I. Proposal for an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee to Study and Make Recommendations on the Structure of Academic Governance

**Task:** Reexamination of the current committee structure of academic governance. Consideration of the establishment of an executive committee with very broad power and of a new structure for University-level standing committees of governance. Recommendation of changes by bylaws necessary to implement any changes.

**Problem:** Faculty members are properly fully occupied with teaching and research responsibilities. Service activities are given a low priority, and university level service is given a lower priority than college and departmental service obligations. While faculty do take initiative at the university level, the task of administering the faculty functions has fallen upon administrators who often are not properly qualified to perform these functions. When faculty take initiative, their efforts frequently are uncoordinated. Multiple university committees, for example, might spend considerable time addressing the same or related issues without knowing of the others’ activities. Furthermore, the diversity of faculty opinion makes it difficult to achieve consensus without some central organ that communicated with all stakeholder, actively gathers opinion, helps with negotiation, and works toward agreement (FV, 3). As long as faculty participation in academic governance at the university level remains essentially a relatively low-priority voluntary activity and unless a way is found to help faculty become better informed and to come to agreement on choices under their jurisdiction, faculty members are likely to continue to feel disenfranchised and frustrated, and MSU will be deprived of optimal decision making (FV, 3).


**Background:** There are three broad changes proposed by the Faculty Voice Report. The Working Group of Executive Council suggests that these should be assigned to subcommittees of the Task 1 committee and should proceed through Faculty Council and Academic Council in the following order:

A. **Improvements and streamlining of the committee structure of academic governance,**
B. **A reexamination of the roles and relationships between Academic Council, Faculty Council, and Academic Senate,**
C. **The formation of a Faculty Executive Committee.**
A. Improvements and streamlining of the committee structure of academic governance.

The Faculty Voice Committee suggests several changes to committee structure:

1. The merging of the University Committee on Academic Policy and the University Committee on Curriculum to form the University Committee on Undergraduate Policy and Curriculum, perhaps with two subcommittees. This new committee, as a whole, would consider changes to undergraduate academic programs. Changes to graduate programs would remain the responsibility of the University Graduate Council, renamed the University Committee on Graduate Academic Policy and Curriculum (FV, 21-22),

2. The merging of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs and the University Committee on Faculty Tenure to form the University Committee on Faculty Tenure and Personnel Policy. This new committee would have a special responsibility to the needs of fixed-term faculty (FV, 23),

3. The expansion of the role of the Budget Subcommittee of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs to advise on the APP&R process (FV, 23),

4. The establishment of a University Committee on Academic Integrity (FV, 23),

5. Redesign of the selection process for ad hoc faculty committees, placing it within academic governance (FV, 23-24),

6. Regularizing of college-level governance so that all colleges have committees on budget and planning, faculty personnel policy, and academic policy and curriculum (FV, 24).

B. A reexamination of the roles and relationships between Academic Council, Faculty Council, and Academic Senate.

The Faculty Voice Committee recommends the broadening of powers for Faculty Council and Academic Senate, but is not specific in its recommendations (FV, 15).

C. The formation of a Faculty Executive Committee.

The Faculty Voice Committee states that the formation of a new Faculty Executive Committee is its most important recommendation, and should precede other implementations. The Faculty Executive Committee would be responsible for energizing and steering faculty involvement in academic governance, but is also
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given great powers to recommend bylaw changes, develop election slates, oversee
evaluation of academic administrators and academic programs, and act as liaisons to
the Board of Trustees. It would have an ex-officio representation on all standing
committees of academic governance, and work closely with the College Advisory
Committees, GOS, ASMSU, and administrative personnel. It would act as the public
relations organ of faculty governance. Consideration of whether an FEC is necessary,
valuable, and viable must precede a discussion of any bylaws changes.

