April 4, 2006

To: Faculty Council, c/o Jon Sticklen, Chair, Executive Committee, Academic Council

From: Task Force II (George Stockman and Grover Hudson, co-chairs)

Subject: Recommendations

Task Force #2 was charged to

• Review the existing literature on faculty evaluation of administrators…and current developmental activities at Michigan State University;

• 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;

• Recommend a system of administrator evaluation to be used by the faculty; and

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

Task Force 2 herewith reports to Faculty Council providing its recommendations and supporting documents as appendices. We ask that

1. Faculty Council endorse our recommendations, and
2. refer these to Academic Senate for possible endorsement by that body.

We suggest the following language for motions of Faculty Council:

*Be it resolved* that Faculty Council endorse the recommendations of Faculty Voice Task Force #2 (Faculty Review of Administrators) to recommend a regular system of administrator evaluation to be used by the faculty, and

*Be it further resolved* that Faculty Council refer the recommendations of Task Force #2 to Academic Senate for possible endorsement by that body, and
Be it further resolved that those of the recommendations requiring enabling bylaw changes (at least section 1(b)) be held in abeyance and passed on to Faculty Voice Task Force #1, to enable Task Force #1 to develop a comprehensive and complete set of bylaw changes as one package.

Attachment: Recommendations for Administrator Review, 4 April 2006
Recommendations for Administrator Review

Version V4.1   4 Apr 06

MSU Faculty Voice Task Force II

Grover Hudson & George Stockman Co-Chairpersons, Robert Banks, Carla Carleton, Stephen Lacy replaced by Shawn Nicholson, Jane Miller, Mark Schroder, Brandon Sethi, John Shelle

Preamble: There is a perceived need at MSU and elsewhere for a bottom-up process of review of administrators by their constituencies in order to provide feedback on their leadership and thus improve the functioning of the university. The 2005 Faculty Voice Committee recommended this and Faculty Council charged Task Force II to further consider and propose such as process. After study of procedures in existence at MSU and other universities, Task Force II presented a draft proposal for faculty consideration via Faculty Council, electronic feedback, and open meetings. This current proposal that follows flows from the input from many members of the MSU community. It is expected that results of the Administrator Review will be used as advisory input in the regular process for evaluation and reappointment of administrators. Supporting information is available on the MSU ANGEL Site under the group ‘Administrator Review’.

1. Responsibility for review

   (a) The faculty, specialists, and librarians (hereafter abbreviated as “faculty”) shall be responsible for planning and managing the collection of input from respondents and for reporting the collected results. The collection process should be independent of biased interest in so far as is reasonably possible.

   (b) An Administrator Review Committee (ARC) shall be established by Faculty Council to administer the review process. ARC shall have no more than seven members and shall be constituted by methods used to elect members of standing committees.

2. Frequency of review

   Responses in the review/evaluation process should be collected in the final two weeks of January of every odd year beginning in 2007. The summary of results should be accessible to constituents by March 1.

3. Who is reviewed

   The following administrators will be reviewed: department chairs, school directors, deans, Director of Libraries, Provost, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and President.
4. **Respondents in the review**

Evaluation is to be solicited from the following groups who are vested in MSU’s future, who have direct knowledge to render in the process, and who may be conveniently identified for the web-based collection process:

(a) tenure-system faculty and librarians,
(b) fixed-term faculty, and
(c) specialists.

A respondent giving feedback in a review must be under the administrator in the strict hierarchical sense – to review a Chair/Director, the department/school must be the primary home; to review a Dean, the college must be the primary home. All respondents may review the Director of Libraries, Provost, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, and President.

5. **Criteria and method for review**

a. Current MSU procedures, refined over many searches with input from many advisory committees, already identify an exhaustive set of criteria. The Administrator Review Committee (ARC) will identify or compose a set of 5 to 15 criteria appropriate to each position and produce a bubble sheet questionnaire amenable to statistical summary. Moreover, ARC will request an activity report and/or vision statement from the administrator so that faculty may review the record of activities and achievements.

b. Provision will be made for free form input, but such input will be anonymously sent to the administrator and then deleted from the record.

c. The administrator under review may submit up to 5 questions: bubble answer or written and responses to these questions will only be reported to the administrator.

6. **Privacy and availability of results**

An uninterpreted set of 5 to 15 histograms (one for each question) of the collected responses will be the only reported results. Identification of the respondent will be deleted from the system as soon as the respondent is certified. Generally, there will be separate histograms for the three categories of respondents identified in 4 above. However, to preserve anonymity, any histogram with fewer than 10 responses will be merged with the next larger category for the administrative unit. (For example, if there were 4 specialists, 4 fixed term faculty and 10 tenure system faculty, then the two groups of 4 would be merged into a group of 8, which would be further merged with the group of 10 to form a single group of 18. Hence, for that unit, a single histogram would be reported.) The only presentation of results will be to eligible respondents, and only by login to a website using an MSU net ID. Only someone eligible to evaluate an administrator may access the histograms of responses for that administrator.
7. **Procedures**

a. ARC will contract with an MSU unit or other experienced social science entity to prepare and administer the questionnaire so that integrity of the data is maintained as well as the privacy of both the administrators and faculty respondents.

b. From each administrator being reviewed a statement will be requested reporting on the vision, activities, and achievements since the last review. The administrator may adjoin up to 5 questions to the questionnaire as in 5, above.

c. Respondent input should be acquired via a secure web transaction during a period of two weeks. The website will contain links to the administrator’s statement.

d. As soon as a respondent is certified, respondent identity will be deleted from the response and no record associating respondent with response will be kept.

e. Anonymous individual responses will be saved for two years. Archives are saved as needed for audit of the integrity of the process.

f. Those eligible to respond in a review may access the resulting histograms via login using an MSU netID up to 31 April after the review.

8. **Sunsetting**

These administrator review procedures will remain in force only until 31 April 2015 unless actively extended by MSU faculty governance.

9. **Estimated cost**

$10k is the estimated cost for the first year of operation, with $5k estimated every two years thereafter.

*End of document*
MSU Administrator Review: Current Guidelines for Academic Administrators January 2006

Summary from Task Force II: MSU Procedures Subcommittee
Jane Miller, Brandon Sethi, George Stockman

Current MSU Procedures

MSU has in place detailed guidelines for a 5-year review of Deans, Chairs, and Directors. Documentation of these procedures were provided by Robert Banks, Assistant Provost, who has responsibility for advising academic units when such reviews are due. Several documents clarify the meaning and significance of such reviews. These are filed under the ANGEL group AdministratorReview under MSUprocedures.

1. Appendix A below outlines the current MSU review procedure for the positions of Dean, Chair, and Director.
2. Two examples are provided for review of a dean -- from Engineering and Social Sciences: in both cases there is (a) a letter defining the procedure as agreed upon between the Provost’s Office and the College Advisory Committee, and (b) a questionnaire to be used to gather feedback from the college constituency. Actual reviews were done recently. The statement of achievements of the Dean of social Sciences from a recent review is also included.
3. There is a document containing criteria that can be used for reviewing MSU administrators in general.
4. Two examples from Engineering are provided for review of a Chair, (a) procedures and criteria for the 5-year review of a Chair and (b) procedures and criteria for the annual review of a Chair.
5. A memo from Robert banks containing the schedule of upcoming reviews required for the many MSU Deans, Chairs, and Directors.

State of current MSU administrator review procedures

MSU has much in place already in terms of both procedures and criteria for reviewing an administrator. These procedures have been exercised many times; the two recent reviews of Deans are just two examples.

Task Force II identifies the following problems with the current MSU procedures for reviewing administrators, some of which are remedied in the proposal for faculty review of administrators.

1. Important administrators, including the President and Provost are not reviewed at all by faculty.
2. The review period of 5 years is too long to provide feedback for improvement or showing of support and far too long for removing an administrator who is not performing. Annual or biannual review would be more appropriate, as it is for faculty and other MSU employees.
3. There is negligible reporting back to faculty or the MSU community concerning the performance of an administrator when reviewed. If an administrator and the administrator’s superior are both performing badly in concert, there is no transparency, revelation, or recourse.
4. There is a perception that current MSU procedures are not carried out in a uniform manner. The process of reviewing chairs varies from college to college.
Appendix A.

Below is an overview of the “Norms” of the current Administrator Evaluation System. Note under section two of the Bylaws of Academic Governance, the College faculty and usually the CAC and provost negotiate a procedure. The flow chart covers the norm, but sometimes Colleges make modifications. The Academic Human Resource Department (AHRD) oversees the Dean’s Review Process. Chairperson evaluations are managed by the individual Colleges with oversight provided by AHRD.

