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Summary

Task Force 1 concurs with the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voice’s diagnosis of the dysfunction generated by MSU’s current structures of academic governance. Without reiterating the details of the diagnosis, Task Force 1 moves toward implementation of the essential goals of the Faculty Voice Committee report of April 22, 2005 (“Voice report”),\(^1\) in light of recommendations from the four other task forces.\(^2\) Mindful of the primary role of faculty in “curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process” (Appendix 1), Task Force 1 proposes a number of changes in current governance bodies, including their composition, functions, powers, leadership, and responsibilities to one another and their constituencies. Recommended name changes describe accurately the proposed bodies, and also signal a new era in which faculty are more informed, more engaged, and more responsible for good judgment in decisions taken within and in the name of the university. Recommendations of Task Force 1 include:

(1) Early, at-large election of The Steering Committee\(^3\) (TSC) by the Academic Senate, followed by the naming of its ex officio members. The Voice report identified TSC as “perhaps the Faculty Voice Committee’s single most important recommendation,” because it “will then become the leader for change that can facilitate and assist with the implementation of all the remaining recommendations that gain support of the ECAC, the Faculty Council, and the Academic Senate.”\(^4\)

(2) Replacement of the Executive Committee of Academic Council (ECAC) by TSC, though

---

\(^1\) See http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/documents/Voice_Committee_Final_Report%2004-22-05_.pdf
\(^2\) See http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/documents/TF2-5FinalRecommendationsforWeb2.pdf
\(^3\) Referred to in previous reports as the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC).
\(^4\) Voice report, p. 18.
not unilaterally: TSC is initially dedicated to shepherding the new governance structures into place, consulting with existing bodies to effect a smooth transition, including rewriting bylaws and refining recommendations so that difficulties might be anticipated and avoided.

(3) Replacement of Academic Council by a University Council of wider compass, chaired by the Provost.

(4) Replacement of Faculty Council by the Faculty Congress — a deliberative, representative, and legislative body.

(5) Authority vested in the University Council and Faculty Congress, not in TSC. Although TSC would be available to act in an executive capacity when necessary — when the university is not in session or when a matter is particularly time-sensitive — its primary responsibility would be to coordinate and refer business to committees, to set the agendas of the University Council and Faculty Congress, and to be the faculty’s liaison with the Board of Trustees, administration, and student groups.

(6) Each member of TSC serves *ex officio* on a standing committee, helping to ensure communication and coordination of effort.

(7) TSC chair elected from among the elected members of TSC by the Faculty Congress.

(8) Faculty Congress and Academic Senate chaired by TSC chair.

(9) Revision of the Athletic Council.

(10) Five standing committees and the Athletic Council report to the University Council.

(11) Two standing committees report to the Faculty Congress.
Diagram illustrating governance model

**ACADEMIC ASSEMBLY/SENATE**
(chaired by TSC chair)
- Chairs of all standing committees, elected College reps, TSC, others ex officio

**FACULTY CONGRESS**
(chaired by TSC chair)
- Elected College reps, TSC, others ex officio

**THE STEERING COMMITTEE**
(chaired by TSC chair)
- Chair elected by Faculty Congress, others ex officio

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL**
(chaired by the Provost)
- Administrative, COGS, and ASMSU reps, Faculty Congress, CAC chairs, and the deans

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**LEGEND**
- Refers matters to, member sits on ex officio
- Reports to, chair sits on Faculty Congress, University Council
- Sets agenda for
- Sends legislation to
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I. Proposed Central Governance Bodies

Task Force 1 examined the roles and relationships of Academic Council, Faculty Council, and Academic Senate, i.e., the bodies through which the faculty discharges some of its most important responsibilities to the university. Task Force 1 did not, however, examine all areas of university governance. Large areas of the Organizational Chart of Academic Governance are untouched by the group’s deliberations. To complete its task before the deadline of 1 October 2006 it was given at the initial meeting of Task Force 1, the group focused on faculty’s role in governance, and the proposals made here reflect that focus. Task Force 1 has not sought to disenfranchise others with whom the faculty shares governance but to improve faculty participation—to make faculty a better partner in governance. Consonant with the Voice report, Task Force 1 recommends eliminating some subsidiary bodies and reconfiguring the central ones. Such a streamlined system of governance is more effective and would significantly concentrate faculty participation in decision-making in a way that would be constructive for the university as a whole.