Impact on current government structure:

1. FEC would take over ECAC's role in determining agendas for Faculty Council
and preside over its meetings. Currently, the ECAC has the following powers that
would be eliminated: 1) it can, in a meeting presided over by the President, act on
behalf of Faculty Council if an urgent action is needed, and it sets the Faculty
Council and Academic Senate agendas,

2. The University Committee on Academic Governance, which determines
election slates and recommends bylaw amendments, would be absorbed by FEC,

3. A new standing committee of Faculty Council would be formed to develop the
election slate of FEC members and periodically review their performance,

4. Each standing committee of academic governance would have an ex-officio
FEC member.

It should be noted that the Voice Committee focused solely on faculty governance. Yet
their recommendations for reorganization leave two critical issues unresolved. How
should the Academic Council be reorganized, if at all, to accommodate the new
structures? And how should faculty governance articulate with graduate and
undergraduate student government? The Faculty Voice Report was addressed to the
Faculty Council. These broader issues need to be taken up by the Academic Council.

The Faculty Council directs ECAC to form the slate for the task for
with the following composition and charges:

Task Force Composition: The task force will be composed of fifteen faculty from a
ballot of twenty-one tenure-stream faculty developed by ECAC. Three undergraduate
students, three graduate students, three administrators, and one Board of Trustees
member or designee will also be seated. Undergraduate student liaisons will be selected
by the Academic Assembly of ASMSU, graduate student liaisons by COGS,
administrative liaisons by the President or Provost, and the Board of Trustees liaison by
the Board of Trustees. The task force will determine its own voting rights.
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**Task Force Charges:**

**A. Improvements and streamlining of the committee structure of academic governance.**

1. Examine other successful institutional models of standing committee functions and resultant structure, identify “best practices,” and assess applicability to MSU’s own model.

2. Consult with current and former standing committee chairs and leaders in academic governance to identify roles and functions of the standing committees. Inquire into the strengths and weaknesses of the current committee structure and solicit opinion concerning the appropriateness of alternative designs.

3. Review and assess our experience with ad hoc committees, including how their members are selected.

4. Inquire into alternative ways for University governance committees to coordinate and communicate with College-level governance committees.

5. Review and evaluate specific cases in which decisions were made or not made in order to shed light on problems and areas where improvements should be made.

**B. A reexamination of the roles and relationships between Academic Council, Faculty Council, and Academic Senate.**

1. Assess the interrelationships between the Academic Council, the Faculty Council, and the Academic Senate, paying particular attention to redundancies and gaps in decision-making rights and responsibilities.

2. Assess the adequacy with which the Academic Senate and the Faculty Council accurately compile and represent faculty interests and opinions.

3. Assess the adequacy with which the Faculty Council and the Academic Council address important issues, paying particular attention to their decision making processes and procedures.

4. Assess the procedures by which action items are proposed and voted upon.

5. Consider roles and responsibilities of each body, and assess whether the balance of powers and duties can be improved to encourage increased faculty participation while retaining the inclusive sense of the MSU academic governance system. In particular consider ways to increase the linkage between members of Faculty Council and their constituents.

6. Consider whether these bodies need to be renamed.
7. Examine whether the current leadership of these bodies needs revision.

C. The formation of a Faculty Executive Committee.

1. Recommend any changes in the executive function of faculty governance, considering the addition of a Faculty Executive Committee. Of particular, but not exclusive concern, should be the following:

   • The rapidity with which different types of decisions need to be made,
   
   • The types of decisions that require extended faculty input versus those that can be made by a faculty executive function,
   
   • The ability of the executive function to acquire and process relevant information,
   
   • The ability of the executive function to facilitate faculty consensus,
   
   • The ability of the executive function to reliably represent faculty opinion to the administration, students, and the Board of Trustees,
   
   • The perceived legitimacy of the executive function and its ability to communicate with both the Faculty Council and to the faculty-at-large,
   
   • The ability of the executive function to attract capable and committed individuals,
   
   • The ability of the executive function to administer the program and administrator evaluation activities being considered by other task forces.

2. The taskforce should recommend implementation procedures and, if necessary, recommend means for funding the implementation and ongoing administration of the academic governance system at MSU.

The task force will return a preliminary report of its findings to Faculty Council in Spring 2006 and make its final recommendations, including action items, to Faculty Council at its October 2006 meeting. Faculty Council is expected to vote on whether the recommendations should go forward to Academic Council.
II.
Proposal for an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee to Study and Make Recommendations Concerning Regular Faculty Reviews of Administrators

Task: Respond to The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voice Report recommending that the Faculty Council empanel a taskforce to design a system for regular faculty reviews of administrators.

