A quick summary of some decisions made in this period:

GovCom
- Dealt with details around 2007-08 GER revision
- Studied, then implemented new student evaluation form
- Formalized College Financial Advisory Committee

College faculty as a whole
- Two by-laws changes (proposed and formulated by GovCom, approved by faculty)
- One GER change (reduce PE requirement)
- Change of advising from FAME to PACE

Routine business not listed in the summary below includes:
- A formal charge of GovCom was to set the agenda for the College faculty meetings, so this was often discussed and approved at GovCom meetings. In practice, often the administration helped set the agenda for College meetings.
- GovCom was in charge of the nominations process for standing committees. The College faculty approved the slate of nominees each year at a regular College meeting. When replacements were needed at random times, GovCom took care of that unilaterally.
- The President and Provost met with the College faculty each semester. Sometimes GovCom came up with a list of questions to ask them, provided to the President and Provost in advance. (For example, during the financial crisis this was done.)

In the details below, the bulleted points are votes taken. Otherwise a brief parenthetical comment gives some idea what happened at a given meeting. Minutes for all meetings are available on the ECAS Faculty Governance website.

2008-09

GovCom Aug 21, 2008
- Discussed new GERs (report from GER tagging implementation committee). Five policy changes were recommended by the implementation committee, and GovCom approved all of them. [Example: “Students who do not pass their freshman seminar course in their first year must take an additional WR course in order to graduate.”]

GovCom Sep 3, 2008 (discussions)

College Sep 17, 2008 (new faculty introduction)

GovCom Oct 8, 2008
- Student Evaluation Task Force formed (chair: Harold Gouzoules)
• Education Abroad Committee: previously informally organized by CIPA, but voted to formally establish EAC as subcommittee of GovCom

College Oct 15, 2008 (Student eval task force announced; President & Provost talked)

GovCom Nov 19, 2008 (discussion of student advising)

College Nov 19, 2008 (discussion of student advising)

GovCom Dec 3, 2008 (reports from standing committee chairs)

GovCom Dec 10, 2008 (discussion of what advising models to present at College meeting)

College Dec 10, 2008
  • Intense discussion followed by vote to replace FAME with what became known as PACE advising

GovCom Jan 21, 2009: (discussions of budget crisis)

College Jan 21, 2009 (President Wagner discussing financial crisis)

GovCom Feb 11, 2009
  • College Financial Advisory Committee (CFAC) was ad hoc, formed by Dean Paul. GovCom voted to formally constitute this as a sub-committee of GovCom

College Feb 11, 2009 (discussed financial crisis. CFAC announced, call for nominations)
  • Motion passed asking LGS to reconsider cuts to graduate student lines

GovCom Mar 18, 2009
  • GovCom confirmed new membership of CFAC

College Mar 18, 2009 (discussions)

GovCom Apr 15, 2009
  • All-ECAS-faculty listserv proposed, agreed to do this

College Apr 29, 2009 (brief discussions, recognition of retiring faculty)

GovCom May 6, 2009 (reports from standing committee chairs)

College May 6, 2009 (discussion of financial crisis with Dean Paul)

2009-10

GovCom Aug 25, 2009 (discussions)

GovCom Sep 2, 2009 (discussion of PACE, PE, plans for meeting with Dean Tedesco)
College Sep 9, 2009 (introduction of new faculty)

College Sep 16, 2009 (discussion of 5-year plan with Dean Paul)

GovCom Sep 29, 2009 (discussion with Dean Tedesco about LGS and financial crisis)

GovCom Sep 30, 2009 (discussion of PE component of GER with Paula Stauf, Chair of PE)

GovCom Oct 7, 2009 (discussion of PE component of GER)

College Oct 7, 2009 (discussion with CFAC about budget crisis)

College Oct 14, 2009 (discussion of ECAS SWOT analysis and budget with Deal Paul)

GovCom Oct 28, 2009
  • Voted to approve Student Evaluation Task Force recommendations; discussed at subsequent December 2, 2009 College faculty meeting