Faculty Congress

As the Faculty Voice Committee and others have recognized, the faculty ought to have a forum and governance structure in which faculty set the agenda for matters in which faculty have primary responsibility. Task Force 1 proposes the establishment of a central governing body whose voting members are exclusively faculty: the Faculty Congress. Others serving ex officio would advise and contribute other perspectives, but the decisions would rest with faculty. The Steering Committee (TSC) would set the agenda for the Faculty Congress, but would not act on its behalf except in rare circumstance (see §III). According to this proposed model, the Faculty Congress would be the deliberative, representative, and legislative body for faculty. It would make recommendations, provide advice, and speak for the faculty on issues raised in committees, issues brought to it by individual faculty, student representatives, College Advisory Councils, and administrators.

Membership. Representatives to the Faculty Congress would continue to be elected by direct ballot in each of the colleges. In addition, its membership would include TSC, and the chairs of the standing committees. Non-voting ex officio members would include representatives from the administration, ASMSU and COGS, and two faculty members of the Athletic Council, designated by the President. The Faculty Congress would be chaired by the chair of TSC.

Functions. Chief among the roles of the Faculty Congress are to act as an agent to im-

---

6 Minutes of Task Force 1, 12 January 2006.
7 The Faculty Congress is essentially a broader based Faculty Council, with functions adapted from Academic Council, as described in the current Bylaws for Academic Governance (3.2.1.1.1) and http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/faccoun.htm
8 The preferable name, consistent with bodies at other CIC institutions, would be Faculty Senate. See below at Academic Senate/Assembly, p. 6 with footnote 17.
prove academic and university quality; to respond to academic and university issues as an effective partner; to inform and to seek faculty input on major initiatives; to obtain and synthesize faculty opinions and recommendations on key issues affecting academics and faculty life; and to carry forward faculty initiatives to improve programs. This governance model emphasizes faculty initiative, not just response, aimed at improving academic and institutional quality generally. Effective communication between the Faculty Congress and its constituents, the full faculty, is crucial. Members of the Faculty Congress are charged to receive input and to communicate back to the faculty.\(^9\)

It is important to good decision-making that there be a robust effort to enable various sides of issues to be heard, and to allow time for reflection on the arguments presented, before taking formal votes. Acting through TSC, standing committees, and/or ad hoc committees, the Faculty Congress will determine whether and when issues should be brought to the full faculty for deliberation and vote. It should assess and determine issues of concern to the faculty that could require a university-wide meeting, discussion fora, referenda or faculty input through electronic or mail ballot. It would appoint faculty to ad hoc committees for specific initiatives (e.g., the recent Committee on College Reorganization in Arts and Letters, and the New Residential College Initiative) that include administrators and students as well; i.e., ad hoc committees would be brought within academic governance.\(^10\)

Two committees will report directly to the Faculty Congress: the University Committee on Faculty Policy and Tenure (UCFPT), and the University Committee on Curriculum (UCC). This arrangement is intended to promote active participation, meaningful work assignments, and increased responsiveness on issues pertinent to faculty.

**University Council**\(^11\)

University business is broader than, though it includes, academic business. Because Task Force 1 recommends that the deliberative and legislative body for university matters differ from the current Academic Council, its new name is appropriate. Chaired by the Provost, but with its agenda set by TSC, the University Council would bring together faculty representatives, student governance representatives, ASMSU and COGS, and the administration, including the deans. The University Council acts on matters brought before it by TSC. Five standing committees and the Athletic Council\(^12\) would report to the University Council: the University Committee on Academic Gov-

---

\(^9\) Task Force 4 has recommended a comprehensive communication process that is an important element for the success of this governance structure.


\(^11\) This is parallel to the current Academic Council, described in 3.2 of the Bylaws for Academic Governance: http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/bylaws/section3/full.html#3

\(^12\) One faculty member of the Athletic Council will serve ex officio on the UCB, and two ex officio in the Faculty Congress.
ernance (UCAG), the University Committee on the Budget (UCB), the University Committee on Student Affairs (UCSA), the University Undergraduate Committee (UUC), and the University Graduate Committee (UGC). A representative from the Office of the General Counsel would have an open invitation to attend.\textsuperscript{13}

**The Steering Committee (TSC)**

One of the key recommendations of the Faculty Voice Report and a continually reinforced theme in Task Force 1 discussions has been the need to create a single, elected, faculty-led committee that would increase the voice of the faculty at MSU by improving communication, coordination, and the flow of information among faculty, between the faculty and students, the faculty and the administration, and the faculty and the Board of Trustees.\textsuperscript{14} The composition of TSC is addressed at length in §III of this report.

