The Faculty Council passed a motion to go to the Committee of the Whole with Provost Wilcox and Professor Weber as Co-Chairpersons appointed by the President. The focus of the discussion was the Task Force 1 Report and Recommendations regarding the Standing Committee structure.

The following points were expressed in the discussion:

- It was noted that there had been several comments at the last meeting on the combination of UCFT and UCFA INTO ONE COMMITTEE. There had also been comment on UCC and UCAP.
- A question was raised about a passage on Pg. 11 of the Report which says “The Steering Committee aims to address the business of the faculty by steering, organizing, referring to committees, etc.” The concern is to use an “etc.” in a document that is to be voted on by members. The roles to be played by this Steering Committee should be spelled out.
- A member of UCFA spoke of concerns of the merging of the Personnel functions of UCFA with the duties of UCFT. The concern is whether the functions are compatible and that perhaps the identity of the UCFT being lost in the structure proposed because the word tenure is not in the name of any of the committees. There is concern about taking the functions of personnel and merging with the tenure functions.
- A member of the Task Force noted that a member of UCFT who served on Task Force 1 said the Tenure Committee did not have enough to do.
- A current member of UCFT said that member was wrong.
- A second member of UCFT also verified that Task Force member was wrong. There was an understanding by UCFT that there was a check and balance by having both committees and by having another committee make decisions about faculty tenure were not the group setting policies.
- If the committees are not merged the functions of UCFT and UCFA need to be made clear, citing the example of the fixed term faculty and the overlap that occurred.
- A UCFT member noted that the issue of fixed term faculty was not the concern for UCFT whose function is tenure policy and not the numbers of tenure faculty and so it was proper that it went to UCFA.
- A question was raised as to whether the group was going to vote on any of the issues at this meeting?
- One of the Co Chairs responded that this was to be a continued discussion today.
- There is a consensus of the current UCFA that no one is in favor of merging the two committees, UCFA and UCFT.
- A member who had served on UCFA in the past noted that the Budget consumes a great deal of time and the Personnel activities are many, including insurance etc., and are important. The member would argue for giving some consideration for keeping Personnel separate and splitting from the Budget Committee.
- A member of UCFT noted that tenure is sufficiently important for a University to keep policy development and implementation as separate committees. The UCFT does have much to do and has a full agenda and stressed the committees should not be merged.
- The co-chair of UCFA reported the committee sees the advantage of keeping the Budget Subcommittee and the Personnel Subcommittee together because of the relationship between policy issues and budget issues. Issues are often related and this provides the opportunity for
the two groups to interact and discuss. There are advantages and disadvantages to separate Budget from Personnel.

- A question was raised as to what we are trying to achieve? Is it a time savings or a slimming down of committee work or are we trying to give the faculty a meaningful voice within the structure of governance? It is this member’s opinion that we are not addressing the driving force. We now have the opportunity to say this is the proper scope and sphere of authority and advisory role of governance of the faculty within the University. If we stick too much with the idea of slimming down and streamlining we will sacrifice faculty governance philosophy in favor of cutting out extra faculty meetings.

- A member spoke in favor of keeping the UCFA and UCFT separate and noted there are circumstances when two committees do have joint meetings to discuss an issue of mutual interest.

- A member spoke in favor of a separate Budget Committee. The budget is a critical issue faculty need to be more involved in and a separate committee would provide faculty to act more on their own.

- A member who chaired the Budget Subcommittee in the past noted that it is related to the Personnel Subcommittee and the two groups need to consult and address the issues of both groups. Faculty have ample opportunity for input into the budget process.

- Support to keep the UCFT and UCFA was expressed by another member in order to assure that tenure is handled properly. In terms of Budget and Personnel Subcommittees, both subcommittees have intense times; however, there are positives for the two groups to work together. Each group takes their work to the other subcommittee which does provide more input and balance and serves the University community well.

- There was agreement with the fact that it is important for the two Subcommittees to interact.

- One of the points not discussed is that Task Force 1 changed the reporting structure for both the recommended Policy and Tenure Committee and UCC which would report to Faculty Council, which then would go to the Board of Trustees. The intent of the recommendation was to increase faculty voice on issues regarding tenure and personnel which would not go to Academic Council.

- An issue that is often forgotten is that the Personnel Subcommittee deals with the co-pays for faculty in the overall budget, so having a separate committee might be an advantage.

- The issue of the recommended Undergraduate Committee perhaps has been misrepresented indicating UCAP was ending. This recommended committee does the primary functions of UCAP so there is an active group looking at undergraduate academic policy. The concern to think about is UCAP and UCC, or the recommended UUC and UCC, act as the policy implementation piece. The difference is that they report to two different bodies and we need to think about the implications because a number of proposals have not just addressed academic policy or just curriculum, they are tied together. Complications could arise if the policy group is reporting to one group and curriculum is reporting to another group and there is no coordination. For example, Programs frequently ask that certain prerequisites be established for limited enrollment programs which has implications for undergraduate education and to discuss separately would be problematic.

The Committee of the Whole adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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