GovCom Nov 18, 2009 – meeting cancelled due to lack of business

College Dec 2, 2009 (discussion of new Student Evaluation form)

GovCom Dec 9, 2009 – meeting cancelled due to lack of business

GovCom Jan 20, 2010 (discussions, including presentations from chairs of standing committees)

College Jan 20, 2010 (President & Provost)

GovCom Feb 3, 2010 (discussion of PE)

College Feb 10, 2010 (discussion of credit hour issue, discussion of fundraising)

GovCom Feb 24, 2010 (discussions)
  • Resolution passed expressing disappointment with process around new University travel policy, to be sent to University Faculty Senate
  • Similar resolution passed reasserting GovCom’s rights to review major ECAS policy matters that directly affect faculty members

GovCom Apr 7, 2010 (discussion of reducing PE component of GER)

College Apr 14, 2010
  • Should PE component of GER be reduced? Motion failed: GER unchanged.

2010-11
GovCom Aug 23, 2010
Philip Wainwright has a pre-college advisory committee and sought a connection with GovCom. GovCom voted to endorse Wainwright’s plans and appointed a GovCom member to sit on the committee.

College Sep 1, 2010 (new Dean Forman’s introduction meeting)

GovCom Sep 8, 2010 (discussion of new leave policy, pre-college program)

GovCom Sep 10, 2010 (discussion of how to teach health: PE 101 no longer an option)

College Sep 22, 2010 (new faculty, newly promoted faculty)

GovCom Oct 13, 2010
  • Formulated proposed by-laws change to allow faculty to self-designate their division

College Oct 20, 2010 (President & Provost visit, bylaws change distributed for future vote)

GovCom Nov 10, 2010 (various discussions, including credit hours)

College Nov 17, 2010
  • Vote regarding faculty self-designating their division. Majority in favor, but a confusion arose related to how this vote was conducted, so question left undecided.

GovCom Dec 8, 2010 (reports from standing committee chairs)

College Jan 19, 2011 (visit from President and Provost)

GovCom Feb 2, 2011 (discuss reducing PE requirement, now at request of PE dept)

College Feb 9, 2011
  • New vote regarding faculty self-designating their division. Motion passed.
  • Vote on increasing GPA requirement for honors: Motion failed.

College Mar 2, 2011
  • 1st vote to change GERs to reduce PE requirement as PE department has reduced faculty

GovCom Mar 23, 2011 (discussions)

College Mar 30, 2011
  • 2nd vote to change GER to reduce PE requirement: motion passed, GER change official.

GovCom Apr 20, 2011 (reports from standing committees)

College Apr 27, 2011 (recognition of retiring faculty)
  • Add to by-laws: need to mention Professors of P where it was missing. Motion passed.
APPENDIX 2

Faculty Senate Review

TIMELINE FOR EVENTS LEADING TO THE CREATION OF THE ECAS FACULTY SENATE

- **Sept 2012**: Dean Forman announces changes/cuts to ECAS programs and departments.

- **Dec 2012**: Emory College faculty meeting. In response to the cuts in programs, two motions are proposed: 1) Review of faculty governance at Emory and peer institutions; and 2) A review of the process leasing to the programmatic changes, including a review of the Dean’s Advisory Committee. There are issues with the motions and general confusion about the proper procedure for passing a motion.

- **Jan 8, 2013**: GovCom meeting. More discussion of the motions, College By-Laws, and faculty governance.

- **Jan 17, 2013**: GovCom meeting. Discussion of Roberts Rules of Order and confusion resulting from the December faculty meeting. Discussion of ways to increase faculty participation in decision-making processes within the college.

- **Feb 7, 2013**: GovCom meeting. Proposal to create two elected committees: Shared Faculty Governance Committee (SFGC) to review faculty governance at Emory and peer institutions and Process Review Committee (PRC) to review the recent decisions on programmatic cuts and the Dean’s Advisory Committee that was part of those decisions.