**Academic Senate/Assembly**

The Academic Senate is identified in the current Bylaws for Academic Governance (3.1)\textsuperscript{15} as “regular faculty” (1.1.1.1). Task Force 5 has recommended that fixed-term faculty with a minimum of three years’ service be considered voting members of the senate.\textsuperscript{16} Whether this recommendation passes or not, Task Force 1 supports:

(a) a name change from Academic Senate to *Academic Assembly*. The term ‘assembly’ would be more appropriate, given the nature of the body and English usage, especially the terminology of higher education. If this name change is adopted, the way would be open to another change: Faculty Council would become *Faculty Senate* (instead of Faculty Congress). Other CIC institutions have Faculty Senates. Because Task Force 5 was charged with examining the MSU Academic Senate, Task Force 1 stopped short of making this name change a central recommendation.\textsuperscript{17}

(b) Irrespective of name change, Task Force 1 explicitly recommends the continuing existence of an assembly of faculty with strong relationships to other bodies: the Committee of the Whole faculty should continue to have all powers under the bylaws to call meetings by petition, and to override the decisions of the Faculty Congress or TSC. It can be called into session by the Faculty Congress and by TSC; its meetings shall be chaired by the chair of TSC; it is the body from which come candidates for Faculty Congress and TSC, and which elects both the Faculty Congress, by division, and TSC, at large; its participation in democratic governance should be enhanced by efforts to im-

\textsuperscript{13} Task Force 1 is not deliberately excluding anyone who currently serves, nor is it seeking to alter in any significant way the existing proportion of faculty, administrators, and students serving.

\textsuperscript{14} Having two heads (one for Congress, one for Council, would dilute this vision and could cause an us-them mentality that undermines good governance. In practical terms, having two heads could easily lead to duplication of effort.

\textsuperscript{15} http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/agbylaws.pdf, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{16} See http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/documents/TF2-5FinalRecommendationsforWeb2.pdf

\textsuperscript{17} In short, it would be ideal to have an Academic Assembly, a Faculty Senate, and a University Council.
prove faculty communication. The voice of faculty would not be strengthened by diminishing the voice of the faculty as a whole.

Articulation of TSC, Faculty Congress, University Council, Parliamentarian

TSC would refer issues to appropriate committees, and the committees would report to the Faculty Congress and University Council as specified in §II below. In a spirit of transparency, decisions of the Faculty Congress would be presented to the Board of Trustees by TSC, in its liaison function, and by standing committee chairs. Task Force 1 regards it as crucial that the Parliamentarian’s role be augmented substantially. The person who occupies the position should be intimately familiar with both the bylaws and parliamentary procedure (including Robert’s), and should be alert to, and prevent, infractions.

---

18 Task Force 4’s suggested changes, http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/documents/InterimReportstoFC3-14-06_000.pdf, are assumed here.
II. Proposed Committees

The recommendations below reflect significant consultation with members of the existing standing committees as well as information that came to light during the Faculty Voice process. Proposals about the constitution of committees leave intact the expectation of student members and administrative *ex officio* members.

Committees reporting to the Faculty Congress

*University Committee on Faculty Policy and Tenure (UCFPT).*\(^{19}\) This committee, with delegated authority and having no student members, shall make recommendations to the Faculty Congress and to the Provost, as appropriate, on personnel policies relating to faculty, such as appointment, reappointment, promotion, leaves, retirement, and assignment to teaching, research, and administration.\(^{20}\) This committee shall also make recommendations on formal and procedural rules on tenure and dismissal, and on substantive policies on tenure, and shall recommend changes in policy and procedure to the Faculty Congress. The University Committee on Faculty Tenure (UCFT) currently performs this function. The UCFT and the subcommittee of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs (UCFA) that advises on policy matters are proposed to be combined to reduce overlap in duties and reduce redundant effort.

*University Committee on Curriculum (UCC):*\(^{21}\) This committee shall exercise the faculty’s delegated authority to review and approve or reject all changes in undergraduate, graduate, graduate-professional courses, curricula, and degree requirements proposed by academic units, making recommendations to the Faculty Congress. It shall also make recommendations to the Provost on criteria for the establishment and deletion of courses and curricula.