Section 2 (2.1.4) of the Bylaws for Academic Governance provide a commitment of reviews for MSU Deans, Directors, and Chairpersons at intervals not to exceed five years.

2.1.4. Chairpersons, directors, and deans shall be subject to regular review at intervals not to exceed five years.
2.1.4.1. The College Advisory Council of each college shall have shared responsibility with the Provost to determine procedures for the review of deans.
2.1.4.2. At intervals of not to exceed five years the dean shall review the reappointment of a chairperson or school director.
2.1.4.3. A department or school faculty shall have shared responsibility with their dean on procedures for review of a chairperson or school director.

**Norms - Dean Review Process**

- Provost alerts Dean of review (reviews occur at intervals not to exceed five years)
- Provost & Asst Provost/Asst VP for Acad HR meet w/CAC
- Dean prepares statement of future vision & lists tenure accomplishments
- Individual private meetings - Provost or predetermined designate with each CAC non-ex officio faculty & student member
- CAC's undergrad & grad student reps solicit opinions - undergrad/grad students and relevant student orgs
- CAC solicits opinions – faculty/staff
- Written anonymous questionnaire developed & distributed to faculty, staff, retirees from past 5 years - Provost's office to provide summary
- External support letters sought by Provost's Office - identified jointly by CAC & Dean & input provided by peer MSU Deans
- Individual private meeting between Provost or predetermined designate with Chairpersons and Associate Deans of college

CAC = College Advisory Committee
Administrator Evaluation: Comparison of Practice at Three Universities

A brief survey of three representative universities comparable in size and nature to Michigan State University, prepared by Carla Carlson, Grover Hudson, and Mark Schroeder, a subcommittee of Task Force 2 on Administrator Review.

Abbreviations:
SUNY B - State University of New York at Binghampton
U of I - University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign College of Arts and Sciences.
UM - University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

1. Selection and Organization of Evaluation Committees

a. University level

SUNY B: Nine full-time faculty chosen from Faculty Senate by secret ballot; one representative from each school

UM: standing committee: Administrator Evaluation Committee (AEC)

b. College level

U of I: Elected from among and by the faculty with one representative from each electoral grouping (e.g. department). The committee chair is appointed by the Provost.

SUNY B: Elected from among college faculty by the college's Faculty Senate.

UM: none, evaluation is university-wide

c. Department level

U of I: Three to five elected from among and by the faculty. Chair is elected by faculty from a list of three candidates provided by the Dean.

SUNY B: Composed of full-time faculty; size and organization left to discretion of each department.

UM: none, evaluation is university-wide

2. Administrators Subject to Evaluation

U of I: Dean, directors of centers and programs, and department chairs.
SUNY B: Currently includes (but not limited to) Provost, President, Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and the Deans and Directors of academic units.

UM: President, provost, deans and dept. chairs

3. Evaluation Procedure

a. Forms of response

U of I: Committee invites written commentary, provides an opportunity for faculty to meet with the committee, and may seek input from individuals outside the relevant unit. A graduate student representative is included in departmental reviews. A written report is submitted to the administrator's immediate superior.

SUNY B: The evaluation coordinating committee sends a questionnaire to "natural faculty constituency" of the administrator; it requests documentation from the administrator (vita, job description, and narrative self-evaluation); and may solicit any other relevant data. This information is shared with the faculty in a general evaluation, and with the departmental review committee in a college evaluation. Departmental review committees solicit input from faculty, organize a vote of the voting faculty, and draft a report, explicitly stating whether renewal is supported or rejected, or they abstain from a decision.

UM: The committee prepared a set of 'core' questions for all administrators plus 'topical questions' suitable for each unit - objective questions. Faculty respondents are also invited to submit 'text comments'. Responses are provided on a dedicated website.

b. Timetable

U of I: At least every fifth year. Dean may approve early evaluations for center and program directors, and department chairs.

SUNY B: Academic administrators evaluated at least once every four years, although the evaluation process can be initiated at an earlier time (by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee).


c. Report Distribution

U of I: "Supporting rationale" for the renewal decision will be communicated.

SUNY B: All evaluation reports remain confidential. All reports are compiled into a final report giving a summary of department evaluations, and a sum total of the faculty vote for and against renewal, where appropriate. Report is forwarded to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee; any response by the administrator is also forwarded.
UM: Text comments are provided to the relevant administrator and are not retained. Faculty receive full report of responses to 'core' and 'topical' questions, which are also archived, and given various comparative and statistical interpretation.
Task Force 2, List of Documents and Studies Consulted, Winter 2006

Illinois, University of, College of Liberal Arts, Policy Manual, Sec. II.3 Evaluation of Administrators.
Lehman, John T. Lehman, AAUP Executive Committee Member, University of Michigan, Evaluation of Administrators by University of Michigan Faculty (n.d.).
Michigan State University, College of Social Science, Chair/Director Review Procedures (Jan. 25, 2006).
Michigan State University, College of Social Science, Performance Evaluation of the Dean of the College of Social Science, Fall 2005: questionnaire (n.d.).
Michigan State University, Office of the Provost, Evaluation Guidelines, Academic Administrators (Sept. 9, 1997).
Michigan State University, Performance Evaluation of the Dean of the College of Engineering: questionnaire (n.d. 2004?).
Michigan, University of, ‘Dean’s Evaluation Questionnaire’ (n.d.).
Michigan, University of, Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC), Report to the University Senate, Senate Assembly and SACUA on the Administration Evaluations carried out in Fall 2004, March 2005.
New York, State University of (SUNY), Faculty Evaluation of Administrators, a Report by the Governance Committee (Winter 2005).
Rutgers University, University Senate ‘FAPC Response to Charge S-0309, Evaluation of Administrators, Review’ (March 26, 2004).
Western Kentucky University, Handbook Chapter 3 (2.10) Evaluation of Administrators, 2006.
Western Michigan University questions for review of dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mar. 21, 2003.
April 4, 2006

TO: Executive Committee of the Academic Council (ECAC)
FROM: Christina DeJong, Richard Groop, Harold Hughes, Michael Moch, James Potchen, and Allen Weich
RE: Final Report of Faculty Voice Taskforce III: Program Review

Attached find the final report of Faculty Voice Taskforce III: Program Review. We anticipate that you will forward our report to members of the Faculty Council in time for them to review it prior to the Faculty Council meeting on April 11. Those of us in attendance will provide a very brief overview of the report. We had anticipated that two of us who are members of Faculty Council would move and second the following resolution:

The Faculty Council, having received and considered the Taskforce III report on Program Review, supports the proposal in concept and overall design and offers it to the Provost and the President as a template for implementing a university-wide system of periodic program review at Michigan State University.

With the ECAC’s April 4 decision to offer our report only as an information item, however, we understand that we cannot offer this resolution. Nevertheless, we will provide an overview of our report.

In our overview, we will express our gratitude for the cooperation of and consultation with administrators across the university. We were impressed by their energy, commitment, and vision. Many college deans are already implementing comprehensive programs of unit assessment and review. Our recommendations therefore should be considered as resting on a solid base of currently operating unit review procedures. We essentially are recommending that the best practices already in place be extended throughout the university.

Had the Faculty Council endorsed our proposal, we had planned to urge the ECAC to take responsibility for coordinating our recommendations with those of the other faculty voice taskforces and for culling, collating and processing the changes in governance procedures and bylaws proposed by all of them. We understand that now the ECAC will endeavor to do this without a Faculty Council vote on our proposal. To aid them in this effort, we advise them that, in our opinion, there are few, if any, points at which the recommendations of Taskforce III need to be coordinated with those being considered by other taskforces. Our recommendations have very little to do with academic governance per se. We focused our attention on faculty participation in program review, an essentially administrative function. The only direct implications of our report for academic governance are 1) a significant role for college advisory committees (CACs) and 2) the establishment of a University Faculty Program Advisory Committee (UFPAC) to advise the Provost on program review.
CACs already play a significant role in academic governance at MSU. Resources permitting, the system of program review we are recommending could be implemented and managed by the Office of the Provost, with or without UFPAC. Our recommendations, including the UFPAC, therefore are advisory to the administration and can be implemented regardless of changes that might be under consideration for the governance structure, administrator evaluation, communication systems, or the roles and privileges of tenure-system and fixed-term faculty. They could, in fact, be implemented administratively with or without the endorsement of the Faculty Council.