- **Sept 4, 2013**: GovCom meeting. The charge of the SFGC was articulated along with a discussion about establishing electronic voting.

- **mid-Sept, 2013**: The SFGC presented its findings to the college faculty and articulated a set of guiding principles for faculty governance. The committee made several recommendations including establishing electronic voting procedures and recommending a representative governance structure that could take one of several possible suggested forms.

- **Feb 5, 2014**: GovCom meeting. Review and discussion of the SFGC and PRC reports. The committee made a strong recommendation that a representative faculty senate government structure replace the current system.

- **March 5, 2014**: College faculty meeting. GovCom led discussion of faculty governance.

- **April 2, 2104**: GovCom meeting. Discussion of feedback from March 5 faculty meeting. Discussion of practical issues related to creation of a faculty Senate.

- **May 1, 2014**: GovCom meeting. Discussion of next steps in creating a new structure for faculty governance. Decision to develop a plan for a faculty Senate over the summer months, based on SFGC recommendations.

- **Sept 24, 2014**: Draft of new by-laws discussed.
• **Oct 1, 2104**: Line by line discussion of the draft by-laws and reasons for moving towards a senate model.

• **Oct 14, 2014**: College faculty meeting. Power point presentation by GovCom including discussion of faculty governance, the proposed new senate structure, goals for representation, and next steps.


• **Nov 12, 2014**: College faculty meeting. Discussion of proposed new bylaws and faculty senate.

• **Jan 14, 2105**. GovCom meeting. Final changes to proposed bylaws, standing committees, and senate made.

• **Feb 18, 2015**. College faculty meeting. New College bylaws passed.

• **April 1, 2015**. Final meeting of GovCom. Discussion of nominations for the new senate and new standing committees.

• **August 25, 2015**. First meeting of newly elected Senate at which its specific bylaws passed.
Executive Summary

The committee reviewed existing empirical literature on shared faculty governance, multiple models of faculty governance from other institutions, faculty governance structures in place at Emory University, and interviews with key stakeholders, and found little consensus on best practices. Rather, the committee concludes that there are clear guiding principles for creating transparent, effective and efficient faculty governance, which include:

1. A focus on the academic mission of the college
2. Maintaining open avenues of communication to facilitate an informed and engaged faculty
3. The need to specify processes that allow adaptability and flexibility to meet changing circumstances and demands in a timely fashion
4. A governance structure that allows significant investment of time from those faculty making decisions to fully study and advise administrators on current issues.
5. Strong partnerships and trust between faculty and administration

Based on these principles, the committee makes the following recommendations:

- As a first and immediate step toward more representative faculty governance, the committee strongly recommends that the college faculty change the bylaws to allow electronic voting. This is a critical step in allowing all faculty to have a voice in deciding the future of shared faculty governance.
- The committee recommends that either Gov Comm or a representative group of elected faculty, in consultation with the dean, begin to articulate a new vision for ECAS, that will be honed and revised through broader faculty input.
- The committee recommends Gov Comm or a representative group of elected faculty conducts a thorough review of the structure and processes of the current college standing committees to ascertain if and how these committees might be better constituted.
- The committee recommends a representative governance structure that could take one of several possible suggested forms.
- To include faculty in decisions to create or close programs, the committee recommends that reviews should follow a multi-stage process to be defined formally by Gov Comm.
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1. The work of the committee

   a. The immediate context: why this committee was formed and our mandate

At the December 12, 2012 faculty meeting of the Emory College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS) the faculty passed a motion by a large majority to create a committee to examine the structure of faculty governance of ECAS and to recommend structural reforms independently of the process being undertaken by the Governance Committee. The Shared Faculty Governance Committee was formed in accord with the processes laid out in this motion, and was tasked with the following mandate:

   a. Review the existing governance structures of ECAS
   b. Review the bylaws on faculty governance
   c. Review the relationship between College governance bodies and other governing bodies of the University, particularly the LGS Executive Council
   d. Investigate other models of faculty governance (especially those at colleges of a similar size and with similar missions)
   e. Consult organizations (such as the national AAUP) with expertise in faculty governance
   f. Solicit faculty input through open meetings and through other venues decided by the subcommittee
   g. Interview faculty they feel have particular expertise in faculty governance
   h. Write a report on faculty governance including a literature review of other models of governance.