Committees reporting to the University Council

*University Committee on the Budget (UCB):*\(^{22}\) This committee, having no student members, shall advise the Provost during the formulation of the university’s annual budget request to the State of Michigan. This committee shall submit an annual report to the University Council on the academic budget allocations and adjustments in salary and other forms of economic benefits. A subcommittee of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs currently performs this

---

\(^{19}\) This committee would combine the functions of the current University Committee on Faculty Affairs (4.6, http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucfa.htm) and University Committee on Faculty Tenure (4.7 http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucft.htm)

\(^{20}\) Nationally, and within the AAU and CIC, universities considered to employ effective shared governance systems delegate authority in matters of faculty status and curriculum to faculty. Faculty decisions in these matters remain subject to administrative and/or Board review, but are altered only in exceptional circumstances, with reasons provided to the committee, and an opportunity for response before a final decision.

\(^{21}\) See Bylaws for Academic Governance 4.5 at http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucc.htm

\(^{22}\) The current function of this proposed standing committee is being performed by a sub-committee of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs (4.6 Bylaws for Academic Governance, http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucfa.htm)
function. Because of the technical nature of budget matters, members shall serve three-year terms. The President, when appointing members of the Athletic Council, shall designate one member to serve ex officio each year on this committee.

University Committee on Academic Governance (UCAG)\textsuperscript{23} This committee shall conduct reviews of the bylaws for academic governance, interpret the bylaws, consider appeals of reviews of department bylaws by college committees, and shall be responsible for recommending amendments to University Council.

University Committee on Student Affairs (UCSA)\textsuperscript{24} This committee shall advise the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services and the Dean of Students on all policies of the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services and other university policies as they affect academic achievement of students in the university. The committee shall initiate and review proposed amendments to Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University, General Student Regulations, and policies relating to the academic rights and responsibilities of students. Any amendment affecting the professional rights and responsibilities of the faculty (as the Faculty Congress interprets these rights and responsibilities) must be approved by the Faculty Congress before consideration by University Council.

University Undergraduate Committee (UUC)\textsuperscript{25} This committee shall advise the Provost on the establishment, disbandment, or merger of undergraduate academic programs and shall advise the Provost on policy pertaining to curriculum revision, methods of instruction, evaluation of instruction, and advising and counseling for undergraduate students and programs. This committee shall consult with the Provost on policy pertaining to admissions and retention, financial aid, and the use and distribution of educational and research resources for undergraduate students and programs. This function is currently performed by the University Committee on Academic Policy. The function of this committee is not proposed to change, although its name changes because it deals primarily with undergraduate students.

University Graduate Committee (UGC)\textsuperscript{26} This committee shall exercise the faculty’s delegated authority on grading policy for graduate students and shall review all changes in graduate and graduate-professional courses, curricula, and degree requirements proposed by academic units and shall recommend their approval or rejection to the UCC. This committee shall have shared responsibility with the Dean of The Graduate School to advise the Provost on the establishment, disbandment, and merger of graduate programs, on policy pertaining to methods of instruction, evaluation of instruction, advising and counseling, admissions and retention of graduate students, and on other policy pertaining to administration of graduate programs. The committee shall have shared responsibility with the Dean of The Graduate School to advise the Provost on the coordination of graduate programs, policy pertaining to financial aid and em-

\textsuperscript{23} The current UCAG as defined in 4.3 of the Bylaws for Academic Governance (http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucag.htm) would be unchanged.

\textsuperscript{24} Likewise, the current UCSA as defined in 4.9 of the Bylaws for Academic Governance (http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucag.htm) would be unchanged.

\textsuperscript{25} The functions of this standing committee would absorb functions of the current UCAP as defined in the 4.4 of Bylaws for Academic Governance (http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ucap.htm).

\textsuperscript{26} This standing committee is essentially unchanged from the current University Graduate Council (4.8 Bylaws for Academic Governance, http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/committees/ugc.htm).
ployment of graduate students and on the use and distribution of educational and research re-

sources for graduate programs and graduate students, and shall advise the Dean of The Graduate 
School and the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies on policy relating to research 
development as it pertains to graduate education.

