

**General Faculty Meeting to Receive and Discuss
Preliminary Report by the Charter Review Committee
3:30 PM, August 29, 2000
Danielson Room**

PRESENT: Suzanne Griffith, Joel Sipress, Gloria Toivola, Susan Heide, Dianna Hunter, Cecilia Schrenker, Gail Craig, Joe Stedl, Pat Childress, Tim Cummings, Maria Cuzzo, Greg Trudeau, Bill Stock, Thma Notton, Bob Carmack, Art Bumgardner, Debra Schlacks, John Davis, Neil Hensrud, Nancy Minahan, Bill Higbee, Dick Hudelson, Victor Piotrowski, Kayt Sunwood, Mike Wallschlaeger, Michael Ball, Marshall Johnson, John Marder, Ken Weeks, Deb Nordgren, Peter Nordgren, Al Katz, Priscilla Starratt, Karl Bahm, Beth Gilbert, David Beran, Elizabeth Blue, and Rosemary Keefe.

[PRELIMINARY REPORT](#). The preliminary report was distributed at the meeting as is linked to the minutes.

DISCUSSION: Suzanne Griffith reported that the committee surveyed the faculty. The survey asked what were their thoughts and involvements? What experience did they have serving on the Faculty Senate and its Councils. Would they serve on the Faculty Senate and Councils again? If not, why not? The committee also conducted focus groups which included representatives from various constituencies. Based upon these data, the committee intends to recommend very little structural change. There is a need to find ways to have faculty voices better heard. The committee will be asking what structural changes might make this happen.

Joel Sipress noted that the focus groups were used to test hypotheses. The committee discovered that the faculty have a deep commitment to governance and understand its importance and the legal obligations for governance. Few were cynical about governance. The committee has concluded that minor structural changes may be needed, but not major ones. This fall the committee will evaluate strategies that can be used to follow-through on our responsibility. He noted that serving as Council Chair, on the Executive Committee, and on the Senate seems to be burdensome. The committee doesn't know how to remedy this problem. This report is preliminary to working on this problem.

Gloria Toivola noted that faculty have legal obligations for curriculum. Some faculty feel that the legal responsibility has not been acknowledged by the administration.

Issues related to the Graduate Council have not been addressed. Bill Stock suggested that the Graduate Council is an artifact of the old structure. Al Katz noted that when issues related to the Graduate Council are brought up they are not dealt with because the Graduate Council is viewed as separate. We need to integrate the Graduate Council with the Faculty Senate. John Davis noted that Continuing Education and Extended Degree are not given sufficient consideration. Tim Cummings observed that Faculty Senate members often do not represent graduate programs and may not wish to make decisions affecting

graduate programs. Joel Sipress asked for the Graduate Council to give suggestions to the Charter Committee. It was agreed that the Graduate Council would add a member to this committee to replace P. J. Powers. The Graduate Council has suggested that the Graduate Council be a fourth Council of the Faculty Senate. John Davis spoke in favor of the Graduate Council being the fourth Council because that is an elegant solution. Joel asked that the Graduate Council recommendations be sent to the Charter Committee so that those recommendations may be considered by the Charter Committee. Do we need more Graduate Council representation on the Academic Affairs Council? It was also suggested that a member of the Graduate Council be placed on the Faculty Senate to represent the Graduate Council. Tim Cummings asked why have both a Graduate Council and an Academic Affairs Council if the Faculty Senate is to approve the recommendations of both Councils?

Greg Trudeau thanked the committee for its work. He suggested that a list of resolutions rejected by the administration be developed and brought up again at the Senate. Mike Wallschlaeger seconded Greg's point. He said we need to use the term "shared governance." The Faculty Senate went a long way on the Chemistry issue last year, but didn't take the last step. Susan Heide made the point that collegiality is shared decision making. John Davis suggested that there are benefits of having the Senate chaired by the Chancellor, as it was under the University Senate. The purpose of the Faculty Senate structure was to give the faculty control.

Marshall Johnson argued for radical change following Michael Ball's recommendations. Marshall Johnson asked the Committee to state the reasons that Michael Ball's recommendations were not acceptable. Marshall asked the Charter Committee to share with all faculty the various models that were proposed.

Cecilia Schrenker observed that governance must be proactive. If the Personnel Council is burdened with personnel issues, there isn't time for it to be proactive. If the Planning, Budgeting, and Review Council is burdened with program reviews, there isn't time for it to be proactive. There have been times when the Personnel Council worked well by delegating to subcommittees. Mike Wallschlaeger agrees. Last year's Planning, Budgeting and Review Council was proactive and the administration did listen to budget and admissions recommendations. The Personnel Council will be reviewing personnel policy this year.

Cecilia Schrenker asked that a one-page sheet summarizing Senate action be sent to all faculty members. The web isn't enough. Most faculty do not go to the web to find the minutes. Joel pointed out that there are three parts to their report--(a) structure, (b) relationship of faculty to governance, and (c) relationship of the Faculty Senate to the administration. Communication is a major consideration. John Davis recommends that these documents be put in Outlook and Exchange. Marshall Johnson pointed out that these strategies increase our workload. Will people use these communications? Beth suggested that program assistants in every program could make copies for all the faculty in her program. Beth Gilbert supported the suggestion to have hard copies of minutes for all faculty. Beth Gilbert pointed out that the Secretary of Academic Affairs Council and Secretary of the Faculty Senate are awful jobs. Gloria Toivola pointed out that the Bulletin, Academic Affairs agenda, and Faculty Senate agenda used to be sent in hard copy form to everyone.

John Davis suggested that anyone who wanted to go to the Senate this month would be the representative from the department that month. A. Katz responded that continuity and institutional memory is important and would be discarded under the John Davis plan. John Davis recommended that all items come to the Senate first before going to the Councils. The Senate would be responsible for notifying everyone that these items are being considered by the Councils.

Liz Blue recommended that there be a new committee to kill committees. One of the NCATE concerns, she pointed out, was proliferation of committees. However, some committees exist for legal reasons and may actually meet infrequently (e.g., IRB). The purpose of committees is listed in the new draft handbook.

ADJOURNED.

Hal Bertilson, Faculty Senate Secretary