Should the Faculty Council eventually endorse our recommendations, we advise ECAC to route the proposal through the Council of Deans. Now that consideration of endorsement has been postponed, perhaps the ECAC might consult with the Council of Deans as they coordinate across taskforce recommendations. The deans have been instrumental in the development of our report. They have not, however, seen the final version. Nor are they all of the same mind. As they will play a central role in program implementation, the deans should be consulted on the program features under consideration. Should they identify shortcomings or ways to strengthen the proposed program, their recommendations should be taken seriously by Faculty Council.

The program review procedure we are recommending will be implemented, if at all, by the administration. It will not be administered through governance. We therefore also advise the ECAC to route the proposal through Academic Council and to put it up for support or rejection in that venue.

In developing the proposal we heard a great deal about cost in terms of both money and time. The taskforce members are not in a position to engage the appropriate costing methodologies to accurately project costs and associated staffing needs. Our proposal, however, is lean and requires no additional evaluation activities where existing procedures are already in place. We believe it can be administered incrementally by existing unit and college staff and within current budgetary constraints. If our expectations prove to be too optimistic, we expect the administration will make the needed resources available or scale down the evaluation program to accommodate the resources that are available.

We want to express our appreciation for the opportunity to serve the faculty and our administration. We also have enjoyed getting to know each other. It has been a privilege to serve on Taskforce III, and we offer our recommendations in the spirit of service and continuing dialog. We will be available to help ECAC, should it seek our advice and counsel as it moves forward to integrate the various taskforce recommendations. With this report, however, we consider our task accomplished and the taskforce disbanded.
The purpose of the MSU Academic Review Program (ARP) proposed herein is to establish a process whereby faculty members will initiate program planning and be directly involved in follow-up activities in the area most germane to their core responsibilities: the determination and assessment of the direction and performance of their primary administrative unit, the academic department. At the college and university levels, the ARP will generate actionable information that will support and guide MSU’s process of continuous regeneration and renewal to meet the needs of its ever changing multiple constituencies.

It is essential that MSU respond to the increasing pace of change in its environment. In telecommunications, for example, significant technological change occurs faster than the tenure-review cycle. In Engineering, MSU must move rapidly to develop specialties for the future, as commodity engineering is increasingly outsourced to developing economies. MSU is facing increasing competition from private providers who are nimble and capable of employing new delivery systems for educational materials. When implemented, the proposed ARP will guide the faculty in identifying future directions for the university and provide support to the administration as it manages the changes that will be required to advance MSU’s distinctive capabilities and unique potential into the 21st Century.
Programs are taken to be academic departments hereinafter called units.\textsuperscript{1} The ARP will provide units with self- and externally-generated assessments that will provide them and college and university administrators with the performance criteria and feedback required for the effective management of change. By improving its programs and by identifying its many successful accomplishments, academic units at MSU will be able to stimulate excellence internally and document their contributions externally. By facilitating communication between students, faculty, support services such as the library, administrators, and external reviewers, the ARP will function to provide faculty initiated broad-based constructive reviews and align all interests in the common goal of achieving and maintaining university-wide excellence.

The primary responsibility for the conduct of ARPs, as currently proposed, will reside with the faculty at the unit level. There will be two deliverables: a unit self-study and an external reviewer report. Responsibility for initiating reviews and assisting units in their timely completion will reside at the college level, in the office of the college dean with the advice of the College Advisory Council (CAC).\textsuperscript{2} Where appropriate, APRs for centers, institutes and other groupings may, at the discretion of the dean and with unit concurrence, be folded into reviews of academic departments. Self-study and external reviews along with dean’s and, where appropriate, CAC commentaries will be provided to the Provost, advised by a University Faculty Program Advisory Committee (UFPAC), selected annually by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. All academic

\textsuperscript{1} A unit is any administrative department existing in a college and supervised by a dean. This definition captures the 215 units listed within each of the 14 colleges listed on pp 27-33 of the MSU 2005-2006 Faculty/Staff Directory and the MSU College of Law. In the case of small colleges such as James Madison, the MSU College of Law, and the College of Nursing, the unit may be taken to be the college itself.

\textsuperscript{2} In the case of units with multiple deans, the lead dean will assume the dean’s APR functions.
units at MSU, unless granted a waiver by the Provost at the request of the college dean, will go through the APR process at least once during any given seven year window.3

Features of the ARP

Different types of program review are required to address different problems and prospects facing units at MSU. Some units might be making significant progress with the resources at hand and require additional resources and greater national or international visibility. Other units may be making significant contributions to MSU in teaching, research or service but require conscious self-assessment and external guidance to realize their potential within the resource-constrained environment that must be anticipated for MSU for the foreseeable future. The proposed ARP therefore is designed to provide the flexibility called for by the diversity of unit needs, strategic options, and resource requirements. The overall process is depicted in Figure 1.

A unit APR will be initiated by the college dean on his/her initiative or upon the request of a unit chairperson. The dean will meet with unit personnel to outline procedures, expectations, and a schedule of milestones. Performance metrics will be negotiated and agreed to by the unit, the dean and the provost. The first stage in the APR process, a unit self-study, will generally take between 9-12 months to complete, but events may require extensions or respecifications. In such cases, the burden for justifying an extension or review respecification to both the college dean and the provost will rest

3 Many units at MSU are reviewed by external accrediting organizations. Others are reviewed by licensing or other external agencies. In many cases, therefore, aspects of the APR process may be redundant with requirements already in place. In these cases, a dean, with approval of the Provost, may exempt a unit from APR or restrict the APR process to those aspects not already covered by other requirements. For example, accreditation reviews often may be directed toward undergraduate or masters education but be relatively unconcerned with Ph.D. education and research. In such cases, the APR process may be restricted to a review of graduate education and research.
with the unit. The self-study, once completed, will document the unit’s accomplishments and its shortcomings and generate an agreed-upon course of action for the future. Self-studies should provide answers to the following questions:

1. What do you do?
2. Why do you do it?
3. How well do you do it, and who thinks so?
4. What difference does it make whether you do it or not?
5. How do you intend to change to reach your (evolving) future given where you are now?
6. How will you evaluate your progress and ultimate success?

The self-study will be reviewed by the college dean, who, with the advice of the college CAC, will select and solicit the participation of appropriate external reviewers. It is anticipated that the unit will recommend reviewers. The responsibility for selecting reviewers, however, will reside with the dean, and the dean may select reviewers other than those on the unit’s list. The external reviewers will consult with unit faculty and staff, students and appropriate unit constituencies within and external to MSU, evaluate the unit and its self-study, and report directly to the unit and to the college dean.

---

4 Unit emeritus faculty might play an important role, both in the self-study and its subsequent review at both the college and university levels.
5 Reviews of units that represent a discipline will need review committees composed, at least in part, of experts in the discipline who are not affiliated with MSU. Other units have little of their foundation in a discipline but link or offer service to other MSU units. These units will need reviewers from outside the unit or even the college who understand the unit’s interdependencies with other units at MSU. The preferred combination of external reviewers from outside or inside MSU will vary by college and by unit and therefore should be left to the discretion of the dean, advised by the CAC.
6 Some have expressed concern that external reviewers who know their evaluations will be given to unit personnel may be less than candid. It is difficult to see, however, how a unit can generate and adhere to a realistic development plan unless it is informed about both its strengths and weaknesses by those it deems
will respond to the external review, forwarding its response to the dean. The dean and
the unit chair then will review the self-study and the external review with the CAC.\(^7\)
Upon college-level receipt of the unit self study, the external review, the unit’s response
to the external review, and a review of the report to the college CAC, the review
materials will be forwarded, along with the dean’s comments, and, where appropriate,
CAC reaction, to the Provost.

The APR, as currently proposed, includes a process for unit and college-level
feedback and follow-up. The Provost will provide feedback to the unit, either directly or
through the college dean, outlining the administrative options he/she has chosen either to
support or redirect the unit’s assessments and future plans. Guided by the schedule of
milestones identified by the unit or respecified by the Provost through the college dean,
the unit will, within 24 months of the completion of its self-study and action plan, submit
a report documenting and explaining its successes and failures, recommending support
and, where appropriate, changes in its action plan. These changes and requests for
support will be reviewed by the college dean with the advice of the CAC and forwarded,
with the dean’s comments and recommendations, to the provost.

