

9/AS/11/K. Jasek-Rysdahl, K. Stone, J. Strong, D. Shimek Recommendations of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate supports the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee, and, be it further

Resolved: that the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee present these recommendations to the President's Senior Staff for approval, and, be it further

Resolved: that upon the approval by both faculty leadership and administration, they will collaborate in order to implement the recommendations.

Resolved: that the Senate Executive Committee will update the Academic Senate at least once a semester regarding progress made in implementing these recommendations, and, be it further

Rationale:

The members of the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee are Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker, Koni Stone, Speaker-elect, James Strong, Provost/VP of Academic Affairs, and Dennis Shimek, Interim VP of Human Resources and Faculty Affairs. The members of this ad hoc committee met on a regular basis since November of 2010.

The group was charged to develop a plan of specific actions to address campus morale, improve communication between faculty and upper administration, and rebuild a productive working environment. The Ad Hoc TRPC will present draft proposals to various campus groups for input and eventual approval.

The charge also indicated that the ad hoc committee will also present draft proposals and seek eventual approvals of the recommendations from the Academic Senate and the President's Senior Staff.

The members of the ad hoc committee regularly referred to a survey of faculty conducted in September of 2010. Respondents to the survey indicated that respect for shared governance which included following existing policies and procedures was critical to rebuilding trust. When there are disagreements between faculty and administration, the structures of shared governance that are in place need to be used to resolve issues.

Improving communication and the quality of the dialogue between faculty and administration was another theme of the responses to the survey. The university's statement on shared governance states clearly that there should be "Early inclusion of faculty in identifying issues and in agenda setting, ongoing consultation, much of it face-to-face, as an iterative process between faculty and administration to reach understanding, and substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreement cannot be reached."

The following recommendations are meant to address these issues through actions that respect shared governance and productive communication between faculty and administration. It also includes a general outline regarding implementation of each recommendation. While it is hoped that implementing these recommendations will have positive impact on trust, it will be up to others (WASC Research Team for example) to document changes in trust.

Recommendation 1

The TRPC should continue to meet to address issues of trust, leadership and governance. The continuation and membership of this committee will be evaluated at least once a year.

The TRPC should continue to meet with a slightly different charge. Specifically, TRPC will be charged to:

- Have regular, ongoing, face-to-face interaction at minimum, every other week.
- Identify areas of conflict
- Discuss concerns regarding university issues
- Continue to develop ways to address issues of trust, leadership, and governance

Rationale:

The committee has worked hard to increase communication between faculty governance and upper administration. One benefit of this is that faculty and administrators have been able to address issues directly as issues have come up. While there has been more communication and the group has been able to address some issues, much more work needs to be completed.

Process indicators:

The committee will continue to discuss issues as they come up.

Recommendation 2

SEC and COC will be responsible for recruiting faculty for all faculty appointments to university committees.

SEC and COC will work with the administration to recruit and appoint faculty members to university related boards.

SEC will work with these faculty members to develop more consistent communication regarding the activities of the committees and boards.

Rationale:

There have been faculty appointments to some university related committees and boards without consultation with appropriate governance committees. This has resulted in a lack of trust of the activities of those entities.

Faculty governance and the rest of the university community often hear about the activities of these boards or committees when they are published for the whole community. This also contributes to a lack of trust when community members contact people at the university and they know less about the action than the person who is contacting them.

Process indicators:

- COC and SEC will get requests to recruit faculty for university committees and boards.
- Request to COC will include: number of faculty representatives needed, criteria of representatives e.g. representative from each College, experience in certain area, tenured or tenure track, etc., when appointment(s) are needed, frequency of meetings, when they will meet, expected duration of the committee, who the committee reports to, charge of the committee, overall composition of the committee.
- COC will be responsible for tracking requests and notifying SEC regarding compliance.

- SEC will request that all faculty who are appointed to university committees periodically provide updates regarding the work of the committee.

Recommendation 3

Administration will work through the normal the Academic Senate committee structure to develop University Extended Education policies regarding special programs, summer session, and winter intersession.

Rationale:

University Extended Education is an area of great importance for all at the university. It is also an area where there are many concerns and issues.

We need better policies as more emphasis is being put on revenue generation in special sessions. Concerns have been raised regarding the distribution of revenues, costs of operation, student fees, and course selection. There are also questions regarding the approval processes for courses and programs that are offered through UEE.

Process indicators:

Administration will share current policy and practices regarding special programs, summer session and winter intersession with SEC along with a request to develop policy.

SEC will share information with appropriate committees for review.

Governance committees will begin work in Fall 2011 with a goal of going to the Academic Senate for review and approval in Spring 2012

Recommendation 4

The President will share his proposal for Endowed Professorships with faculty governance and will submit it for review and revision.

Until a policy is developed, the administration will consult with deans, academic departments, and academic program reviews when endowed professorship opportunities arise.

Searches to fill endowed professorships will not begin or continue until a policy has been approved by the Academic Senate.

Rationale:

There is a long and well established principle that faculty control the curriculum. Faculty appointments are a critical element of curriculum delivery and design. Colleges and departments must follow well established procedures when requesting new faculty lines. Currently, the practice for creating and filling endowed professorships is not aligned with these procedures.

The absence of policy regarding this leads to inconsistent processes that result in questions regarding the purpose of these positions.

Process indicators:

The administration will bring a proposed policy document to SEC.

SEC will ask relevant committees to study the proposal and suggests revisions.

SEC will work with administration to revise the proposal based on suggestions.

Document will be forwarded to the Senate in Fall of 2011.

The next search begins after the policy has been approved.

Recommendation 5

Committee on Committees will work with appropriate administrators and committees to examine the membership of some administration and faculty governance committees to increase communication between faculty and administration. Any recommendations will go through the regular governance processes for review.

Committees to examine first should be the Provost's Deans Council, President's Senior Staff, University Budget Advisory Committee, Enrollment Planning Committee, and Leaves and Awards.

Rationale:

Continue to expand the joint communication and consultation process on issues that are of joint interest to both the senate and the administration.

Process indicators:

This process will begin in Fall 2011 and will be ongoing.

Recommendation 6

The Speaker, URPTC, and FAC will work with administration to develop a process to gather information regarding RPT from the provost, deans, department RPT committees, department chairs, and candidates who are going through the review cycle or have just completed the review cycle.

The goal will be to gather information about the perceptions people have about the RPT policy and procedures. This information will be used to examine our policies and procedures to determine if any steps can be taken to reduce the conflict that is created every year on this campus. Any recommendations will go through the normal faculty governance evaluation process.

Rationale:

Faculty members perceive that administrators want to increase research expectations and that administrators are applying their own criteria and definitions for acceptable research when evaluating faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. There have been questions from deans and other administrators regarding elaborations and their role in reviewing the elaborations.

Process indicators:

This process will begin in Fall 2011 and will be ongoing.

Revised 5/10/11

Approved by the Academic Senate on 5/10/11 Sense of the Senate