A&S Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance  
February 3, 2017  
Present: McCulley, Mifsud, Gupton. Baughan, Abreu, Goddu

Guests: Todd Lookingbill, Nominating Committee and Wade Downey, Undergraduate Research Committee

Questions for general discussion:  
- What would be the key components in an effective shared governance model for A&S?  
- What obstacles get in the way?  
- Are there shared governance models at other institutions, which you believe are effective and could be implemented at UR?

Undergraduate Research Committee  
The role of the Associate Dean has changed a great deal from the chair of the URC committee to ex officio member, meaning that the practices of the committee and the Associate Dean serving ex officio need to keep pace with this change to shared governance. Bylaws need to explicitly state that the rights and role of ex officio members of committees, including voting rights. URC is currently an advisory committee to the Dean.

As chair this year, this is Dr. Downey’s first time to see and review the URC budget. Members of committee historically have not seen the budget. It is a $100,000 budget, but there is no commonly known method for asking the Dean to increase budget. What is the process for requesting budget increases? Should that go through the Associate Dean? There is no transparency about what type of funding is or is not available from the Dean’s office to supplement the URC budget. Exhausting funds for supporting students is a real problem facing URC, which has been over budget for three of the last four years. A1 accounts are extremely frustrating because student travel, for which a budget is generated by the student applicant, and student research grants go in the faculty member account. This is a problem because if the student travel funding is not used in full, it stays in the faculty account and the funding is not returned to the URC budget, which results in a decrease in URC budget. In addition, faculty
can then spend that money, sometimes unknowingly for purposes other than student designated research/travel.

The committee also has to work with the SpiderFund, which works with the Richmond Guarantee, but the Guarantee has forced URC to bias its summer fellowship pool and not actually rank according to merit.

URC can have a final meeting to talk about the year, revise procedures, etc. No actions have to date been put before A & S faculty for report, let alone review and vote.

Other committees seem to have lost their power in governance, such as the University Admissions Committee which Dr. Downey served on for 3 years. It has no power at all to decide anything and faculty just serve as audience to admissions reports.

**Nominating Committee**

Nominating committee chair turns over every year and this results in lack of consistency with governance. A clearly appointed administrative point person could help smooth the annual transition.

Why do all the same people get nominated all the time? Are there other ways to diversify those who get nominated? Should we recommend to the current nominating committee that they review how nominations are made to enhance inclusivity and diversity of faculty serving? The Nominating Committee relies heavily on preference forms to assign service for about 24 committees. The other 6 committees are elected. If people complete the form, they generally get assigned. If they don’t complete the form, they may not, but the nominating committee often reaches out to those who did not complete the form to meet committee composition rules. Perhaps we should work through the chairs and ask them to nominate faculty to serve? Maybe have nominations from the whole of the department, or vote for people in your own division?

Can the nominating committee make recommendations to A & S faculty about how to improve nominations? Yes, but the committee doesn’t know
how to do so and has no structure or precedent or clear charge for doing so.

What is relation between the Nominating Committee and Committee on Committees? The nominating committee makes recommendations to serve, and committee on committees must adhere to these recommendations. This does not always happen and should be clarified. It can also happen that a committee chair makes a decision to replace someone on leave informally without checking with the nominating committee. This should also be clarified. The Nominating Committee is charged with seeing the broader picture of service throughout the university. Other committees are appointed directly by the Dean’s, President’s Office and other Administrative offices, which further complicates the shared distribution of responsibilities.

It is also not always clear that administrators serving in the Dean and Provost offices who were faculty are no longer faculty but administrators during their term of service in administrative offices. What is their status? There must not be administrative over-reach into faculty governance as we forge our idea and practice of shared governance.

A conversation also ensued about the lack of governance and support for interdisciplinary programs, especially course support between schools, etc.

**General Discussion of Committee**

Review of recommendations:
- Reviewing pros and cons of 3 models
- Reviewing needs to pull other kinds of recommendations from minutes, such as recommendations on written documents and record keeping, Roberts Rules of Order training and workshops for faculty.

**Task Delegation:**

February 7: Mari Lee will present at Academic Council. Lucretia, Dixon, and Lizzie will be there to support and guide conversation
Mari Lee will go through the minutes for recommendations beyond the 3 models

Lizzie and John will go through models for bylaw drafting for executive committee

Geoff will review how changes to faculty handbook would need to be made.

The committee will meet again at 3 p.m. on Feb. 10 and Feb. 17.

Addendum from Wade Downey (2/12/17)
The dates for the summer research period each year are effectively set by the housing office, who decides what dates the apartments will be open for summer research students to live in. For the past several years, there has been an eleven- or twelve-week window from housing, which allowed the research students (and their mentors!) to have some much-needed flexibility regarding the beginning and end of their 10-week summer research contracts.

This year, that window was narrowed to 10 weeks without any warning. If students (particularly international students and/or economically disadvantaged students) want to start research early so that they can limit their travel needs for the summer, they will have to move into temporary housing at the end of the semester, then move again from temporary housing into their summer housing. Also, if a student has family obligations for a certain week in the summer and needs to work an extra week at the end of the summer to make up the time, that student will have to move into temporary housing at the end of the summer. This seems unnecessary to us on the Undergraduate Research Committee, but we were not consulted in any way.