Implementation

It will take time to ramp up the APR process. A significant number of units,
however, notably all those in the colleges of Social Science and Arts and Letters, are

\(^7\) Recognizing that securing candid external reviews may require pledges of some confidentiality, the unit
and the dean may choose to provide the CAC with an overview of the APR but restrict the CAC’s access to
either the external review, the self-study, or both.
already on a review rotation. APR also has been accomplished in whole or in part through accreditation reviews in the colleges of Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine, Nursing, Veterinary Medicine, Communication, Education, Engineering, Law and Business. Some units in the College of Natural Science fall within the accreditation domains of other colleges and have participated in reviews in that capacity. In the past six years, the Graduate School has facilitated program reviews in a variety of units in Engineering, Natural Science, Human Medicine, Osteopathic Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, Arts and Letters, Education, Social Science, and Communication. The Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies is continuing a systematic process of reviewing research centers, institutes, and laboratories that was initiated in the Spring of 2002. These have involved the Colleges of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Arts and Letters, Business, Communication, Education, Engineering, Human Medicine, Natural Science, Nursing, Osteopathic Medicine, Social Science, and Veterinary Medicine. The proposed APR should leverage these efforts and avoid redundancy. APRs therefore should be prioritized in proportion to the amount of time that has passed since the most recent previous review and priority be given to those aspects of an APR that have received less attention from accreditation procedures, licensing, the Graduate School, the Vice President for Research, or other forms of review. Discretion for how to ramp up the APR process, however, should reside with the unit faculty by initiating a review and the college deans, advised by their college advisory councils, based on college and unit level priorities and concerns. When fully implemented, approximately 30 units will participate in or be excused from an APR during any given
academic year, a number that should not be overly burdensome, given the potential benefits to the unit, the college, and the university.

Costs and Costing

In developing the proposal we heard a great deal about cost in terms of both money and time. The taskforce members are not in a position to engage the appropriate costing methodologies to accurately project costs and associated staffing needs. Our proposal, however, is lean and has been designed so that it will require no additional evaluation activities where existing procedures are already in place. We anticipate that it will be administered incrementally by existing staff in units and colleges and within current budgetary constraints. We have been advised by some quite knowledgeable people, however, that additional resources will be needed, including assigning overall responsibility for program reviews to the Senior Associate Provost. If our expectations concerning program costs prove to be too optimistic, we expect the administration will make the needed resources available or scale down the evaluation program to accommodate the resources that are available.

---

Several commentators have raised the issue of funding for the APR process. Proposals have ranged from having the process supported entirely by unit resources, complemented in some cases by deans and the Graduate School, to the establishment of an Academic Program Review Office administered by the provost. We view this feature of the APR as essentially an administrative issue and therefore outside the purview of the mandate of the taskforce. Support sufficient to implement APR is essential. How that support is administered, however, should be determined administratively rather than specified through academic governance.
Academic Program Review Flowchart

Figure 1
Facility Voice Task Force 4
Communication and Transparency

Tuesday, April 04, 2006

Members of Faculty Council
Michigan State University

Faculty Colleagues:

Faculty Voice Task Force #4 (TF4), Communication and Transparency of Governance, was organized under a motion passed by Faculty Council on 13 Sept 2005, and charged to address the following general issue:

**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.) [Quoted from Charge to Task Force #4 from Faculty Council]

The specific three-item charge to TF4 from Faculty Council was as follows:

1) Review existing practices at like universities for enhancing communication, particularly by electronic and print media means. Develop a set of recommendations tailored for the MSU situation that will enhance communication from governance to the community, and from the community to governance, leaving room for future growth and implementation choices.

2) Review existing practices at like universities concerning methods used to link faculty governance representatives to their constituents. Develop a set of recommendations tailored for the MSU situation that will enhance these connections.

3) Review existing practices at like universities concerning methods used to communicate across multiple tiers of governance systems. Develop a set of recommendations tailored for the MSU situation that will enhance communication across tiers in the MSU governance system.

TF4 members reviewed Internet (web) and academic resources to identify communication practices and innovative ways of encouraging participation in governance programs that were effective elsewhere, and which had the potential for application in the local environment. Task force members also leveraged personal contacts at other academic institutions to better understand alternative approaches to academic governance communication. In addition, web sites of two institutions, Penn State University and the University of Michigan, were examined in an effort to assess their means for effective web-based channels for managing governance information for faculty and students. Finally, a survey spanning a range of technological arenas...
was completed by nine governance leaders in eight CIC sister schools. (Survey results are attached as an appendix.)

From discussion and deliberation in weekly task force meetings, and based on our information gathering, TF4 members crystallized three guiding goals for the consideration and development of effective, transparent communication in the MSU academic governance system:

A) *Enhance transparency of two-way flow of information in governance* (from governance to constituents and vice versa) – analysis revealed many incongruent, inconsistent systems of information flow, often leading to confusion, apathy, and mistrust. Proposed actions will enable communication channels to be open, thus allowing straightforward and effective sharing of information.

B) *Enhance understanding of governance and participation in governance at all levels* – the TF4 review established that there is widespread misunderstanding of governance processes. Proposed actions are expected to provide better control of content flow across all levels, a better system of establishing information relevance to individual users, and more effective, lower cost communication channels using available technologies.

C) *Enhance accountability of the governance system to its constituency and of the constituency to governance* – analysis revealed a systemic problem tied to the lack of formally defined responsibilities in many facets of governance and a general lack of recourse for unfulfilled duties. TF4 proposes a more comprehensive assignment of accountability to ensure that Principles A and B are reliably implemented, that greater individual trust in the governance system is maintained, and that the governance system becomes self-perpetuating.

Endorsement of these three guiding goals is one kernel of the recommendations from TF4 to Faculty Council; the complete motion for consideration at Faculty Council is attached.

More specifically, but flowing directly from the above goals, TF4 members developed a series of procedural and technological recommendations. Each of these specifics is directly tied to one or more of the three guiding goals above. Rather than present each of these specific items for “vote” at this time, members of TF4 strongly agreed that consideration, prioritization, and implementation of any or all of the specific suggestions be secondary to a survey of all faculty indicating interest in each of the specific recommendations.

Thus the remainder of the motion that TF4 brings to Faculty Council deals with a staged approach, involving first an advisory survey of faculty, second, consideration over the summer months (2006) by a small implementation committee, and finally a report back from the implementation committee to Faculty Council in the meeting of Council in September 2006. The report out in September of the implementation committee is expected to include a recommended and concrete timetable for implementation of specific items.

It was apparent to all TF4 members from the outset that there was some overlap between the work of TF4 and Voice Task Force #1 (TF1): Structure of Governance. One of the central foci of work for TF1 lies in restructuring the bylaws for academic governance following a reasoned and agreed upon target university-level structure for (a) the executive committee of governance, (b) the standing committee structure, and (c) the balanced roles of Faculty Council and Academic
Council. The area of overlap between TF1 and TF4 lies in any recommendations that TF4 would make that would entail changes in bylaws. As part of the motion TF4 brings to Faculty Council, the issue of overlap with the work of TF1 is handled by proposing that any specific recommendations of TF4 which would entail bylaw changes be held in abeyance for now, and passed on to TF1. It was the reasoned position of the members of TF4 that changes in bylaws recommended by TF4 should be considered by TF1 so that TF1 is able to develop a comprehensive and integrated package of bylaw changes.

A final section of the motion being brought to Faculty Council by TF4 is to propose that the entire issue, as considered by Faculty Council, and if endorsed by the Council, be referred on to Academic Senate for consideration. The rationale for this proposal is rooted in the manner in which TF4 came into being. Although Academic Senate endorsement was not a part of the originating motion as passed by Senate in Spring, 2004, it is the case that it was through the active participation of Senate members that a strong statement was put on record voicing the consensus of faculty feelings. TF4 members feel that a strong statement by Senate would aid in giving the impetus to see through implementation of TF4 recommendations.

Following this cover letter to Faculty Council, you will find (a) the specific motion being brought by TF4, (b) the complete Final Report of TF4, centering in large part on an enumeration of the specific recommendations, (c) an appendix showing the result of the CIC Leadership Group survey, and an appendix showing the tree structure of the specific recommendations list.

To conclude, a potentially very important point became apparent to TF4 members: currently only one surveyed university amongst those examined strongly leverages technology as an enabler for its academic governance system. This suggests that MSU could assume a national leadership role in the area of supporting academic governance through cutting edge technology - in particular by the use of technical means to ensure that rank and file faculty get the information they want and need to get from governance, but no more.