Problem: Suboptimal levels of faculty participation in the evaluation of administrators, and a lack of transparency in the evaluations that occur at MSU.

Background: The quality of administrator-faculty relationships is a critical success factor for both administrators and faculty, and faculty are in the best position to evaluate the quality of their relationships with administrative personnel. Currently only unit chairs/directors and deans are evaluated by the faculty on a regular basis. These evaluations are scheduled on a 5-year basis and the results are not always fully disseminated.

The Faculty Council directs ECAC to form the slate for the task force with the following composition and charges:

Task Force Composition: The task force will be composed of five faculty from a ballot of seven tenure-stream faculty developed by ECAC. One undergraduate student, one graduate student, one administrator, and one Board of Trustees member or designee will also be seated. The undergraduate student liaison will be selected by the Academic Assembly of ASMSU, the graduate student liaison by COGS, the administrative liaison by the President or Provost, and the Board of Trustees liaison by the Board of Trustees. The task force will determine its own voting rights.

Task Force Charges:

1. Review the existing literature on faculty evaluation of administrators (e.g., at the University of Michigan and the University of Tennessee) and current developmental activities at Michigan State University (Suggested resources: Prof. Fred Morgeson and Kris Hynes).

2. Review existing administrator evaluation practices at Michigan State to assess their conformity to existing requirements and to determine where a faculty-led assessment program might provide a useful contribution.
3. Recommend a system of administrator evaluation to be used by the faculty. The recommendations should include but not necessarily be limited to:

- What administrators (based on position) should be evaluated and how often,
- Identification of the group to conduct the evaluation and the faculty whose opinions should be solicited,
- The method(s) and general content of evaluations,
- The general content of the evaluations, particularly as they address the problems of faculty power, faculty participation, and transparency,
- Specification of what should be done with the completed evaluations and the appropriate degree of transparency, including coordinating with existing assessment activities and disseminating results either directly to faculty or indirectly through their representatives in governance.

4. Recommend implementation procedures and, if necessary, recommend means for funding the implementation and ongoing administration of the evaluation system.

The intention of the Council is to develop a system that will provide relevant administrators with constructive feedback on their performance as it impacts the faculty. It should also be a tool for identifying problems that need to be addressed. In developing this recommendation it is possible that some publishable information will be developed. The taskforce is encouraged to be supportive of such publication, but their main focus should be on producing the requested recommendations on a timely basis. Also, it is possible that an overall system of evaluating administrators used by all constituent groups may be developed. The task force should be aware of any such efforts and coordinate with other evaluating entities where possible.

The task force will return its recommendations, including action items, to Faculty Council by March 2006.
III.
Proposal for an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee to Study and Make Recommendations Concerning Regular Program Reviews

Task: Respond to The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voice Report recommending that the Faculty Council empanel a taskforce to design a system for regular program reviews.

Problem: A suboptimal distribution of power between administrators and faculty, inadequate levels of faculty participation in decision-making, and a lack of transparency of decision making at MSU. Faculty-based program reviews have the potential to provide a credible means for generating faculty input to budgetary decisions that require discrimination among different MSU programs.

Background: Many faculty feel that, rather than increasing faculty-administrative cooperation and mutual problem solving, previous budget shortfalls and subsequent budget reductions have led to faculty-administrator confrontations uninformed by serious systematic broad-based faculty input concerning relative program quality and potential.

The Faculty Council directs ECAC to form the slate for the task force with the following composition and charges:

Task Force Composition: The task force will be composed of five faculty from a ballot of seven tenure-stream faculty developed by ECAC. One undergraduate student, one graduate student, one administrator, and one Board of Trustees member or designee will also be seated. The undergraduate student liaison will be selected by the Academic Assembly of ASMSU, the graduate student liaison by COGS, the administrative liaison by the President or Provost, and the Board of Trustees liaison by the Board of Trustees. The task force will determine its own voting rights.