**Athletic Council**

Task Force 1 seeks to strengthen the ties between the Athletic Council and the rest of the 
governance system for the benefit of all. It views with dismay the current extent of the inde-

pendence of the Athletic Council from much of the academic side of university life, noting that 
the education of athletes is a proper concern of all faculty and noting also that, while athletic 
revenue is off the table in budget discussions, deficits in the athletic program can be made up 
through the general fund, an inappropriate imbalance. Task Force 1 also notes that opportuni-
ties to improve the education of athletes have sometimes been missed through inadequate coopera-
tion, e.g., in the planning and implementation of tutoring for athletes. At the request of the Ex-

ecutive Committee of Academic Council, Task Force 1 scrutinized the Bylaws for Academic 
Governance 5.2 Athletic Council, finding potential for conflict of interest, inadequate oversight, 
and insufficient emphasis on reporting.

To improve the integration of athletics with academics, Task Force 1 recommends that 
the President, when selecting members of the Athletic Council, designate two of the eight to 
serve *ex officio* without vote on the Faculty Congress, and one to serve *ex officio* without vote on 
the University Committee on the Budget. It recommends further that one of the faculty members 
designated to serve on the Faculty Congress have explicit responsibility for regular and up-to-
date reporting to the Faculty Congress, and that the other have explicit responsibility for keeping 
the Athletic Council abreast of the business of governance through regular reports to the Athletic 
Council.

---

27 Section 5.2 of the Bylaws for Academic Governance details the current function of the Athletic Council, which is identified as an advisory committee under “Other Committees” ([http://www.msuathleticcouncil.org/](http://www.msuathleticcouncil.org/)).

III. Proposal: The Steering Committee (TSC)

What was called “the Faculty Executive Committee” in the Faculty Voice Report is herein called “The Steering Committee” (TSC) because its membership is not limited to faculty and because its chief functions are to coordinate, to refer, and to communicate, i.e., to steer information, discussion, and legislation — coordinating both the Faculty Congress and the University Council — only infrequently, and in circumstances specified below, to exercise executive powers.

Membership and quorum

Each faculty member of TSC, except the chair, sits ex officio on a standing committee, so the total faculty membership of TSC is eight, with five faculty members constituting a quorum, and the chair voting only in cases of ties. Eight is large enough to sit on all the standing committees and to do the large amount of work, but small enough to form quickly and act executively when required. Serving ex officio on TSC itself would be an administrator (the Provost or her/his designee), a representative graduate student, and a representative undergraduate. The President, Provost, and Chairman of the Board or Trustees would have a standing invitation to attend meetings of TSC. Ex officio members of TSC would have voting rights on all matters not reserved to faculty.

Election and terms of office

The Steering Committee aims to address the business of the faculty by steering, organizing, referring to committees, etc. Any regular member of the Academic Senate/Assembly would be eligible to serve as regular member or chair. A nominating subcommittee from, and established by, the Faculty Congress, that would include no members of TSC, would solicit nominations for TSC, including self-nominations, from all eligible faculty, to ensure that the number of candidates exceeds the number of available slots. The nominating subcommittee might function as a subcommittee on committees as well. Ballots to all Senate/Assembly members would include candidate statements, and an annual direct election would determine the composition of TSC. It is likely — if past MSU culture is a guide — that senior, respected faculty with experience in governance would be elected. These qualities would make it more likely that TSC would be effective in its functions: senior enough to have respect, diverse enough for

---

29 The target membership of the TSC was originally six faculty (Voice report, p. 18), one to serve ex officio on each of five standing committees plus a chair, but an increase in the number of standing committees in prospect increased the membership of the TSC proportionately.

30 Task Force 1 noted that, in the past, simple ex officio representation has not ensured effective communication among groups; thus regular meetings among the executives of the various bodies should also be built into the model for effective shared governance.

31 It is the Faculty Congress that is conceived as representative in the model recommended by Task Force 1.

32 Task Force 5 recommends increasing the membership of the Academic Senate/Assembly, as discussed briefly above in §1, but Task Force 1 reiterates the view of the Faculty Voice Report (p. 20, note 26), which concludes: “All faculty members could be considered; however, they should become candidates and be elected on their own merits, not because of their particular personnel category.”
legitimacy, and experienced enough to be effective in communication and representation.\textsuperscript{33} To ensure continuity, and to balance experience with fresh perspectives, each elected member of TSC would serve a three-year term with the option of being reelected, or elected again, once, i.e., a lifetime total of six years service on TSC would be observed.\textsuperscript{34} Task Force 1 reiterates the recommendation of the Faculty Voice committee that the election of TSC not await a full-fledged plan for governance, but that TSC be elected as soon as possible, to advise and to guide other changes as they become clear.

