The meeting began at 4:00 p.m. with full quorum.

Approval of Agenda:
The agenda was amended to allow Professor Beck to provide commentary on process upon his arrival. Professor Potchen noted that Professor Beck is a process consultant who met with ECAC. ECAC found the information helpful and asked Professor Beck to meet with Faculty Council. The agenda was approved as amended.

Faculty Voice Task Force 1 Report: Section III – Proposed Steering Committee:
Professor Bice explained she wished to propose an amendment to the main motion, the “yellow sheets”, to delete lines 20 and 21 and insert “The TSC shall be composed of 5 faculty elected at-large plus the chairpersons of all of the standing committees” and to delete the related lines 69 to 73. The amendment was supported. The rationale for the amendment was that being a chairperson of a standing committee and a member of ECAC/TSC enhanced the role of the committee chairperson. The faculty who chairs the standing committee is the best person to be on the TSC as opposed to having a faculty from the TSC sit as a liaison to a standing committee. For example, most of the work in UCC is done in the subcommittees so a TSC member would have to sit in on five meetings a month to fully understand. Professor Teehan spoke in disfavor of this amendment noting there are new members that are not fully informed of the Task Force 1 report. Another presentation of the Task Force 1 report was strongly suggested to acquaint everyone with the recommendations before making changes. A member spoke in favor of the amendment noting there have been many discussions last year and this year and that UCFA supports the amendment. Professor Tims, an at-large member of ECAC, spoke in favor of the amendment commenting on the input and expertise of the standing
committee chairpersons. There was further discussion in support of the amendment. Professor Teehan suggested finding out from Task Force 1 members the reason for the suggested change. The question was called and passed. The proposed amendment passed.

**Discussion was stopped to go to the agenda item on Professor Beck’s commentary.**

**Commentary on Process:**
Professor John Beck, from the School of Labor and Industrial Relations, reported he had been invited to ECAC and requested to work with a small group to try to look at the notion of how do you get decision making done and move processes forward without bogging down. Professor Beck was invited to come to Faculty Council to share information on process that could be helpful.

Many times large groups will use Robert’s Rules of Order. The issue at any given time is whether the Rules get in the way of actually transpiring business. You can have different alternatives to facilitate meetings for the purpose of discussion without talking about the minutia moving to the large. Robert’s Rules of Order is often like building a wedding cake with the largest motion being on the bottom and all of the subsidiary motions are on top. What happens in groups is that the top layers have to be cleared before you can get to the bottom layer. This can frustrate any movement on the order of the day due to the minutia of the small amendments. There are different kinds of processes where you attempt to build consensus without necessarily moving into the minutia of each individual motion tying up the process. Professor Beck had suggested, to ECAC and the small group that met with him, that meetings can be designed to actually allow a decision as to how to clear out the order of business. Professor Beck noted that many times people get frustrated with organizations that have used Robert’s Rules of Order because it means they sit in meetings misunderstanding what the question is to be decided. There are a variety of ways to design for participation and design for decision making. It is a question of looking at agendas and designing the process necessary to get the business done.

Professor Floyd commented that it seemed not to be parliamentary procedure itself but rather when parliamentary procedure seems to have been deployed in order to obfuscate the issues. Professor Floyd noted that the full faculty should have an open discussion of the Task Force 1 Report, pros and cons. Academic Governance has had the same system for 20 years and it is Professor Floyd’s opinion it has ceased to function. Professor Beck noted he could not respond to the specific points but to the spirit of what was raised. Meetings can be designed in a way to make sure that an open airing of things happen, designed to hear points for and against and designed in such a way to maximize participation without repetition. Ground rules need to be in place that allow multiple voices, rules that are in place to make sure people are respectful and ground rules in place that try to build a conversation and dialogue rather than to cut it off.

Professor Beck was asked to talk about how processes work and he indicated that it depends on what kind of process is desired and what kind of decision making process the group wants to design. A Council member noted that sometimes the process is just as important as the outcome and that Roberts’ Rules of Order is not the problem and urged the members to continue. Professor Beck spoke in favor of design, looking at the set of questions then look at the best way
of moving forward on the agenda. Professor Morash noted that ECAC very much wants to get
the Task Force 1 recommendations before the body and stressed that there are no efforts to not
allow this to go forward and debated. Professor Morash also summarized Council’s action that a
vote had been taken and that Council does want to make changes in governance and also want to
consider the Steering Committee. Professor Morash added that a motion was debated and a vote
was taken today, noting we are moving finally. Another member commented that Council does
not follow any process to its conclusion and seems to get caught up in minutia. Professor Beck
responded that there should be things that are consistent, for example the emphasis is on
weighing the discussion points around the consequences. Professor Beck appears to favor
getting the sense of the body motion in order to have a sense of where the group is going and
determine the goal followed by the step to design the pieces in play.

Following Professor Beck’s commentary, Provost Wilcox directed the Council to the
continuation of the discussion On Task Force 1 Report. Professor Bice commented that the
amendment to the “Yellow Pages” presented earlier in the meeting was written before this
meeting without discussion with anyone. Professor Bice wanted to assure Council members this
was her decision. Professor Rosser commented that last year in Faculty Council there were
formal presentations on Task Force 1 given and there were many discussions open to other than
Council members to express their views. Professor Rosser noted that there was perhaps the
strongest discussion in open debate that he has observed. As a member of Faculty Council in
2003, Professor Rosser noted Faculty Council had few if any meetings and now since he has
returned he sees an active Council. Provost Wilcox noted the time. Professor McCormick asked
members to submit proposed amendments/motions ahead of meetings and that they be
distributed. Another member also asked those making amendments and motions to indicate
resulting effects/ripples.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Wright
Secretary for Academic Governance