Task Force Charges:

1. Review the existing literature on program evaluation and study faculty-based program evaluation activities at other universities (e.g., The University of Colorado).
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2. Review existing program evaluation practices at Michigan State to determine whether systematic faculty-based program evaluations might contribute to the timeliness and quality of program reviews and subsequent budget allocation and program development decisions

3. Determine whether such evaluations should be separate or subsumed under a broader evaluation program under combined faculty, administrative and student auspices

4. Specify and recommend a program evaluation system. The specifications should consider, but not necessarily be limited to:

- A determination of what constitutes an academic program,
- How critical success factors would be identified and how these factors might vary across academic programs with different missions,
- Methodologies for measuring program performance in terms of these success factors and how methodologies might vary across academic programs with different missions,
- Procedures for implementing these methodologies,
- A determination of where the need for program review is greatest, especially where existing review procedures are inadequate,
- How faculty-based academic program reviews can be integrated with existing evaluation activities to complement them and minimize redundancies,
- The appropriate frequency of program review and circumstances that might require accelerated versus regular on-going evaluation,
- How review committee members should be selected, including the appropriate combination of faculty, student, and administrative representatives, "insider" versus "outsider" members, etc.,
- How to best balance the need to provide program-specific feedback and generic evaluation sufficient to ensure comparability across programs,
- How to balance the need to provide evaluation information to students, administrators, and faculty while maintaining an appropriate level of confidentiality,
- How evaluations should weigh younger faculty members’ strengths and anticipate future demand for program activities,
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- How to integrate evaluations with implementation plans and with broader university planning,

- How to conduct follow-up evaluation to determine the adequacy of administrative and faculty responses to the identification of program deficits.

5. The taskforce should design reviews that serve multiple purposes (e.g., program curtailment or elimination, restructuring due to changes in the University mission or budgetary constraints, external accreditation, etc) and consider different evaluation features for each purpose.

The taskforce will return its recommendations, including action items, to Faculty Council by March 2006.
IV.

Proposal for an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee to Study and Make Recommendations Concerning Communication and Transparency of Governance

Task: Respond to The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voice Report recommending strengthening two-way communication effectiveness between academic governance and the faculty. Consider both changes to the culture of governance and the deployment of modern electronic means to support information dissemination (particularly to enhance the transparency of governance), consensus formation, and voting.

Problem: The core problem underlying the Faculty Voice final report is that faculty feel alienated from governance. Part of the alienation is traceable to faculty not having easy access to the topics and proceedings of governance in condensed and time effective form. Part of the alienation is traceable to faculty feeling that their opinions and positions will not be factored into decisions made in governance. And, part of the alienation is traceable to faculty feeling that major decisions of the University are made without input from governance. (Final Report, Faculty Voice Committee, pages 15, 20, 25, 27, 28, and relevant recommendation on page 30.)

Background: The Faculty Voice final report points to two broad shortcomings of communication methods used in governance. First, the practices of governance do not link governance representatives to faculty constituents. For example, a member of Faculty Council does not have a precinct-like link to an identified group of constituents. Second, the Faculty Voice final report also points to a lack of leveraging communication methods to inform and engage faculty. Such methods range from a regular column in the MSU News Bulletin devoted to governance, to effective use of email and web sites, to streaming video for major proceedings of governance, and even to electronic voting.

The Faculty Council directs ECAC to form the slate for the task for with the following composition and charges:

Task Force Composition: The task force will be composed of five faculty from a ballot of seven tenure-stream faculty developed by ECAC. One undergraduate student, one graduate student, one administrator, and one Board of Trustees member or designee will also be seated. The undergraduate student liaison will be selected by the Academic Assembly of ASMSU, the graduate student liaison by COGS, the administrative liaison by the President or Provost, and the Board of Trustees liaison by the Board of Trustees. The task force will determine its own voting rights.
Task Force Charges:

1. Review the existing literature about, and practice in governance systems of like universities concerning the methods of communication, particularly noting any and all electronic and print media means. Develop a set of recommendations that are explicit while focusing on specific functions to be met so as to leave room for future growth and for implementation choices.

Electronic and print means shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- E-mail,
- Listservs,
- Angel (or Angel-like) groups,
- Web sites,
- Streaming video (archived and/or live) for major meetings (Senate, Academic Council, Faculty Council, Executive Committee),
- Means and methods for electronic voting,
- Campus and other TV, radio, and print media (for MSU: WKAR, WDBM, possibly student TV or radio outlets, and campus print media).

The detailed review should not be a listing of technical “devices” but rather be a functional enumeration of what each type of communication offers.

