

Faculty Senate Five-Year Review

2011

1. Campus Deans.

Strengths: The deans expressed respect for the Senate and thought that attendance is good. Loy Harvey was praised for her work, as were committee chairs. Meetings were interesting to the deans.

Challenges: The deans reported that they rarely speak at Senate meetings and feel there is a lack of clarity in the CE and Honors College relationships to the Senate. These units do not have their own faculty members. The deans felt that that they do not have a way to formally interact with the Senate; their relationship is not what they would like to see. One dean commented that most faculty here don't feel powerful and many use votes to obstruct actions. The deans would like to see their constituency broadened and would like to formalize representation.

A dean commented that there is a lack of formal communication between Provost Council and Senate. Although the Provost does speak to Senate, there is no specific discussion pertaining to Deans' business.

Proposal: Senate or a Senate Committee could give Deans opportunity to present information regarding their issues. Unrepresented faculty members could be represented as members from the Honors or CE units.

2. Staff Association and Student Government Association

Strengths: There is a staff presence on Senate and on BPA. Staff president communicates with Loy Harvey and through chairs. Representation is strong in that all campus staff members vote for their representative. Additional communication occurs as the SA President works with Senate chairs on staff issues. This structure is seen as positive. Loy Harvey is an asset to the process.

Challenges: Conflicts may occur in situations when staff representatives serve on the same committees as their supervisors serve. Elected student representatives need to attend more meetings.

Proposals: A staff person could be represented on Senate Steering committee. Campus orientations would inform staff members and others about representing units on the Senate, including issues such as learning about how policies are developed and how the governance works. Electing 2 staff representatives to sensitive committees, such as the Budget committee, would alleviate the issue of possible conflict of interest between staff person and his/her supervisor. Students can work on recruiting other students for governance positions.

3. Steering committee

Changes since last review:

- Major by laws change
- Moved offices
- New committee research policy
- Reduced number of committees
- Changed student Forum
- Senate chair chooses people for nominating committee.

Strengths: Chancellor is committed to share governance. Faculty elects the IFC member who reports to the Senate at Fall and Spring meetings. Meetings are run very efficiently. Loy Harvey's work is outstanding.

Challenges: New faculty members are needed to serve on the Senate though there are few incentives for service on campus; some members termed the Senate a "click" in that some faculty feel faculty governance is a sham. For example, it was commented that campus B&P cuts even happened even though some faculty shared contrary views.

Suggestions: Time and new faculty representatives were the major concerns. The Senate needs to plan for leadership replacements as well as some type of reward system. Other suggestions were to move IFC elections to the Senate and that the Senate chairmanship needs to be extended to a longer term of 2- 4 years with more release time granted. Past chairs could serve on IFC and Steering committee; Chair elect, chair and past chair should work together. All deans could speak at meetings and serve as standing representatives on the University Assembly. Voices of NTT faculty members should be heard as well as tenure track and tenured faculty members. "The organization should be about individuals, not procedures." It was recommended that non-represented faculty be associated with an academic unit to expand possibilities for membership.

4. Committee Chairs

Strengths: Chairs have seen some improvement of committee structure and reported they felt the Senate was well organized and planned efficiently. Loy Harvey's work was praised in "making it work." Student representatives are very helpful. Serving on committees before being a chair was thought to be a helpful procedure. Much work is accomplished via email.

Challenges: Chairing a committee requires much time and effort.

Suggestions: The chairs did not favor instituting "term limits" for Senate members. It would be better, chairs felt, to expand the Senate to involve more

faculty members. There is too little support from some departments to serve on the Senate. Institutional incentives are needed to encourage membership and departments should create incentives. Research panels are needed to be retained as committees as is the Tenure Removal committee. It was suggested that at the first committee meetings, the chair explain the committee's purpose and operations; committees would benefit from hearing from an ex officer.

The budget process is a good example of success. Key administrators, staff, SA and faculty participated in the process and deliberations and as result there were fewer complaints from the faculty than in the past. The chairs liked the idea of chair elect and past chair on IFC though that amount of responsibility could mean a 3-6 year commitment of time.

Summary of suggestions/concerns:

Voice and representation for all

Term limits

IFC representation

Communication

Encouraging faculty to participate with incentives

Time and incentives to encourage faculty to become Senate chair

Internal Review Committee:

Helene Sherman: Chair

Rocco Cottone: Member

Yan Tian, Member