Respectfully submitted,

Members of Faculty Voice Task Force #4: Communication and Transparency
Wolfgang Bauer, Chairperson
David Gift
Wanda Lipscomb
Scott Michaelsen

George Allen
Scott Lanard
Kyle Martin
Jon Sticklen

Attached: Motion brought to Faculty Council by TF4
Body of Final Report of TF4
Appendix 1: results of survey of CIC Leadership Group (Chairs of Governance Systems)
Appendix 2: tree structure of the specific recommendations of TF4

MSU is an Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Institution
Motion for Faculty Council, April 2006
Faculty Voice Task Force #4: Communication and Transparency

Be it resolved that Faculty Council endorses the following three goals of the Faculty Voice Task Force #4 (Communication and Transparency):

(1) to increase the information flow between the elected governance representatives and their constituencies, in both directions;

(2) to increase the level of participation of faculty and students in the process of governance by removing barriers; and

(3) to increase accountability on all levels to ensure a responsible self-government.

Be it further resolved that Faculty Council endorses an advisory survey on each menu item provided by Task Force #4, said survey to be accessible to all members of Academic Senate for a period of one (1) week following favorable Senate action, and

Be it further resolved that based on results of the Senate-wide survey, the Chair of ECAC, the Chair of Task Force #4, and one Administrator selected by the Provost, will meet over the summer months to develop implementation plans based on the survey. The current Chair of ECAC will report progress to Faculty Council at its September, 2006, meeting. And

Be it further resolved that those survey items identified in the final report of Task Force #4 as requiring enabling bylaw changes be held in abeyance and passed on to Faculty Voice Task Force #1, to enable Task Force #1 to develop a comprehensive and complete set of bylaw changes as one package. And finally,

Be it further resolved that Faculty Council refer the issue on to Academic Senate for possible endorsement by that body.

---

1 If no quorum is reached for Academic Senate, then based on endorsement by Faculty Council, the survey will take place immediately after the Senate meeting per language above.
Enhancing Transparency and Communication in Academic Governance

Faculty Voice Task Force #4 (TF4), *Communication and Transparency of Governance*, was organized under a motion passed by Faculty Council on 13 September 2005 and specifically charged with three fundamental goals:

1. to increase information flow between elected governance representatives and their constituencies, in both directions;
2. to increase the level of participation of faculty and students in the process of governance by removing barriers; and
3. to increase accountability on all levels to ensure a responsible self-government.

These three goals were formulated in response to a number of perceived needs and problems in existing governance. For instance, analysis revealed many incongruent, inconsistent systems of information flow, often leading to confusion, apathy, and mistrust. TF4 review also established that the sheer volume of information and number of channels by which information reaches individuals at MSU leads to general misunderstanding of governance processes. Lower participation levels are tied directly to information overload. Finally, our analysis uncovered a systemic problem tied to the lack of formally defined responsibilities in many facets of governance and a general lack of recourse for unfulfilled duties.

In order to meet these goals, we had to answer the following three fundamental questions: To what extent can better communication between academic governance and faculty create a culture of participation? How can communication between academic governance and faculty be strengthened by new technologies? How can better linkages be created among the various levels of governance in a multi-tier system?

A range of methods was used when conducting the analysis. TF4 extensively reviewed web and academic resources to identify recommended communication practices and innovative ways of encouraging participation in governance programs. Task force members also leveraged personal contacts at other academic institutions to better understand alternative approaches to academic governance communication. Moreover, faculty within the MSU School of Communications was interviewed. Next, web sites of two institutions, Penn State and the University of Michigan were assessed in an effort to understand more effective channels for managing information for faculty and students. Finally, a survey spanning a range of technological arenas was completed by eight members of the CIC Governance Leadership Group. (See Appendix 1 for both the questions asked and the responses returned.)

In general, only Penn State has progressively leveraged technology as key enabler of its academic governance system. The CIC Governance Leadership Group survey, in fact, revealed limited reliance to technology at most institutions, suggesting that MSU could assume a leadership role with a more aggressive application of technology in its governance program.
A series of procedural and technological recommendations are proposed by TF4. Each action is directly tied to one guiding principle. The task force uncovered certain instances where processes and technologies utilized in isolated areas of MSU could provide greater benefit if extended to the entire University. Where possible, these elements will be drawn up during implementation to lower resource requirements.

Technological suggestions included several key applications including an innovative MSU web portal, not unlike those found at Penn State and the University of Michigan Business School, with an appropriate level of flexibility in design and content control capability. Additional technology elements consist of a streamlined academic governance website, more systematic archiving and indexing of information, improved electronic reporting abilities, the implementation of electronic voting practices, electronic broadcasting of governance meetings, two-way meeting communication allowing for remote meeting participation, improved feedback collection repositories, and automated process control software to ensure a more systematic execution of governance processes or responsibilities. Procedurally, recommendations cover clarification roles, enhancing meeting accessibility, better communication of college and unit level representatives, and more efficacious use of reporting channels.

The list of recommendations is long, ranging from very simply implemented measures to increase information available to faculty from governance (e.g., establishing a practice for the Chair of the Executive Committee to report each fall and spring via the State News, Recommendation 1.1.4), to modest enhancements involving electronic communication capabilities (e.g., improving the governance web site, Recommendation 1.3), to extensive, new electronic facilities (e.g., making use of “push” technology to ensure community members receive the governance information they want, but not more (e.g., RSS publication of governance information, Recommendation 2.2). TF4 members, recognizing that precise costing of all recommendations would be difficult and shifting, propose (on the attached formal motion) that the list of specific recommendations below form the basis of a survey of desirability to be made available to all faculty once the attached motion is approved by Faculty Council. The result of the advisory survey will then inform an implementation committee to be made up of the Chair of ECAC, the chair of TF4, and an administrator designated by the President or Provost. The implementation committee will report out to Faculty Council in September 2006.

To the extent that some of these recommendations may entail bylaws changes, the Task Force suggests that such issues should be forwarded to Task Force I once endorsed per the procedure delineated on the attached formal motion the Task Force brings to Faculty Council. The specific recommendations that are dependent on bylaw changes are noted in the list below. In Appendix 2, the same structure of recommendations is shown, but more explicitly in a tree structure.

Below the specific recommendations of the Task Force are enumerated. These recommendations are organized with anchors of the guiding goals set by the Task Force.

**First level** is one of the guiding goals set by the Task Force  
**Second level** is a general implementation step to achieve the goal  
**Third level** is a specific recommendation of the Task Force to achieve the guiding goal  
**Fourth level** is a further specialization of the recommendation if necessary.
Specific Recommendations of Task Force #4

1. Increase transparency and information flow

Transparency, or ready access to the workings of governance, is a cornerstone of democracy. We can only hope to enhance transparency by making sure that every stakeholder in the governance process can access information in a timely and efficient manner, and without huge barriers. Regular reporting, especially at the formative stages of policy, is desirable.

1.1. Regular reporting from governance

Establishing regular procedures for reporting by governance bodies and office holders to constituencies at different levels will define expectations for information flow.

1.1.1. University standing committees (UCs) report to Faculty Council (FC) and Academic Council (AC) on a regular basis

At present, the normal operating procedure of standing committees is to work on proposals in seclusion and present the finished product to FC and/or AC for an up-or-down vote only after all of the ideas have been discussed, the work has been completed, and the proposal language has been set. Participation in FC and AC would become more meaningful if standing committees were required to give regular updates on their work. These updates, and the discussion that they may trigger, will enable FC and AC members to have more influence on decisions reached by the standing committees during the formative phases of proposal development.

This item could be accomplished by practice within governance. As TF1 develops a comprehensive package of proposed bylaw changes, this item should be considered for inclusion.

1.1.2. Faculty head of governance reports …

1.1.2.1. …to FC at each meeting

At each meeting, FC should schedule a brief report by the faculty head of governance to the body, just as the president’s report is a regular agenda item.

1.1.2.2. …to colleges

Regular reporting by the faculty head of governance to meetings of individual colleges’ faculty would allow topics to surface which may be of interest only to members of a particular college, and which might otherwise not get aired.

1.1.3. FC representatives report to “precincts” [identified groups of faculty within a college]

The “precincts” envisioned here are subdivisions of a given college, which may consist of one or more departments, or which may also be established based on other common interests of their members. Establishing a precinct structure in colleges and designating FC representatives for individual precincts would lead
to a governance structure that is more in line with the ideas of a representative democracy. An FC representative for a given precinct would be required to report issues before FC back to his/her precinct.

This item could be accomplished by practice within governance. As TF1 develops a comprehensive package of proposed bylaw changes, this item should be considered for inclusion.

1.1.4. Periodic announcements/reports

Establishing a culture in which periodic announcements from academic governance are expected will serve to keep the issues before academic governance on everybody’s “radar screen” during the academic year. Announcements could be published utilizing three parallel channels: print media (State News, MSU News Bulletin), email, and the governance web site.

