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1. Sample A&S Governance Model from Pacific University— Serves as an example, especially for a university that blends professional and liberal arts schools. The document looked good to Jan.

2. Most important priorities to structure shared governance, to be part of A & S Governance in relation to Dean’s Office—
   a. The shared governance body should be elected.
   b. What do we mean by elected? What kind of representation should we consider (i.e., tripartite and quadripartite, etc.) that represents the best of things? Do these structures need to be revised?
   c. There should be an executive committee that is elected and the chair could be part of the Dean’s cabinet or at some of the Dean’s meetings with Associate Deans.
   d. DAC is an odd body. It is somewhat elected (three elected to P&P and four elected by chairs/coordinators in), but serves as advisory to the Dean and not the faculty. It has a problematic reputation because faculty perceive it as “acting,” but it is really advisory to the Dean, who makes the decisions. Jan thinks DAC needs to be replaced with an executive committee.
   e. Leadership structure could be similar to the University Faculty Senate (UFS), perhaps a parallel structure to UFS?
   f. Jan thinks the Chair of UFS should be part of president’s cabinet, and the Chair of an A&S executive committee should be part of Dean’s cabinet (for meetings where personnel matters are not discussed)
   g. Chair of the executive committee would keep “faculty hat” on no matter what, even if part of Dean’s cabinet.
   h. Chair of executive committee would run A & S faculty meeting, like the President of UFS does.
3. Place A&S faculty committees under the faculty umbrella and oversight, not under the Dean, who would sit as ex officio, non-voting member (as with UFS faculty committees). There could be administrative committees that are under the Dean’s purview, but that have faculty involvement – would have to be hammered out.

4. Create a structure/faculty that is representative.

5. Can URC be like FRC making the decision on funding and not just recommending to Dean funding? Yes, but would have to consider Richmond Guarantee and work in collaboration with those decision-makers.

6. How much definition and guidance should we give to these committees, so the committees can decide once appointed, or comprehensive detailed guidelines?
   a. A Committee should have a charge, make it simplistic, clear, and thorough, but know it is also a work in progress
   b. Use By-laws to devise a plan to create new committees and outline how the committee is organized, rules of play, etc.
   c. Is our working group expected to draft a constitution? Or by-laws? No, but we can recommend they need to be drafted.
      i. Need to draft by-laws for this new governance, a founding document that contains the rules for play. Don’t know if this committee is the one that drafts the by-laws, but very likely NOT.

7. Nominating committee: Various ways of thinking about how to nominate people for committees, desire to incorporate new people into committees
   a. Charge should be not just to find people who are representative of the divisions, but people who have an interest related to teaching and research, and seek new people, while still protecting pre-tenure in appropriate ways (not to the exclusion of University service though)
   b. Quadripartite is too hard for elections because one is so small.
      i. Need to be clear on tri and quad in idea and practice
c. What do we mean by representation—equal representation of all three divisions (tripartite), then do we have the election process be within that division, or having everybody vote for everything?
d. Elect from within the division, so that the person has a constituency. Establishing a constituency is important.
e. Consider revising nominating committee appointment, and shift as many as possible to election.
f. Mirror the way UFS does it? Could divisions have their own processes and structures for nominating or would that lead to charges of unfairness?
g. What is the idea of appointment? What does it mean? Appointment is a way to spread around the service and so can be valuable.

8. What should the relationship between A & S UFS elected faculty and the new A & S governance structure? Should we prohibit senators from serving in both places, but allow senator to be exofficio to serve on A & S executive committee, or some other method of inclusion?

9. What is the difference between administrative duties and governmental duties?
   a. Faculty is in charge of the curriculum—governmental duty, not the Dean, as an example. The Dean has to implement the curriculum the faculty create and vote on - an administrative duty.

10. Primary question, what is the jurisdiction of the new A & S governance? Clearly curriculum (there should be an A&S curriculum committee that makes motions to the larger A&S governance body which then can bring important curricular items to the full A&S faculty.

11. What are the administrative burdens of the faculty currently? The chairs, directors and Academic Council is now the administrative body. AC is not governance, but it has been used in that way and, for some, is perceived as such.
a. AC would become purely administrative, then we could disentangle these things.

b. AC would go away—Dean could call a meeting of his chairs anytime, but AC would go away, and Executive Council of faculty would take place.

12. The whole question of interdisciplinary studies needs to be addressed in governance