Faculty Council Colleagues:

We begin discussion and deliberation at our meeting on 13 February of the report and recommendations of Faculty Voice Task Force 1: Structure of Academic Governance. This topic will occupy much of the effort of Faculty Council through the Spring Term, 2007. It is essential that members of Faculty Council read and digest the final report of Task Force 1, and other material that will come from the Faculty Voice Implementation Committee (VIC) that summarizes the core recommendations. Further, it is the responsibility of each Faculty Council member to arrange and promote discussion and feedback within the college of the member. The task on which we embark is core; for the process to succeed, we
must engage the entire university community, and we must reach a broad consensus that will form the basis for structural change in our system.

The VIC has organized the effort for Faculty Council around three topics which mirrors the organization of the final report of Task Force 1, and the recommendations contained therein:

1. proposed central governance bodies,
2. proposed university standing committee structure,
3. proposed top level executive.

The process begins with the 13 February meeting of Faculty Council. At this meeting, the Council will discuss the recommendations of Task Force 1 with respect to proposed central governance bodies. The meeting of 13 February will include discussion and deliberation only. At the following meeting of Faculty Council (13 March), Council will continue the discussion, and the proposals of TF1 on proposed central governance bodies will come for vote.

The final report and recommendations of Faculty Voice Task Force 1 is available on the home page of Academic Governance:

http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov

The parts of the current bylaws of Academic Governance that relates to the central governance bodies of governance are Section 3.1 (Academic Senate)

http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/bylaws/section3/full.html#3_1

and Section 3.2 (Academic Council)

http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/bylaws/section3/full.html#3_2

Section 3.2 also includes the bylaw description of Faculty Council.

The Faculty Voice Implementation Committee (VIC) has analyzed the TF1 proposals for central governance bodies, and has produced the summary and comparison, and discussion questions that are below. Material following is not meant to replace your reading of and thought about the final report of TF1. It is meant to help move the discussion and deliberation of Faculty Council forward.
**Terminology**

The current system includes three central governance bodies: Faculty Council, Academic Council, and Academic Senate. The reorganization proposed by TF1 also includes three central governance bodies: Faculty Senate, University Council, and Academic Assembly.

The three bodies proposed are intended to take the existing bodies as a starting point for discussion where the linkage would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Structure</th>
<th>Proposed Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Faculty Council</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Academic Council</td>
<td>University Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Academic Senate</td>
<td>Academic Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major differences: TF #1 Proposals and the Current Governance Bodies**

The major differences between the current governance structures and the structures as proposed by TF #1 are as follows:

1) **Academic Senate (current structure) VS. Academic Assembly (proposed structure)**

   (a) Currently Senate can only (i) endorse actions (proposals) of Faculty Council or Academic Council that are explicitly referred by those bodies OR (ii) refer the item back to the originating Council. There is a second mechanism that can bring items to Senate as well per current bylaws: referral to Senate by a petition process.

   In the proposal of TF#1, the wording in TF #1 proposals is ambiguous as to whether (i) the limitation on Academic Assembly to only
“consider favorably on referral” or “refer back” would remain – OR
(b) if Academic Assembly could replace/amend actions from the lower bodies.

(b) Currently chaired by the President, the proposed Chair for the Academic Assembly is the Chair of the executive committee

2) Academic Council (current structure) VS. University Council (proposed structure)

(a) In the report of TF #1, a distinction is made between “academic issues” (which are to be the sole province of the Faculty for decision making in the Faculty Senate) and “university issues” (which are the province of all in the University Council)

(b) Currently the University Curriculum Committee reports to Academic Council. In the TF#1 proposal, the analogous university-level committee on the curriculum would report to Faculty Senate.

(c) Currently chaired by the President, the proposed Chair of the University Council is the Provost

3) Faculty Council (current structure) VS. Faculty Senate (proposed structure)

(a) A major emphasis for TF #1 was revamping the role of the current Faculty Council. The core ingredients were meant to better engage the Faculty, and to create a body that would be a better communication vehicle from governance to the Faculty, and a better conduit by which concerns of the Faculty could be voiced.

(b) Currently Faculty Council is one of four subgroups of Academic Council (from MSU Faculty Handbook, page 8, Feb 02). Although the TF#1 report does not explicitly address the issue of the relationship of Faculty Senate and University Council, under the proposed reorganization, Faculty Senate would have autonomy of action; in
particular, decisions taken by Faculty Senate on “academic issues” would not be reviewable by University Council.

(c) Faculty Council is directly charged with matters narrowly associated with the Faculty (tenure, salary, benefits) and receives reports from the associated standing committees WHILE Faculty Senate concerns will be expanded to include all items directly concerning the “academic program” (curriculum and programs).

(d) Specially, currently the University Curriculum Committee reports to Academic Council. In the TF#1 proposal, the analogous university-level committee on the curriculum would report to Faculty Senate.

(e) Currently chaired by the President, the proposed Chair of the Faculty Senate is the Chair of the executive committee.
The following list is a starting point for discussion.

Issues for Discussion

A. If the President does not serve as the Chair of at least one of the large, central bodies, will there be a loss of integration of administration views? Which of the three central bodies might it still be important to have the President serve as Chair?

B. Is the establishment of the faculty-only body (Faculty Senate) best built around the premise that it should be charged with all aspects of the academic program without voting voice of students or administrators?

C. If Faculty Senate and University Council are to be co-equal, with defined, largely non-overlapping functions, then how can the views of students and administrators be effectively factored into discussion in Faculty Senate? (The reverse issue is not a problem since all members of Faculty Senate will automatically be members of University Council.)

How can this reestablishment of Faculty prerogatives be consistent with the path of increasing inclusiveness – a path that has characterized MSU academic governance?

D. Is a committee of the whole necessary for Faculty? (Is Academic Assembly needed?) If it has a valid purpose, then should that purpose be exercised at regular intervals (every year, biannually, …) or only when “needed?”

E. Is a quorum of 10% appropriate for Academic Assembly? This is particularly important to examine IF Academic Assembly is given the power to consider and possibly overturn actions by all lower bodies of academic governance.

F. What is the definition of Academic Issues versus University Issues? (This is a key question regarding the separation of responsibilities between Faculty Senate and University Council.)