The set of items below should become part of the culture of governance.

1.1.4.1. Short monthly column: “This Month in Governance”

A regular monthly column would serve to inform on issues under discussion before the outcomes are set and would allow input during the formative phase.

1.1.4.2. Yearly article in early fall: “Topics Before Governance This Year”

Listing the items that academic governance is expected to take up during the subsequent academic year would serve as an “early warning system” for constituencies and allow them to think about pertinent issues before final decisions are made.

1.1.4.3. Yearly article in late spring: “What Governance Achieved this Year”

A reflection on the accomplishments of governance during the academic year will lead to an increased understanding of and appreciation for the work of academic governance.

1.2. Make meetings more accessible

Faculty and students frequently complain that governance meetings are not well advertised. In addition, it is often unclear who can attend such meetings, and the agendas are often not publicized. The following suggestions, some of which are procedural and some technological, are meant to alleviate these concerns.

1.2.1. Open meetings to the public (except for personnel matters)

Limiting attendance is not conducive to democracy; we declare all meetings as open to the public, as long as they are not required to be restricted in order to protect the privacy concerns of individuals. This is a reiteration of existing policy now, but because of importance in an open system of governance, it should be reaffirmed.
1.2.2. **Provide public comment section at each meeting**

“Public comments” is a regular agenda item for the meetings of the Board of Trustees. The same policy should hold for each meeting in the academic governance system.

This issue should become part of the culture of governance.

1.2.3. **Open agendas to public access**

The publication of an agenda in a public forum (web site and/or newspaper) avoids the appearance of secrecy in meetings and allows all potentially concerned individuals to decide whether or not to attend.

This issue should become part of the culture of governance.

1.2.4. **Web stream AC, FC, ECAC, and Senate meetings, and archive these broadcasts**

All major meetings of academic governance should be broadcast via streaming technology for synchronous viewing by any constituents who cannot physically attend these meetings. These web streams should also be archived for asynchronous consumption by those who were unable to be present.

This is a technology issue, and does not entail changing bylaws, but rather is an issue to increase accessibility of governance. This issue does not involve any two way electronic interaction, nor any electronic voting for issues before bodies.

1.3. **Improve governance web site for information flow**

The web site of governance is the main communication channel for academic governance. Care should be taken that information be readily accessible on this web site.

1.3.1. **Re-engineer and reorganize the site**

The information available on the governance web site should be reorganized, with particular attention to usability. Organization of the site should be reviewed regularly (e.g., annually).

1.3.2. **Add Faculty/Board of Trustees liaison web page**

A simple web page, which informs faculty about the faculty/Board of Trustees liaison, should be available on the governance web site, so that faculty might easily communicate with their representative.

1.3.3. **Organize all standing committee web sites consistently, to facilitate storage and retrieval of information**

If all standing committee web sites use the same basic presentation format, then committee members and staff can use a consistent set of tools for storing information and viewers can retrieve this information reliably.
1.3.4. **Add section for governance log**
All governance actions should be logged with time and date stamps on the web site. Interested parties can thus see actions taken and progress achieved.

A key ingredient in an open and transparent system of governance is access for all to the issues that have been, and are now within the system. The governance log should be such a lynchpin. Any person for the MSU family should be able to access the governance log to find a current issue before governance and the committees(s) currently considering the issue.

1.3.5. **Archive topics considered and actions taken**
Archival of progress in governance is essential for all who are interested in following progress on particular problems or issues.

1.3.6. **Link university governance to college governances**
Providing links from the university governance web site to those of the college governance web sites, and vice versa, allows for a straightforward way to link both levels of governance to each other.

1.4. **Create equivalent of Academic Council in colleges**
Several colleges already have the equivalent of Academic Council. However, the implementations are non-uniform and should be generalized to all MSU colleges. What is meant by “equivalent of Academic Council” is a single body which includes faculty, administrators, and students in one deliberative body.

2. **Increase participation**
A universal complaint is the low participation in academic governance. The following recommendations are intended to facilitate an increase in participation by making it simpler to do so. Such participation is inclusive or those currently serving in governance, those who might in the future, and those others who simply seek to closely follow governance issues.

2.1. **Improve governance web site for access and participation**
The suggestions in these sections are meant to complement those in section 1.3, but we here focus on helping faculty and students gain input to governance processes.

2.1.1. **Add drop boxes**
A drop box for (possibly anonymous) complaints and suggestions has a long tradition in democratic institutions. The Internet equivalent of such a drop box should be implemented on our governance web site.

2.1.2. **Add voting capability**
The governance web site should be set up to facilitate voting on a variety of issues. Authentication of voters is essential, of course, as are secure, reliable collection of vote totals and optional anonymity when appropriate.

Voting now in governance is routinely conducted by email. The extension to voting by web means would require no new bylaw authorization.
2.1.3. Add contact phone numbers and email addresses

Presenting a way to contact the author/owner of a web site on each web page is good practice for any web site, but it is particularly important for the web site of academic governance, where user feedback is not just welcome, but essential for its functioning. (Email addresses should be presented as GIFs or JPGs, to forestall their collection by spammers.)

2.2. Enable RSS publication for governance via the MSU portal

RSS (real simple syndication) feeds are now commonly employed by many media outlets and web sites, including universities. They update web sites dynamically as news events unfold. Examples can be found on the MSU home and the Athletics Department web pages. RSS feeds are a “push” technology, in the sense that they direct information to the user without the user having to make a special effort to obtain that news. Proper configuration can insure that such RSS feeds will send only the information that each user wants and needs (cf., section 2.3.).

2.2.1. Create MSU portal for faculty that uses RSS technology to “push” governance information

2.2.2. Enable user-customized “profile” capability for RSS feed screening

Many RSS feeds of commercial news outlets are customizable and allow the user to focus only on certain types of news events. This type of profile capability should also be implemented for the governance RSS feeds in order to enable users to customize news feeds for their particular college affiliations and committee memberships.

2.3. Enable rapid feedback from campus when needed

Modern communication technologies, if properly used, can allow us to gather information rapidly when the need arises. The following are two suggestions to accomplish this task.

2.3.1. Monthly web-based campus-wide surveys on important topics

Academic governance could obtain a sense of how faculty and students feel about issues by conducting quick polls that give voters multiple-choice style options.

2.3.2. Binding web-based campus-wide referenda on important topics

In addition to polling functionality, web-based polling can also be used to conduct binding votes. Requisite features are proper announcements of pending votes, allowing a sufficiently long period to complete the votes, proper authentication procedures to prevent fraud, and, if appropriate, assurance of anonymity.

This issue would require a bylaw change and should be considered carefully. There is a tradeoff between broadening participation and face to face deliberation that is key in the discussion of this issue.
2.4. **Enable town meetings to augment Senate**

Academic senate meetings have, in many cases, suffered from poor attendance and have not attained a quorum. Augmenting in-person senate meetings by electronic means could allow faculty to remain at their offices (which are often geographically quite distant from MSU’s main campus) and still participate in senate meetings. Streaming web broadcasts of these meetings were already mentioned in section 1.2.4, above. In order to allow for full participation of remote observers in these meetings, the following steps can and should be taken.

2.4.1. **Enable two-way deliberation**

Full multi-point video conferencing is currently not cost-effective for use in academic governance. However, a low-cost alternative is to combine streaming broadcast technology with the use of conventional telephones. In the same way that an audience member waits at the microphone until recognized, remote participants could call a telephone number and wait to be recognized. The phone’s audio signal would be fed into the loudspeakers.

A traditional cornerstone of parliamentary procedure is that, to engage in the discussion of the body, it is preferable that anyone participating be present. Routine exceptions are made for telephone participation in standing committees. But to enable analogous function for the large bodies (Academic Council, Faculty Council, Academic Senate), a bylaw change would be required.

2.4.2. **Enable binding votes**

Remote participants could vote on issues before the Senate via computer. The same issues and precautions already discussed in section 2.4.2 would apply.

In terms of standard parliamentary procedure, this recommendation is the most radical, and would require a bylaw change.

2.5. **Enable electronic grass roots referenda by N faculty** [for some N, e.g. 1% of all faculty]

The constitution of the State of Michigan allows for issues to be put on election ballots, provided they have gathered a sufficient number of signatures that support the measure. Academic governance could implement a system of grass roots referenda leveraging electronic means. For an issue to be put to vote in front of the Academic Senate, a Senate member would have to initiate ballot language and get a sufficient number of colleagues to sign on to his measure.

