April (a little fuzzy but it was not earlier in the semester, like February). Advising was asked to participate in a group to look at class dean concept. Hale was not aware that Advising needed to report to Curriculum. Hale reports that when Alvarez asked his Sept faculty meeting question, he realized that there was an obvious flaw in the process.
- Chair spoke with Alvarez and Fancy to update them on status of the landscape.
- Chair has not received new business items from the faculty.
- Chair will work with Faculty Chair to send email to chairs of committees reminding them to produce and post minutes, report to appropriate committees, report out to faculty at large (their main agenda items), and provide an annual report to the Chair of the Faculty.
- No updates on Confidentiality policy memo, still with university lawyer.
- Draft Handbook changes circulated to committee members.

Tim Good volunteered to take minutes.

Minutes approved from Sep 16.

Approved SOM Handbook changes for committee member.
Howard will recirculate and we will finish next week

Discussion of the process that led to Class Dean system, advising software, and grade grievance.

Report from Tim Good Student Academic Life Committee discussion

- a. the Class Dean system and advising software should not have been instituted without a vote of the faculty, or at least
- b. they should not have been instituted without more input from the faculty.
- c. Liaison appointment and reporting procedures specified in the Academic Handbook were not followed, and consequently
- d. the existence and activities of the Advising Committee were not reflected in relevant committee meeting minutes and so
- e. faculty were less informed about, and less able to comment on, these changes than they should have been.

It was emphasized that the Class Dean system and new software are administrative changes and therefore not subject to faculty vote, though the administration may seek faculty input, and did.

Re (c), (d), and (e): these concerns appear justified to some extent.

- i. The Advising Committee has been active for at least five years, though its activities are not always reflected in meeting minutes.
- ii. Some breakdowns in communications may have been due to the overall change in faculty governance structure.
- iii. Not all liaisons specified in the Handbook were appointed, so there was less communication than there should have been, and less faculty awareness.
- iv. Student Academic Life discussed how much input faculty ought to have, regardless of whether changes are under faculty control.
- v. We discussed whether Student Academic Life ought to take over the Advising Committee's duties. In any case, the AC's charge includes promoting/communicating, which hadn't been happening as it should.

Further conclusions:

Need to demand annual reports from Core committees to Chair of the Faculty

Be sure Chairs post their minutes, especially from Core committees

Howard Brooks will use the handbook to construct a governance organizational chart

Adjourn 240pm