A&S Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance
Notes from meeting with Academic Council on February 7, 2017
Present: McCulley, Mifsud, Baughan, Abreu + members of Academic Council

Reporting system is complicated: academic units report to the provost but others report to the president.

Shared governance should provide channels for communication. Faculty should have a voice in the prerogatives of the academic mission.

Relationship of faculty governance with HR, accounting, etc. needs to be clarified – it used to be that they were ‘serving’ the faculty, but now it seems they are ‘policing’ the faculty. Lines of authority need to be clarified, especially when decisions by HR, accounting, etc., interfere with the academic mission. How can we re-organize our committee structure to become a wall of defense to prevent such interference? How might a budget or personnel committee help to prioritize the academic mission?

What would be the relationship between DAC and an Exec. Committee? The relationship between DAC and P&P makes it potentially a finance committee – could that become a new budget committee, or should it be separate?

We need a feedback loop for committees and faculty, with committees reporting back to the faculty. Academic Council takes on too many issues, becomes bogged down and inefficient. (Council of Chairs and Program Directors is necessary, but it could be separate from faculty governing body.)

Staggering of terms on committees is good – this is something we should not change, and it should be added to more committees. It ensures continuity of process and records.

We need to educate faculty in governance if faculty governance is going to work.

How would A&S Senators relate to a possible Exec. Committee in A&S? A good analogy could be DC v. state assembly.

Should the new system of governance be created in full before beginning the change? Concern was expressed about a newly elected executive committee making its own structure.

Committee nominations and elections:

We should reconsider the whole system of voting and nominations. In the old system, everyone nominated 10 people in rank, and those ranks were compared, so that
someone who was often ranked #4 might win over someone who was ranked #1 by only a few people. This process resulted in greater variety among the people winning the elections.

Actually, the majority of committees are appointed, not elected, and these appointments depend on people completing the committee preference forms. Can we hold people accountable for not filling out the committee preference forms? Can dept. chairs get their dept. members to fill out the forms?

We also need to consider how service is valued and evaluated.

Is this the time to reconsider tripartite v. quadripartite divisions? Also consider electing by division only, so that the system of governance is truly representative?

Communications people need to be involved in how we present governance structures. The current A&S governance page lists some committees that are actually university committees, not A&S.