   b. The work thus far

Committee members met multiple times across the spring and summer 2013, as well as sharing information on a regular basis through email and a dedicated BB site. At the initial meeting, members discussed the mandate and specific steps to be taken to meet this mandate, and across meetings information about what we had learned and additional steps needed continued to be discussed. Notes from initial meetings are appended to this report. Subsequent meetings are documented through the series of reports and recommendations.

In preparing this report, committee members gathered data from multiple sources:

   • Literature review of research on faculty governance
• Web based searches of governance structures of peer institutions
• Solicitation of good models from the full faculty and follow-up on these suggestions through our own searches
• Responses from chairs of standing Emory College governance committees
• Interviews with relevant constituents
  ▪ Dean Forman
  ▪ Former Dean Bobby Paul
  ▪ Micheal Giles, Previous chair of gov.com
  ▪ Sharon Strocchia, President of Emory chapter of AAUP

2. Literature Review

a. Defining Shared Faculty Governance:

“Shared governance is the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions” (American Federation of Teachers, 2006, p.4). Consistencies within universities consist of administrators, faculty, staff and students, operating under a Board of Trustees.

b. The National Context:

History of shared faculty governance. Although the concept of shared faculty governance seems intuitively and obviously necessary for an academic institution, in fact, shared faculty governance was not the norm at the beginning of higher education in this country (see Jones, 2011, for a review). In colonial times, colleges were run by governing boards and presidents in a hierarchical top-down fashion. In the early 1800s, Harvard faculty challenged this model and in 1826 Harvard instituted faculty governance structures that allowed faculty control over student admissions, discipline and curriculum. Through the next 150 years, colleges and universities operated under individually developed guidelines for faculty governance. In 1966 the “Statement on Government in Colleges and Universities”, a joint statement from the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, provided guidelines outlining responsibilities and authority for both administrators and faculty. This statement included two core principles: 1) important actions should involve, at one point or another in the process, decision-making participation of all institutional components; and 2) differences in the weighing of each voice in this process should be determined by the particular matter at hand. Thus the document concludes that governance should be both shared and segmented.

The current state of shared faculty governance. Higher education more generally, and the liberal arts more specifically, are facing multiple challenges in the current economic and political environment. Calls for accountability and responsiveness to changing perceptions of the role of the academy have led to calls, such as the 1998 statement from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, for the curtailing of faculty governance in favor of reiterating the authority of boards and presidents to make quick and efficient decisions (see Birnbaum, 2004, for an overview of these arguments). In this context, the efficiency and
effectiveness of shared governance has become a topic of focused research attention (see recent special issues of New Directions for Higher Education, 2004; and Academe, 2001). In particular, more “corporate” models have been replacing more “consensual” models of faculty governance (Lee, 1998). In responding to this challenge, it is critical to examine the empirical evidence regarding shared faculty governance.

c. Review of the literature on shared faculty governance

Here, we provide a summary of research on:
- level of faculty involvement in shared governance
- the effectiveness of shared faculty governance on university outcomes
- critical aspects of processes of shared faculty governance.

It should be noted at the outset that virtually all of the research focuses on the university level rather than at the unit/school level within universities, and examines faculty/administrative structures and processes at the level of provosts and presidents rather than deans. Almost all of the models examined are some form of faculty senate governance structure. Still, although this research may not speak directly to the issues considered by this committee, the findings provide a good starting point. After summarizing the existing research on shared faculty governance more broadly, we turn to the limited research on shared faculty governance specifically on issues of program and department restructuring and closings.

