Faculty Task Force on Shared Governance
Minutes
February 9, 2015

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

Chair Maisel opened the meeting at 4:10am

The plan for this meeting was to review the suggested topics raised by members of the faculty after viewing our minutes and to begin a discussion about the Bowen and Tobin book.

Discussion ensued regarding the questions posed by various members of the campus community. The set of questions were far reaching, and many were outside of the charge of the TFOSG. The general consensus from the group was to acknowledge receipt of the questions and articulate our plan to address and consider them as our work continues.

Bowen & Tobin – Locus of Authority
The discussion began by reviewing the book’s comprehensive examination of the evolution of governance and faculty roles dating as far back as the 17th century. As the historical overview continued toward current day status, the authors highlighted challenges regarding the way governance practices are not effective in the rapid changing and competitive landscape of higher education.

The second half of the book highlighted four case studies that stimulated discussion among the members of the TFOSG. There was some discussion around the outcomes of the Kelley Committee at Princeton and the subsequent response from the board, in their Statement of Policy on Delegation of Authority. The statement highlighted the various aspects of authority: for curricular and academic procedures trustees delegated authority to the president and the Faculty; for admissions responsibility was held by the president & administration pursuant to policies determined by the faculty; for student life and discipline oversight was delegated to the President and Faculty but exercised through various faculty and student groups. Comments were shared about the similarities and differences to our current structure. We also reviewed the experience at Macalester College, spending less time on Berkeley and CCNY, as those contexts seem further form ours.

Our attention returned to the discussion about areas of faculty responsibility, areas of primary authority or influence/control and areas in which faculty have less influence.

Key additions to the discussion were around expertise & democracy, which are relevant in the first two panels on the post-it notes. In many regards, faculty
members have specific opinions about various departmental areas and want those opinions heard and responded to but may not want the authority for decision-making.

Michael Burke pointed out that we have not dealt with the issues on the bottom of the left panel (faculty allocation, budget etc.). The budget reflects priorities so the logical question is whether or not the Committee on Missions and Priorities is the appropriate governing body to allow faculty input and decision making authority.

**Additional Items/Points for consideration:**
- Supportive comments for our faculty meeting to be chaired by someone other than the Provost or President
- The Princeton model has a good example of how the board acts first, faculty act 2nd
- The charge is to define the primary responsibility for faculty governance.
- What is the role for faculty in the budgeting process?

**Action Items:**
- Post the suggested topics raised by members of the faculty on our Google Drive
- Once minutes are approved, forward to Paul Greenwood for posting on the Provost's web page