2. Review the existing literature about, and practice in governance systems of like universities concerning methods of linking faculty representatives to their constituents. Develop a set of concrete proposals appropriate for the MSU environment.

3. Review the existing literature about, and practice in governance systems of like universities concerning methods of communication across tiers in multi-tier governance systems (e.g., university level, college level, department level). Develop a set of concrete proposals appropriate for the MSU environment.

The task force will return its recommendations, including action items, to Faculty Council by March 2006.
V.
Proposal for an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee to Study and Make Recommendations Concerning Fixed-term Faculty

Task: Consider the appropriate role for Fixed-term Faculty to participate in academic governance; recommend any By-Laws changes needed to enable recommendations; disseminate monitoring systems to implement recommendations.

Problem: What rights should Fixed-term Faculty be accorded to participate in governance? Or, framed another way, “What is the definition of faculty for purposes of expanding the “faculty voice”?

Background: This is a contentious issue across MSU. There are many competing values surrounding the rights and responsibilities of fixed-term faculty. There are clearly several classes of faculty, Tenure-system Faculty and Fixed-term Faculty. In addition, Specialists often perform faculty roles. In addressing the problem, a Task Force on Fixed-term Faculty must come to terms with at least the following tensions:

- The heterogeneity of needs and practices among diverse units of the University,
- The need for some common principles that apply across all units and at the all-University governance level,
- The need for fairness, to afford Fixed-term Faculty rights consistent with their roles within the university and within their Units,
- The desirability of maximizing the participation of all qualified faculty in the governance process

The Faculty Voice Committee has taken the faculty to be “all tenure-system faculty and, to the extent they perform the same functions, those in Fixed-term Faculty positions.” The committee recommended that to the extent that Fixed-term Faculty performed the same functions as Tenure-system Faculty, they ought to be included in the governance processes. As a result the following recommendation was made: “Fixed-term faculty . . . will be subject to two matters of great concern with regard to faculty voice:

- guarantees of academic freedom,
- participation in academic governance.

We, therefore, propose that whatever university bodies take up the question of Fixed-term versus Tenure-system Faculty numbers and roles must forthrightly address these two
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concerns, and do so in a way that maximizes appropriate protections of academic freedom and participation in academic governance for all faculty (FV, 3, 8-14).

The Voice committee took the position that individual colleges ought to determine the level of participation in governance at the Unit level. To guide deliberation, the Faculty Voice Committee recommends that the closer the teaching and/or research roles assigned to fixed-term faculty equates to traditional tenure-stream faculty roles, the stronger the presumption that Fixed-term Faculty in that Unit should receive academic freedom protections and rights of participation in academic governance equivalent to those accorded to Tenure-system Faculty.

The Faculty Council directs ECAC to form the slate for the task for with the following composition and charges:

Task Force Composition: The task force will be composed of five faculty elected by Faculty Council from a ballot of seven tenure stream faculty developed by ECAC, and two fixed term faculty elected by Faculty Council from a ballot of four prepared by ECAC. One undergraduate student, one graduate student, one administrator, and on Board of Trustees member or designee will also be seated. The undergraduate student liaison will be selected by the Academic Assembly of ASMSU, the graduate student liaison by COGS, the administrative liaison by the President or Provost, and the Board of Trustees liaison by the Board of Trustees. The task force will determine its own voting rights.

Task Force Charge:

The Fixed-term Faculty Task Force should address the problem of rights and responsibilities of Fixed-term Faculty in academic governance. We recommend the following steps:

1. Review the current literature on roles and responsibilities of Fixed-term Faculty (FV, 13),

2. Review the University level governance system to comprehensively identify the current level of participation of Fixed-term Faculty and Specialists at the University level and at the Unit level. (This includes voting rights, and how they are counted in determining Unit representation.),

3. Review the Voice principles regarding academic freedom and participation, decide if they agree on the principles, and recommend changes in University level voting opportunities for Fixed-term Faculty and Specialists.

4. Propose a set of guiding principles to recommend to Units in implementing the principles at the Unit level.
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5. Review rights of Fixed-term Faculty and specialists, taking into account both existing University By-Laws and practices, and those followed at other universities; elaborate plans for dissemination of the report.

The task force will return its recommendations, including action items, to Faculty Council by March 2006.