**Faculty involvement in shared governance.** Much of the research on shared governance has focused on faculty perception and faculty involvement. Overall, large scale surveys have confirmed that the majority of faculty at 4 year colleges and universities positively affirm support for shared governance (e.g., Jones, 2011; Tierney & Minor, 2003). In Tierney and Minor’s (2003) study of over 3800 individuals at 750 colleges and universities, over 80% of faculty strongly support shared governance. Interestingly, over 75% of faculty surveyed thought there was sufficient levels of trust between administration and faculty, and over 70% thought there was sufficient communication. Yet this same report also found that 43% of these individuals did not think their respective faculty senates were valued, and less than 50% of faculty think that faculty members are sufficiently involved in campus decision making. Thus, whereas most faculty endorse shared governance and express trust and open communication with administration, they simultaneously think that faculty are not sufficiently involved in decision-making.

In terms of areas where faculty are actively involved in campus decision making, reviews of shared faculty governance reveals that faculty influence has been most prominent in academic decisions, such as curriculum and teaching standards, and, in most institutions, this also includes standards for tenure and promotion. Areas where faculty have the least shared governance are setting budget priorities and evaluating presidents (Birenbaum, 2004; Brown, 2001). Although most institutions surveyed in these large reviews converge on finding that faculty have little governing authority over budgets, in most institutions, faculty are often consulted about mergers and/or discontinuations of programs. However, overall, faculty involvement in budgeting and reorganization is low.
Effectiveness of shared governance. Somewhat surprisingly, several large scale reviews and case studies of the effectiveness of shared faculty governance have found that the structure of faculty governance has little impact on final decisions (Birenbaum, 2004; Brown, 2001; Jones, 2011; Kaplan, 2004). Structure refers to organizational structure, lines of authority, roles, procedures and bodies responsible for decision making (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Given the lack of relations between faculty governance structures and outcomes, it becomes critical to examine how outcomes are defined. At the most abstract level, outcome is conceptualized as efficiency and effectiveness, where efficiency is defined as response time and ability to meet competing demands flexibly, and effectiveness is defined in terms of achieving a quality decision based on evidence and integrity of processes (Kezar, 2004). Although there may not be overall relations between how faculty governance is structured and university outcomes, it may be that faculty governance does matter for more specific outcomes.

Studies have thus begun to examine more specific relations between areas in which faculty have more voice and resulting outcomes and have found that the picture is mixed. In some areas, shared governance leads to more positive outcomes and in some areas, more shared faculty governance leads to more negative outcomes. For example, McCormick and Meiners (as discussed in Jones, 2011) found that more autocratically run departments were more productive in terms of faculty publications than more democratically run departments. Using the 2001 Survey of Higher Education Governance, Cunningham (2009) examined effects of governance structures on three indicators: 1) the number of presidents over the past 3 decades (as a measure of institutional stability); 2) institutional finance measured as faculty salaries and expenditures per student, and 3) strategic policy decisions, measured as input into program closings and setting teaching loads. The finding most central for this committee is that “the proportion of faculty participation in all examined areas had no relationship to the likelihood of program closure or of a president with a background in academia” (p. 29). Higher levels of shared faculty governance was actually related to lower faculty salaries, but also to lower teaching loads. Brown (2001) examined 584 universities, and assessed the specific areas in which faculty shared governance in relation to student outcomes (SATs on incoming freshman), overall university ranking, and faculty salaries. When faculty were more involved in making decisions regarding curriculum, it was associated with positive student outcomes, but not rankings or salaries. When faculty were more involved in making budgetary decisions, it was associated with more negative outcomes on all three indicators. Overall, there is consensus in the research data that shared faculty governance especially around budgetary issues may actually be detrimental on a number of specific university outcome measures.