Delineating the ability to create a grass roots referendum electronically and the functions of governance that would be covered under such a referendum would be necessary, and such a codification of this right would need to be effected by a by law change.

3. **Increase accountability**

In order for academic governance to achieve the goal of stronger participation, improved outcomes, and greater weight, one needs to ensure that elected members of academic governance remain accountable to their constituencies. The following recommendations,
technological as well as procedural, are meant to accomplish this goal of increased accountability.

3.1. **Information dissemination from each FC member via web**
   FC members should be expected to report back to their constituencies using web sites and email.

3.2. **Clear and complete listing of college representatives**
   Updated lists of FC representatives from each college should be published on each college’s web site.

3.3. **Develop FC “precincts” in colleges**
   Accountability increases if FC members feel directly responsible for their “precincts” (cf., section 1.1.3.). This precinct structure is implemented on the level of department advisory committees in some of the larger departments at MSU and accomplishes the stated goal.

3.4. **Publish attendance records for AC, FC, and standing committees of academic governance**
   Attendance is already taken at all FC, AC, and standing university committee meetings. These records should be publicly available.

3.5. **Create recall procedures for people serving in governance**
   Presently there exist no means to recall elected members of academic governance. Accountability would increase, if clear procedures on how to conduct a recall would be created and published. Grass-roots referenda on recalls could be one suggested way to accomplish this.

   This would require a bylaws change which would apply to every individual serving in governance.

3.6. **Automate check points for activities [e.g., filing of reports] using task scheduling software**
   Task scheduling software should be acquired and installed to automate recurring processes, to ensure that deadlines are observed, and generally to facilitate activities and processes in academic governance. Such scheduling aids would alert governance leaders to pending deadlines and advise them whenever deadlines were missed.

3.7. **Collect meta-data on outcomes (e.g., user satisfaction, user perceived problems)**
   Academic governance needs to be sure to serve its constituency. Users’ perceptions as to successful and unsuccessful functioning of the system should be collected regularly basis and should serve as a basis for improving the system.
Appendix 1

Survey to CIC Governance Leadership Members

and

Responses Received
Person responding ....... ____________________

...email address............ ____________________

... from institution ........ ____________________

Thank you for your time and effort. These results will be accumulated and used to help in the current process of governance reform at MSU. Once accumulated we will cycle the results back to the responders. Other than internal use within governance at MSU, no other use will be made of this data without expressly asking your permission.

1. Use of campus newspaper or newsletter (or other print media) to keep the community informed.
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

2. Governance covered on a regular basis by a reporter from you campus newspaper
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years
3. Regular “What’s happening in governance?” type column in your local print media on a weekly or monthly basis
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

   If regular column - who writes it? _______________________

---

4. Email to all faculty from central office of governance to disseminate information
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

5. Email to support information dissemination for committees
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

6. Email as a means to vote on committees
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

7. Email as means to make University wide nominations (procedure led by Central Office for governance)
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years
8. Email as a means to vote for University-wide position vote (vote conducted by Central Office for governance)
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

9. Email used for binding vote for University-wide issues before governance (vote conducted by Central Office for governance)
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

---

10. Web sites (or web like - e.g. ANGEL) used for committees
    a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
    b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
    c) plan to do this in the future
    d) have been doing this for ___ years

11. Linkage of committee web sites to enable to community to track issues
    a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
    b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
    c) plan to do this in the future
    d) have been doing this for ___ years

12. Web sites open to your whole (mostly) community
    a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
    b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
    c) plan to do this in the future
    d) have been doing this for ___ years

13. Web sites used to make available to the community a formal history of proceedings?
    a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
    b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
    c) plan to do this in the future
    d) have been doing this for ___ years
14. Web sites used to put up resource material for the committee? (Agendas, support docs...)
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

15. Web sites used for taking polls on topical issues to be debated by main legislative body(s) of governance
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

16. Web sites used for voting on candidates for governance positions
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

17. Web sites used for enabling binding university wide voting on issues before governance
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

---

18. Web broadcast of main University Level governance meetings in real time
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

19. Web broadcast of University Level governance meetings achieved for later viewing
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years
20. Input into debates before University level governance committees from “distance”
   participants
   a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
   b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
   c) plan to do this in the future
   d) have been doing this for ___ years

21. Tailored means to allow (self developed) faculty profiles to screen for relevant information
    coming from governance (e.g., RSS feeds)
    a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
    b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
    c) plan to do this in the future
    d) have been doing this for ___ years

22. Presence on your university home page of a link leading directly to your governance system
    a) are not doing this, nor probably will we
    b) are not doing this, but it sounds like a good idea
    c) plan to do this in the future
    d) have been doing this for ___ years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Response (a, b, c, or d)</th>
<th>any fill-in blanks</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>campus-faculty staff is now on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>also the central PA local newspaper covers senate hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;4</td>
<td>chair of senate writes a Senate Newsletter that is distributed 6 times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>this is done primarily to obtain the sense of the committee or conduct a vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>conduct online elections for senate officers &amp; extra senatorial positions; ie, P&amp;T, faculty rights &amp; responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>these votes occur at senate plenary sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Am not clear about question; some of our committee websites are linked to administrative sites or reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>the senate office publishes minutes, senate agendas &amp; senate records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5 mo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5 mo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Penn State IT services has a new portal to “push” info/we are integrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>one level (1 click) down from home page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c or d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&lt;10 infrequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&lt;10 infrequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5 Faculty Senate agenda &amp; documents only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>7 for Faculty Senate only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c, d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>&quot;many&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c, d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>comes to Senate meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>selective - sharepoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>some sites are in the public domain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>c,d</td>
<td></td>
<td>could do more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>for some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>not the &quot;home page&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c, d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>did for yrs. But publication was closed due to budget issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>but our participation was dropped by 60% with electronics vs paper solicitations &amp; balloting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>see above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>have done it rarely with previous agreement by the Body in face-to-face meeting to address urgent evening issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>but rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c, d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c or d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>do not follow the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a, b, c, d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>regularly over last few yrs.; sporatically in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>note: info goes back 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Response (a,b,c,d)</td>
<td>any fill-in blanks</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>many yrs. In Bloomington &amp; Univ. level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>all campuses have own lists &amp; there is a system-wide list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>once we determined how to deal with state-open records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>again, state-open records apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td>in Bloomington &amp; IUPUI, but haven't had to for whole syst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>in Bloomington, IUPUI &amp; University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>older files routinely flushed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*not web but video conference between campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 2. Tree Diagrams of Task Force 4 Specific Recommendation.

In appendices 2.A. through 2.C., the numbers 0 to 3 in parentheses at the ends of lines represent the estimated combined degree of difficulty and resources required for implementation, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Code</th>
<th>Degree of difficulty &amp; resources required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little additional effort, no additional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minimal effort and/or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Significant time commitment, no financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant time commitment, significant financial resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.A. First Two Tiers of the Task Force 4 Specific Recommendations.

This tree shows the first two tiers of the four-tiered map representing Task Force 4’s recommendations. The two additional tiers are shown in Appendices A2 and A3. A small box with a “+” sign at the end of a line indicates that that line will be expanded in one of those appendices.
Appendix 2.B. Expanded Section 1 of the Task Force 4 Specific Recommendations.
Appendix 2.C. Expanded Sections 2 & 3 of the Task Force 4 Specific Recommendations.