TSC chair would be elected annually by the Faculty Congress from among the faculty members of TSC, but a lifetime total of three years as chair would be respected.\textsuperscript{35} To stagger terms, the eight TSC positions would initially be allocated to terms of one to three years by the nominating committee. The Faculty Congress would have responsibility for appointing a replacement in the event of the anticipated absence of a TSC member for a semester or more.

Functions and procedures of TSC

\textit{Communicative function.} TSC will have a crucial role in energizing, mobilizing, and steering faculty involvement in academic governance and will thus need to communicate directly, electronically and in print, with faculty. TSC will communicate frequently and directly with the administration and College Advisory Committees. It will also meet on a regular basis with officers of COGS and ASMSU. In effect, TSC will be the public relations organ of faculty governance. Liaison with the Board of Trustees (replacing faculty liaison representatives) is regarded as a crucial function, and TSC chair would always attend monthly meetings of the board, with additional meetings as needed. It is the recommendation of Task Force 1 that both TSC and the chairs of the standing committees should attend meetings of the Board of Trustees whenever possible and always when the agenda includes matters relevant to their particular charges. It is important for TSC to be a highly visible link between regular faculty and the board, enabling any member of the faculty to contact someone with authority to inquire, assist, and communicate further. To fulfill that role effectively, and to have the confidence of the trustees in the event that emergency consultation is necessary, TSC members need to attend board meetings and to become known to the trustees. It is also useful for the chairs of the standing committees to be present at board meetings to address the particulars of issues that may be specific to the sometimes complex work that is accomplished in committee.

\textit{Administrative function.} Task Force 1 recommends an annual planning meeting of TSC with all \textit{ex officio} members, rather than their designees, in attendance; this meeting would be proactive, bringing new members up to speed and looking ahead to the issues likely to be en-

\textsuperscript{33} It will take some time for TSC to be perceived as legitimate, and only if there is effective communication with the Faculty Congress, the faculty, and the university.

\textsuperscript{34} The task force considered whether TSC members elected initially to one- or two-year terms should have the option of standing for election for a third term and decided not: six years is a lifetime maximum.

\textsuperscript{35} The aim is to spread responsibility among TSC members, on the assumption that several would have sufficient experience to serve as chair in any particular year. Because the task is so time-consuming that requirement of a longer commitment might severely limit the number of senior faculty willing to serve, and to avoid the problems associated with too much authority concentrated in a single person, there was unanimity on the subcommittee for one-year terms.
countered during the academic year. Apart from the nominations subcommittee already mentioned, another Faculty Congress subcommittee might manage the details of the evaluation of academic administrators and academic programs; but TSC — and the Faculty Congress, ultimately — would have responsibility for oversight of any subcommittee. Stemming from its ex officio roles on the seven standing committees of the Faculty Congress and University Council, TSC would take the lead in an effort to inform and to coordinate the committees’ agendas.

**Executive function.** TSC replaces the ECAC in setting the agendas of the Faculty Congress and University Council, and in presiding over the former; it would also have the chief role in referring matters to all the standing committees and subcommittees. TSC would solicit input from faculty, would accept referrals from others, forge agreements with other bodies, and make considered judgments when rapid responses are required and when other governance committees are not in session. TSC will need to work assiduously, following the bylaws, to avoid making decisions precipitously when wider faculty opinion can and should be sought.

**University support for service on TSC**

The tasks of TSC are many and varied, and considerable time will be required to perform them in a manner most valuable to the university as a whole. Those who serve on TSC should receive two forms of significant support: (a) clerical support and administrative assistance through the office of the Secretary for Academic Governance, and (b) credit in their home units toward merit pay, tenure, and promotion. In both cases, support should be proportional to workload.

(a) A variety of possibilities for assisting TSC members should be available, appropriate to their individual needs and those of their home units. Task Force 1 estimates that each regular position will involve a quarter-time commitment, and possibly a half-time commitment for the chair. A reduction in teaching load, with funding for a suitable replacement in the unit, is only one of several types of assistance the university should support. Some faculty might prefer, or require in addition, to employ a student research or administrative assistant, or to receive a summer salary or overload pay. There is no recommendation that TSC members’ base salaries be increased. There should be someone with the responsibility for meeting the clerical needs of TSC without its having to rely on personnel within units.