Principles and processes of shared governance. Given the somewhat surprising findings of a negative relation between shared faculty governance on budget issues and outcomes, several researchers have argued that structure of shared governance may not be the critical factor in outcome; rather processes by which decisions are made may be more important (Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Lapworth, 2004; Tierney, 2001; 2004). Stemming from culture theory, Tierney (2001; 2004) has argued that faculty governance must be understood within a set of situated meanings that allow faculty and administrators to create not just shared decisions, but shared meanings. There must be communications about the goals and constraints and resources available to meet those goals. Similarly, Kezar (2004) argues that principles of trust and
leadership are critical in creating effective shared governance. Trust within university governance structures entails competence, openness, benevolence and reliability (Pope, 2004). Discussion of process changes the focus from effective outcomes per se to examining how faculty involvement may impact effectiveness. Critical issues include when and what kind of information is available to faculty, how is faculty input solicited and used in decision making and how dialogue is established and maintained.

Although there are no empirical studies ascertaining the relations between process and outcomes, based on a process-oriented approach to faculty governance, scholars have argued for core processes that are necessary for creative, flexible and responsive shared governance (Lee, 1991; Tierney, 2001). General principles include:

- Frequent formal and informal communication between administrators and faculty.
- Leadership training for faculty as they move into faculty governance positions.
- Reward structure for service.
- Creating specific goals for specific committees; and creating timelines of meeting those goals.
- Access to information early in the process, and continuing throughout the process.
- Inclusion of multiple constituencies in decision making.

Principles of openness and inclusiveness are paramount.

d. **Research on faculty participation in department and program closings**

Given the context within which this committee was formed, we provide a more specific review of research that has examined the role of faculty governance in making decisions about department / program re-organizations and closings. Eckel (2000; 2002) has conducted case studies of the role of shared faculty governance in 4 universities that have closed program and departments. Briefly:

- **University of Maryland at College Park.** The university has an Academic Planning Advisory Committee at the provostial level to review financial implications of academic program changes, as well as a faculty senate. The provost asked the senate’s executive committee to develop a set of criteria for closing programs/ departments and also asked each dean to recommend programs to close. These reports were considered by the provost and the Academic Planning Advisory Committee and 9 departments and 2 colleges were recommended for closure. This report was disseminated and faculty were asked to discuss the implications of these closings in a series of forums. About 10% of faculty participated. When this process was complete, the senate supported the recommendations (they served an advisory role) and theses closings were instituted.

- **Oregon State University.** The president informed the faculty he was closing one college and 13 departments. Three years earlier the president and provost assigned three deans to produce a document on guidelines for program redirection and criteria for program reduction and termination and, in consultation with the deans, the president and provost
followed these guidelines in making the decisions. The Faculty Consultative Group, a committee of the senate, was unable to access much information during this process due to confidentiality clauses. Once the decisions were made public there was little opportunity for response, and all closings were instituted.

- **University of Rochester.** The dean announced that 4 PhD programs would be “suspended” and four additional PhD programs would be refocused. Leading up to this announcement, there were a series of discussions scheduled with the Council of Chairs (the chairs of all departments in the college that is also the college governing body), and the faculty senate (which most faculty perceived as an ineffective governing group) as well as multiple meetings with individual faculty across all departments. The dean also sent a series of questions out to faculty and asked for written input. He received fewer than a dozen responses. It was made clear that while input was being solicited, ultimate decisions rested with the dean and provost. Ultimately, the dean called an emergency meeting of the council of chairs on 24 hour notice, spoke with the chairs of the affected departments that morning and made the announcements that afternoon. One department was able to argue against their PhD program being suspended for reasons of distinctiveness; the remaining proposed closings were implemented.

- **Kent State University.** The university is unionized with a strong history of faculty governance. The College Advisory Council is composed of elected representatives from all departments. The dean discussed the necessity of closings with the council and with department chairs in a series of meetings. Both formal and informal discussions and forums were held with all interested faculty. Ultimately, the program in counseling psychology was targeted for closure and the faculty approved.

Across these case studies:

- Central administration initiated and led the process. At no institution did the faculty have primary responsibility for decision making.

- Faculty were involved in the discussion at all institutions but to different extents, ranging from only faculty on a specific faculty consultative committee, to all faculty being invited to provide input from early on in the decision making process.

