

## SENATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

**Committee Members: Joy Calico, Malcolm Getz, Scott Hiebert, Larry LeBlanc, Charles Lukehart, Anne Moore, Cynthia Paschal, Tony Weil.**

### *CHARGES 2008-2009*

1. Review, and discuss with the Chancellor and members of the Board of Trust, ways in which the Faculty Senate might engage more fully in Shared Governance of University activities; these discussions would include, but not be limited to, the possibility of a Senator being appointed a member of the Board of Trust.
2. Evaluate the number and composition of present Senate committees to determine if any should be changed, added, or dropped.
3. Determine if a carry-over of nominations for University Awards from one year to another is allowable under the current guidelines of the University; if not, the Committee will consider a recommendation to allow such individuals to be renominated without having to go through the entire nomination process again.

***1. Before any discussion with the Chancellor or members of the Board of Trust, it was decided that it would be prudent to survey peer institutions to determine how they shared governance with their BOTs. The following is a summary of the survey of peer institutions and their faculty representation on the Board of Trustees or equivalent:***

An attempt was made to survey the following schools to determine the extent of Senate Faculty involvement on the BOT: Carnegie Mellon, Case Western, Cornell, Dartmouth, Duke, Emory, Johns Hopkins, MIT, Northwestern, Rochester, Washington University. I was unable to reach anyone at **MIT**; **Johns Hopkins and Dartmouth** do not appear to have a Faculty Senate or Faculty Council. I am not sure how governance between the faculty and BOT of the latter two schools is structured.

Participation on BOT ranged widely in the remaining eight peer institutions from no members on the BOT (**Case Western, Rochester, Northwestern**; individuals from these schools all expressed a strong desire, however, to have a senate member on the BOT) - to a Faculty Senate Member being a voting member of the BOT (**Cornell**). A number of the schools do have Faculty Senate Members or equivalent who are *ex officio* members of BOT (**Wash. U., Carnegie Mellon**). One University did not have faculty representation as a member of the BOT, but did have faculty serving on most BOT subcommittees (**Duke**).

At **Emory**, the Chair and the Chair-Elect of the Faculty Senate serve as *ex officio* members of the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the BOT, and faculty counselors (who may or may not be members of the Senate) sit on all subcommittees of the BOT *except* those on compensation and executive governing. Moreover, the Chair of the BOT speaks to the Senate on occasion, and the Chair and Chair-Elect are invited to one full board meeting a year; there appeared to be a very good working relationship between the BOT and the Faculty Senate. More than any of the other schools, there appeared to be a genuine satisfaction with the interaction between the Faculty Senate and BOT.

***2. There are currently 5 standing Senate committees (Academic Policies and Services; Faculty Life; Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom; Senate Affairs; Student Life).***

There was no strong feeling about a need to change by adding or subtracting the number of standing Senate committees. No further action was taken.

***Comment: Review of the standing Senate committees is probably of value and should be done periodically to ensure adequate coverage of issues important to the faculty and faculty/student interactions.***

***3. Suggestion on change of policy regarding carry-over nominations for University Awards.***

The Harvie Branscomb Distinguished Professor and Thomas Jefferson Faculty Awards are selected by the Chancellor after nominations are reviewed by the Consultative Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Alexander Heard Distinguished Service and Joe B. Wyatt Distinguished Professor Faculty Awards are also selected by the Chancellor, after review of nominations by the Executive or Consultative Committees of the Faculty Senate and recommendation by the Provost.

It has been suggested that individuals who are nominated for, but do not receive, these awards in a given year have their nomination packages automatically forwarded for consideration in the coming academic year.

After the meeting of 10/2/08 of the Faculty Senate Affairs Committee, it was generally agreed that individuals who have been nominated *may* have their nomination packages forwarded for one year if the following requirements are met: 1) a new cover letter, to accompany the previous letter, must be submitted by the nominator detailing any new or additional information relevant to the nominee's qualification for the award; and 2) the nominee must submit an updated curriculum vitae.

We believe this will allow for qualified individuals to be considered for two consecutive years for a given Faculty Award. After the second year, a nominee would have to be re-nominated and would be required to submit a complete nomination package, including new internal and external letters if required, as well as any other documentation.

***Comment: It was suggested that nominations for ALL of the awards be reviewed by one committee (for example the Consultative Committee) and then be forwarded to the Chancellor – in order to make this process more uniform and streamlined.***