

Special Executive Committee Regarding Shared Governance

Meeting Minutes

January 25, 2007

Present: DeAnna Timmermann, John Miller, Michael Jaeger, Jana Parmele, Doug Briney, Jeff Johnson, David Komito, Shakira Bandolin, Kathryn Shorts, Rebecca Cross, Rebecca Hartman, Mary Koza, Danny Mielke, Teun Fetz, Gerry Ramey

The meeting was called to order at 2:05pm in the Alumni Room by Provost John Miller

❖ **Shared Governance Proposal:**

1. Background:

- John Miller opened by saying that the process for Shared Governance began a year ago, a campus wide meeting was held last spring and several members of the committee worked on it over the summer. It is the intent of the committee to move forward with the proposal for discussion and present it at a March Assembly with hopes of adopting it in April. Executive Committee is the first committee to hear the proposal and input and suggestions as to how best to move forward to other groups will be appreciated.

2. Proposal:

- Michael Jaeger added that a senate has been an ongoing interest. It is the intent to respect the legacy of the past while moving toward a new Shared Governance for the future. This Shared Governance proposal model was chosen after several drafts because it shows that committees are the core of what Eastern really does well; therefore they were very important and most were retained. The following committees were retained, added and omitted (omitted):
 - Retained:
 - Most committees and opportunities for constituencies to add additional committee member if necessary
 - Wide opportunity for participation by faculty, students and classified staff. The Faculty Senate would represent faculty and the University Council would represent all constituencies.
 - Added:
 - Creation of faculty senate
 - Creation of University Council – brand new structure
 - Recommended and reporting lines of committees are divided between the Faculty Senate and the University Council.
 - Omitted:
 - Assembly
 - Executive Committee

Positive aspects of this model include giving faculty say over curriculum matters. This model will give everyone a say about university policies that affect everyone because constituencies will select who will represent them.

- Doug Briney offered a summary of changes made to the current constitution:
 - Removed article 3 where it talks about Assembly and put in an article about Shared Governance which identifies the Faculty Senate and committees that will make recommendations to the faculty senate. Also creates the University Council and who will make recommendations to that body.
 - The Shared Governance Committee structure stays the same
 - Members for committees are chosen by constituencies
 - Not a lot of change involved other than from Assembly to Shared Governance
- Jeff Johnson emphasized that it is the intent of this model to repair something that is not working. Various problems with Assembly have arisen; i.e., quorum and off campus folks.
- Kathryn Shorts expressed that she was excited about Shared Governance because classified staff will be given ownership and be asked for input where it wasn't asked before. As it stands only members of classified staff that serve on committees can vote at Assembly.
- Shikara Bandolin added that students are excited about Shared Governance and believe it will be a better system than what we have now.

2. Questions:

- Q – What happens when a committee makes a recommendation to senate?
A - It would be the same as the Assembly voting it up or down, only the Senate would vote it up or down. At the same time that it is given to the Senate it will be given to the University Council; if there is an issue that needs to be discussed a joint session can be convened. Decisions will be made at the committee level so we need to make sure all the people who need to have a say have a say in the committee structure.
Comment –It will be critical for all committee members to participate in order for process to work.
Michael –
- Q – What is the term for faculty Senate?
A – Was not discussed
Q – How does that work when the constitution is changed? Would the Assembly decide this?
A – The Shared Governance Committee chose to be more open with language in the proposed Constitution and not to put too much detail in. Details would be determined by bylaws from both parties. It was added that the intent was to leave it open so faculty could invent and build. It is still in the process of fine tuning.
- Q - If bylaws are not addressed at this stage and something similar to this constitution moves forward to a final vote, it seems it would be a leap of faith with a very big component missing. Is there any way to incorporate suggested or proposed bylaws?
A - There is a 'safe' & an 'extreme' model for changing the Constitution. The safest thing to do is to put as much detail into the constitution that guarantees (guarantees) that what you vote for is what you see. Two factors came into play, trying something new and drafting something that would make it hard to amend the constitution. It would take 60% vote in both senate and council and then 60% vote of the entire University constituency to change the Constitution in this model. So, if we were to go the safe route and then realize the wording was not what we really wanted, it would be difficult to change it. Creation of a senate raises the stakes because they will be responsible for bylaws.
- Q – Is there a proposed timeline and when would the constitution be in effect, if these changes are adopted in April? Because if the changes are in effect as soon as we vote on this, we would be sitting without a governing body because Executive Committee would be abolished.
A – Executive Committee would provide for an orderly transition and will still have authority during an interim period. It was suggested that a vote would come in April, we'd tear up the old constitution, and then use last couple of months in spring to elect membership of new bodies to take effect in fall. Governance committee will continue to work on this issue.
- Q – In terms of the organization of the meetings of Faculty Senate and University Council, in sense of timing, how will it be organized? Who will do the reporting back and forth between the groups? Other concerns regarding this issue were aired.
A – All of the details are not worked out yet. One point is that all of the arrows on the schematic will not be active all of the time. Few issues will stimulate interest on both sides. This is good because if there is a disagreement at least there is an opportunity to hear the concern.
- Q –If a recommendation was made to the Senate or Council and then reported over to the secondary body, and if there is a reconsideration claim, wouldn't the original body already voted on the recommendation? If they had what could be done?
A – Meetings would not be closed. The Shared Governance Committee believes each body would be able to report via email or such and by calling emergency meetings if necessary. It is important that committees be representational, people will need to be there and this is definitely a more demanding model.
- Q – For the Faculty Senate it appears the electorate will be at least ½ time appointments. For the University Council it is a ½ time appointments or academic faculty and administrative support, but full-time classified staff. Comparing that to language in the current constitution, which says classified staff shall elect without the restriction of if being full-time, isn't this more restrictive than it is right now? And doesn't it leave people out?
A - This issue has been discussed and they will go back and think about it some more.
- Q – How will it work for the Diversity Committee recommending to the University Council?
A – It would be a two step process. Diversity is a university wide concern and not particularly a faculty or curricular concern. Curricular changes would go to EPCC which would kick that part back to the senate.
- Q – How are standing committees created?
A – Only Ad Hoc. Each body would create its own standing committees.
- Q – What do you anticipate in terms of challenges?
A – Believe some things will need to be voted on. Believes students to see this as win/win, classified to see it as win/win and administrative staff might see it as losing some influence. Some might see it as a small body excluding people. But the Faculty Senate can still choose to have a meeting of full faculty.

In closing, John plans to share these materials with campus on Monday. They will also be creating a website and will give updates at Assembly.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10pm.