2. Increase participation
   - 2.1. Improve governance website
     - 2.1.1. Add drop boxes (1)
     - 2.1.2. Add voting capability (2)
     - 2.1.3. Add contact phone numbers and email addresses (1)
   - 2.2. Enable RSS publication for governance on the MSU portal
     - 2.2.1. Create MSU portal for faculty that uses RSS technology to "push" governance information (3)
     - 2.2.2. Enable user-customized "profile" capability for RSS feed screening (3)
   - 2.3. Enable rapid feedback from campus when needed
     - 2.3.1. Monthly web-based campus-wide survey on important topics (1)
     - 2.3.2. Binding web-based campus-wide reference on important topics (1)
   - 2.4. Enable town meetings to augment Senate
     - 2.4.1. Enable two-way deliberation (3)
     - 2.4.2. Enable binding votes (3)
   - 2.5. Enable grassroots referenda by faculty
     - For some N, e.g., 1% of all faculty (3)
   - 3. Increase accountability
     - 3.1. Information dissemination from each FC member via web (1)
     - 3.2. Clear and complete listing of college representatives (3)
     - 3.3. Develop FC "predicts" in Colleges (2)
     - 3.4. Publish attendance records for AC, FC, and standing committees of academic governance (1)
     - 3.5. Create recall procedure for people serving in governance (2)
     - 3.6. Automate check points for activities (e.g., filing of reports) using task scheduling software (1)
     - 3.7. Collect meta-data on outcomes [e.g., user satisfaction, user perceived problems] (3)
Faculty Voice Task Force 5:  
Recommendations Regarding Fixed Term Faculty  

March 31, 2006

I. Our Main Proposal

We propose that the Bylaws for Academic Governance be amended so that fixed term faculty who have served at least three consecutive years on full time appointment(s), and who are appointed at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, or librarian, will be included among (or with)

(1) the “voting faculty” who participate in the election of University councils and committees (see Bylaw 1.1.2.1)

(2) the “faculty members” who may be elected, to represent their unit in University-level academic governance bodies (see Bylaw 1.1.2.4), except the University Committee on Faculty Tenure;

(3) the “voting membership” of the Academic Senate (see Bylaw 3.1.1.1);

(4) the “voting members” of the Academic Council (see Bylaw 3.2.2.1);

(5) the “voting members” of the Faculty Council (see Bylaw 3.2.2.2); and

(6) the “voting faculty” who are counted in determining whether a college qualifies for more than the minimum two representatives that each college has on the Academic Council (see Bylaw 3.2.3.1);

Our rationale for this proposal is that there is a demonstrated mutual commitment between the University and many fixed term faculty such that they are therefore entitled to most, if not all, of the rights and privileges of tenure-system faculty. Our proposal is in the spirit of and in agreement with the Faculty Voice Report recommendation that fixed term faculty should generally have a greater role in university governance, commensurate with their importance in fulfilling the University’s main goals in teaching, research, and service.

We should note that while our task force was concerned about the possible implications of our proposal for the tenure system, we concluded that this is really a matter that faculty should raise with deans, and that needs to be addressed up the University structure. Increasing the participation of fixed term faculty in University-level governance will create but a very small, marginal incentive to hire temporary rather than tenure-system faculty. These concerns do not outweigh the benefits that will be realized from enhancing the due process rights of fixed term faculty with whom a mutual commitment to and from the University has been demonstrated.
II. What Needs to Be Changed Where in the Bylaws of Academic Governance

Mindful of the argument recently put forward that attention to Bylaws changes should be delayed until all the Faculty Voice Task Force recommendations have been presented and discussed, we nevertheless present below our best sense to date of which Bylaws changes are likely to be necessary for implementing our proposals. This is in part because our Task Force discussions centered on the Bylaws.

(1) In order to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “voting faculty” who participate in the election of University councils and committees, we propose the following change in Bylaw 1.1.2.1:

**Current:**

1.1.2.1. The voting faculty in the election of University councils and committees shall be all regular faculty engaged in the academic activities of the University on a regular basis.

**Proposed Change:**

1.1.2.1. The voting faculty in the election of University councils and committees shall be all regular faculty engaged in the academic activities of the University on a regular basis, and all persons appointed as temporary full-time faculty who have served three consecutive years on full time appointment(s), and who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, or who are persons appointed as librarians.

(2) In order to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “faculty members” who may be elected to represent their unit in academic governance bodies (except the University Committee on Faculty Tenure), we propose the following change in Bylaw 1.1.2.4:

**Current:**

1.1.2.4. A faculty member may be elected to an academic governance body as a representative of any unit in which the person holds regular faculty status.

**Proposed Change:**

1.1.2.4. A faculty member may be elected to an academic governance body as a representative of any unit in which the person holds regular faculty status, or in which the person is appointed as temporary full-time faculty, has served three consecutive years on full time appointment(s), holds the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, or is appointed as librarian.
(3) In order to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “voting membership” of the Academic Senate, we propose the following change in Bylaw 3.1.1.1:

**Current:**

3.1.1.1. The voting membership of the Senate shall be the regular faculty (1.1.1.1.) except for the President and Provost. Honorary faculty (1.1.1.3.) shall be members with voice but without vote. The presiding officer may vote to break a tie.

**Proposed Change:**

3.1.1.1. The voting membership of the Senate shall be the voting faculty as defined in 1.1.2.1 except for the President and Provost. Honorary faculty (1.1.1.3.) shall be members with voice but without vote. The presiding officer may vote to break a tie.

(4) In order to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “voting members” of the Academic Council, we propose the following change in Bylaw 3.2.2.1:

**Current:**

3.2.2.1. The voting members of Academic Council shall be the faculty representatives, student representatives, designated members of Academic Council Standing Committees, voting members of the Executive Committee, deans of academic programs, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of International Studies and Programs, Dean of the Honors College and the director of the Libraries.

**Proposed Change:**

3.2.2.1. The voting members of Academic Council shall be the faculty representatives as defined in 1.1.2.4, student representatives, designated members of Academic Council Standing Committees, voting members of the Executive Committee, deans of academic programs, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of International Studies and Programs, Dean of the Honors College and the director of the Libraries.

(5) In order to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “voting members” of the Faculty Council, we propose the following change in Bylaw 3.2.2.2:

**Current:**
3.2.2.2. The voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the elected faculty representatives and voting faculty members of the Executive Committee.

**Proposed Change:**

3.2.2.2. The voting members of the Faculty Council shall be the elected faculty representatives *as defined in 1.1.2.4 and the* voting faculty members of the Executive Committee.

(6) In order to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “voting faculty” who are counted in determining whether a college qualifies for more than the minimum two representatives that each college has on the Academic Council, we propose the following change in Bylaw 3.2.3.1:

**Current:**

3.2.3.1. Each college shall have at least two representatives. Each college shall have one additional representative for every fifty voting faculty in excess of fifty. Each college with three or more representatives shall have at least one non-tenured faculty member among its representatives.

**Proposed Change:**

3.2.3.1. Each college shall have at least two representatives. Each college shall have one additional representative for every fifty voting faculty, *as defined in 1.1.2.1,* in excess of fifty. Each college with three or more representatives shall have at least one non-tenured faculty member among its representatives.

(7) It will also be necessary to change Bylaw 4.2.1.10, so as to delineate more precisely which fixed term faculty are still covered there. That is, Bylaw 4.2.1.10 will apply to those fixed term faculty who do NOT meet our criteria as defined in 1.1.2.4 will only be electable to University standing committees if this is specifically provided for in their College’s Bylaws. Those fixed term faculty who DO meet the criteria in 1.1.2.4 are eligible for election to University standing committees under the provision of 1.1.2.4, that is, that right would no longer be dependent on their College’s Bylaws.

**Current:**

4.2.1.10. Where faculty members of a committee are elected in college elections, nominating procedures shall be specified in college bylaws. Colleges may, in their Bylaws, provide for election to any standing committees except the University Committee on Faculty Tenure or the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, of temporary faculty and/or Specialists in the job-security system.
**Proposed Change:**

4.2.1.10. Where faculty members of a committee are elected in college elections, nominating procedures shall be specified in college bylaws. Colleges may, in their bylaws, provide for election to any standing committees except the University Committee on Faculty Tenure or the University Committee on Faculty Affairs, of temporary faculty who do not qualify as eligible for being a representative under 1.1.2.4 and/or Specialists in the job-security system.

(8) In (2) above, we propose to include fixed term faculty among (or with) the “faculty members” who may be elected to represent their unit in academic governance bodies by the change we propose in Bylaw 1.1.2.4. That these fixed term faculty are not eligible for the University Committee on Faculty Tenure) can be accomplished by the following change in Bylaw 4.7.1, in the section on the University Committee on Faculty Tenure:

**Current:**

4.7.1. Each college, including the non-college faculty, shall select one member. The committee shall have at least three non-tenured faculty in its membership. Each year the Committee on Academic Governance shall designate which colleges, or college groupings, shall select non-tenured faculty. The committee shall have two undergraduate student members and one graduate student member selected so that one student is a member of the Academic Assembly of ASMSU. The Provost or a designee shall be a member with voice but no vote.

**Proposed Change:**

4.7.1. Each college, including the non-college faculty, shall select one member who must be a faculty member who is appointed under the rules of tenure. The committee shall have at least three non-tenured faculty in its membership. Each year the Committee on Academic Governance shall designate which colleges, or college groupings, shall select non-tenured faculty. The committee shall have two undergraduate student members and one graduate student member selected so that one student is a member of the Academic Assembly of ASMSU. The Provost or a designee shall be a member with voice but no vote.