- The actual committee structure (e.g., advisory committees, council of chairs) varied widely in their ability to access information and provide input. What appears to differ most dramatically across these case examples is the extent to which faculty input was solicited during the decisions making process versus after.

**Criteria for evaluation.** Eckel (2002) provides a qualitative description of criteria universities developed and used for program and department closings. He begins by listing Dickeson’s (1999) ten criteria based on economics, quality and centrality:

- History, development and expectations of the program
- External demand for the program
- Internal demand for the program
- Quality of program inputs and processes
- Quality of program outcomes
- Size, scope and productivity of the program
- Revenue and other resources generated by the program
- Costs and other expenses associated with the program
- Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program
- Opportunity analysis of the program

Eckel examined how the 4 specific universities discussed above developed and used evaluation criteria.

- University of Maryland College Park developed specific criteria when they knew they had to cut programs due to budget cuts. These criteria were developed by the executive committee of the faculty senate at the request of the provost. Criteria included mission centrality, program quality, demand duplication and cost.

- Ohio State University relied on a previously produced set of criteria when they faced new budget cuts. This document had been created by the deans and approved by the faculty senate. Criteria included reputation and quality, duplication and cost.

- At the University of Rochester, the dean revealed closure decisions and faculty leaders subsequently developed a set of criteria including quality, costs and centrality to undergraduate education, and distinctiveness to argue against the closures. Only one of the 8 targeted programs argued successfully.

- Kent State did not develop any criteria before instituting closures.

Across institutions common criteria were cost, quality and mission centrality. Despite commonly help criteria for evaluating program closure decisions, once decisions were final, the actual criteria that had been used were different than those initially stated. Across all 4 institutions, the major factor that led to closure was lack of strong leadership for that program. Centrality to the college mission (but not the university mission) was also used, as was low numbers of students. Although quality was not used explicitly, interviews with faculty suggested that quality impacted decisions at an indirect level, in developing an initial list of possible departments/programs to close. Eckel concludes that the majority of criteria explicitly developed for evaluation are not ultimately used in making final decisions. Still, he argues that the process of developing and discussing explicit criteria may be important in fulfilling both a symbolic function and for eventually making utilitarian choices.

e. References


3. **Summary of existing college faculty governance within university governance**

a. **University governance structures**

*The University Senate* is the governance body for the university as a whole. The bylaws ([http://www.senate.emory.edu/home/bylaws/senate_bylaws.html](http://www.senate.emory.edu/home/bylaws/senate_bylaws.html)) describe the structure and function of this body. In brief, the University Senate is comprised of faculty, staff, and students. The Senate:

- considers and makes recommendations regarding all matters of general University interest, including matters referred to it by the President or Board of Trustees
- reviews all new policies and changes to existing policies
• submits recommendations to the President on any matter affecting the interests of the University
• makes recommendations regarding Honorary Degree recipients

University Senate Governing Structure.
• Membership:
  o Committee chairs are appointed by the Executive Committee. Near the close of a chair's term, each committee might recommend a person or persons to serve as chair for the forthcoming Senate year. The current chair will forward the recommendation(s) to the Senate President for Executive Committee action. The Executive Committee may then select a chair from the recommendation(s), or it may select someone else.

  o Committee chairs will normally serve a three year term. However, special circumstances might require a term to be shortened or extended at the discretion of the Executive Committee. Committee chairs are to:
    ▪ participate in the recruitment and selection of committee membership for Senate confirmation;
    ▪ establish committee agenda, organization, and procedures;
    ▪ organize and lead committee meetings;
    ▪ assure that committee minutes are promptly sent to the Senate President;
    ▪ guide committee in recommending policy that is to be brought before the Administration and/or Senate for action;
    ▪ report committee recommendations to the Senate; and
    ▪ file a written report annually with the Senate and report otherwise as directed by the Senate.