(b) There is an identified problem across the university that some administrators, when determining merit pay etc., do not value or reward governance service. Either the central administration should supplement where units fail, or unit heads should be monitored for compliance with crediting university service. This cannot be enforced from below. It is assumed that Task Force 2 on administrative review, when final details are available, will make it possible for faculty to report which administrators do not recognize service to the university as part of the process of assessing merit, tenure, and promotion.  

---

36 See http://www.msu.edu/unit/acadgov/documents/InterimReportstoFC3-14-06_000.pdf
Appendix 1: *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*

§V. The Academic Institution:

The Faculty

(a) The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

(b) The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in courses, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

(c) Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

(d) The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

— Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges,
American Council on Education, and
American Association of University Professors
Appendix 2: Task Force 1 Committee Charge

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 to 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, 37). 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 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.

**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, and
• 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.
Appendix 3: Task Force 1 Chronology of Actions and Membership

22 April 2004  Academic Senate resolves to establish the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Faculty Voice
21 October 2004  *Ad Hoc* Committee on Faculty Voice convened
22 April 2005  Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Faculty Voice
2 August 2005  ECAC Interim Short Report (“Summer Working Group report”)
13 September 2005  Task force groups approved by Faculty Council
18 October 2005  Task force groups amended by Faculty Council
6 December 2005  Task Force 1 nominees informed of election results
12 January 2006  Task Force 1 convened
20 January 2006  subcommittees formed, series of independent meetings begun
24 February 2006  subcommittee interim reports discussed, subcommittee meetings continue
24 March 2006  revised subcommittee reports submitted
3 April 2006  interim reports of Task Forces to Faculty Council due
4 April 2006  reports of Task Forces 2–5 received
25 May 2006  summer working group formed (Task Force meeting at intervals during the summer)
1 October 2006  Task Force 1 report deadline

In reaching its recommendations, Task Force 1 reviewed the Faculty Voice report, the ECAC Summer Working Group report, national standards of university governance (statements), two governance proposals submitted independently by Task Force 1 members, alternative models of governance at three AAU Research I universities, and the reports of Task Forces 2–4; in addition, it interviewed a number of participants on current committees. To conduct its work effectively, Task Force 1 met regularly as a committee of the whole:

Maureen McDonough, Agriculture & Natural Resources
Muraleedharan G. Nair, Agriculture & Natural Resources
Ann Larabee, Arts & Letters
Debra Nails, Arts & Letters
Phylis Floyd, Arts & Letters
Susan Melnick, Education
James Minor, Education, Vice Chair
Indrek Wichman, Engineering
Houria Hassouna, Human Medicine
Charles Ten Brink, Law
Ralph Taggart, Natural Science
Yair Schachar-Hill, Natural Science
Norman Abeles, Social Science, Chair
Steve Chermak, Social Science — replaced by Jeff Beck
Merry Morash, Social Science
Eric Hinojosa, undergraduate student
Bob Murphy, undergraduate student
Alex Plum, undergraduate student
Alicia Bray, graduate student
Joe Fair, graduate student
Paula Richardson, graduate student
David Byelich, Assistant VP and Director, Planning and Budgets
June Youatt, Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Linda Stanford, Assistant Provost for Academic Services and Registrar

Task Force 1 also divided its members into three standing subcommittees:
Subcommittee 1 on committee structure: Norm Abeles, Alicia Bray, Steve Chermak/Jeff Beck, Eric Hinojosa, Ann Larabee, Muralee Nair, Linda Stanford, Ralph Taggart

Subcommittee 2 on current and proposed central governance bodies: Phylis Floyd, Houria Hassouna, James T. Minor, Merry Morash, Robert Murphy, Paula Richardson, June Youatt

Subcommittee 3 on the formation of a faculty executive committee: Dave Byelich, Joe Fair, Maureen McDonough, Susan Melnick, Debra Nails, Alex Plum, Yair Shachar-Hill, Chuck Ten Brink, Indrek Wichman

Summer Working Group 2006 to reconcile remaining discrepancies, and to consider the interface with other Task Force reports, chaired by James Minor: Phylis Floyd, Eric Hinojosa, Susan Melnick, Debra Nails, Yair Shachar-Hill, Chuck Ten Brink

Phylis Floyd and Debra Nails shared responsibility for minutes, for consolidating reports, and formulating the final draft.