Task Force on Shared Governance
Minutes
February 2, 2015

Attendees: Denise Bruesewitz, Paul Greenwood, Adam Howard, Lori Kletzer, Sandy Maisel, Bruce Maxwell, Andy McGadney, Stewart Stokes and Winifred Tate

Chair Maisel opened the meeting at 10:12am

Sandy reviewed/summarized our charts regarding areas of faculty responsibility, areas with some combination of faculty responsibility or potential responsibility and areas that faculty have primary authority or influence/control at other institutions.

Sandy shared a plan for today’s meeting, which included a discussion of the vertical structures for the board of trustees, and faculty meetings.

Trustee Meetings
There was discussion about the role of faculty reps on the board and the need for enhanced communication structures. Comments of concern regarding the past and current role of the faculty reps were shared. It was suggested that the primary purpose of the role should be to provide strategic advice and counsel, from a faculty perspective, on topics of importance during trustee discussions. It is important to ensure that both faculty and trustee interaction follows governance best practices. Examples of faculty rep interaction with trustees at other institutions were also shared.

There was support of the Committee on Mission and Priorities and the faculty rep structure.

An explanation of the Consent Agenda was provided: the consent agenda is basically for items that have been more thoroughly vetted in committee.

Faculty Meeting
Members of the TFOSG questioned, with some concern, how faculty meetings have been run in recent years. Paul Greenwood reported that the faculty meeting agenda (aside from the Reports of College Officers) has been completely up to the faculty. Paul asked for suggestions and the organization of the agenda was based upon timing and the needs for the items to be brought forward for discussion. There were moments where questions would come from the floor. In general, the faculty meeting structure has been relatively the same over the years.

A suggestion was brought forward around committee chairs providing reports during the meeting and allowing all minutes to be posted. It was noted that published minutes are not always the most effective way to get new information to the entire faculty.
Conversations ensued about the roles of faculty with different departments (ex: admissions, physical plant, student affairs). Committee members are interested in various aspects of the departments but not wanting the responsibility for all aspects.

Questions around the structure of our faculty meetings, who should moderate the meeting and ultimately what is the purpose of the meetings was discussed.

We touched upon the role of divisional chairs and program chairs.

**Additional Items/Points for consideration:**

- The Bowen/Tobin books on governance were distributed at this meeting
- A final recommendation from TFOSG should be to define the role of the faculty rep to the board of trustees
- It was reiterated that there is some value in changing all of the names of the committees
- Faculty expectations were addressed: You must serve when asked – should that be a requirement?
- Consensus around the idea of a faculty chair to lead/moderate faculty meetings
- Perhaps a cultural change is needed, where smaller group discussions and/or break-out sessions when discussing topics of importance are more of the norm vs. the exception
- Example of a well working group was shared – Chairs and Directors meeting – how could we take some of that flavor and move to the faculty meeting?

**Action Items:**

- Formalize a meeting with the president, provost and secretary of the college with the faculty reps prior to each meeting of the board