• Committee members are to be acquired from the broadest possible means or recruitment. This includes announcements in the Emory Report and recommendations from Senate members, the Employees Council, the Student Government Association, the University President, deans, department chairs, supervisors, and any other means of securing interested persons for Senate committees. Committee chairs should seek to constitute a committee that has a representation from staff, faculty, and students. By August 20, committee chairs should send to the Senate President their list of members (including departments represented); chairs should also submit the list of persons who requested committee membership but who are not being recommended. The Senate will vote approval of all committees' members, including chairs, at its first meeting. A term of membership will be one year. Normally, members will not serve more than three terms.
  o Each committee may establish attendance policies that authorize the chair to terminate committee membership.
  o Committees may establish sub-committees that facilitate the committees’ work. Sub-committee members do not need to be approved by the Senate. However, only Senate approved members may cast votes that represent decisions of the standing committees.
  o Normally, ex-officio committee members do not vote. However, committee chairs can determine the circumstance under which ex-officio members can vote.
Jurisdiction

- As a committee addresses issues relevant to its mission statement, the committee functions as an authorized voice of the Senate. A committee has the authority to support, reject, and revise initiatives brought before it by the University President and Provost or any recognized group of the University. The committee may also take the initiatives to challenge current policies and practices, develop policy recommendations and establish forums of discussion.

- Any proposed change of University policies, or a substantial change in the interpretation and practice of policies, needs to come before the Senate for approval.

- The University President, Provost, committee members, the Executive Committee, Senate members, or any recognized group within the University may request that the full Senate reconsider a committee's decision.

b. The Laney Graduate School governance structure

The Bylaws of the Laney Graduate School faculty governance (http://www.grauateschool.emory.edu/about/governance.html) describe the structure and composition of faculty governance within the Laney Graduate School of Emory University (LGS). As a unit of Emory University, any governance policies adopted by the LGS must be consistent with the governance policies of Emory University as articulated in the University Bylaws (http://www.emory.edu/secretary/governance/bylaws.html). The LGS bylaws were radically revised and revisions approved by faculty vote in May 2013. These revisions were in response to changes ('cuts') implemented by the Dean of LGS in the Fall of 2012. It may thus be instructive to consider the previous bylaws and the current ones as a model for faculty led reform of governance policies in ECAS.

LGS Governance: Past Structure. The past structure of faculty governance as set down in the 1995 bylaws was not much different than what is currently in force with the revisions of the bylaws in May 2013. It provided for a Laney Graduate School Executive Council (EC) and an Appointments Committee. There were nevertheless several differences that affected how these structures implement governance. Rules surrounding voting assumed largely in person voting and quorum and majority were not specified. Another major perceived problem with the 1995 bylaws was that they did not provide for EC votes on important issues affecting curriculum when the EC was not in meeting during summer months.

The most important draw back of the 1995 bylaws was that lines of responsibility in policy decisions between the Graduate Executive Council and the Dean of LGS were not clearly delineated. Thus the bylaws stated:

“The graduate faculty, observing that the university by-laws provide that the faculty holds responsibility for decisions pertaining to curriculum while the Deans are responsible for administration of programs, recognizes that in practice
these domains are closely intertwined. Accordingly the Laney Graduate School Executive Council and Dean will jointly decide matters concerning:

Approval of new programs and courses;

Maintaining, revising, and implementing common standards of quality for instruction and student research in the Laney Graduate School

Evaluating priorities in allocating stipend and tuition budget funds

Program development and planning for the Laney Graduate School over multiple years

The Dean of the Laney Graduate School though not a voting member, will Chair the Executive Council meetings. In the Dean’s absence, the faculty Chair will Chair the meetings."

These bylaws thus ambiguously the roles of the dean and the faculty when University bylaws are in fact more clear.

**LGS Governance: Present Structure.** The LGS bylaws approved in May 1995 (available at [http://www.graduateschool.emory.edu/about/governance.html](http://www.graduateschool.emory.edu/about/governance.html)) address the issues raised above and make several other more minor reforms. The Laney Graduate School Executive Council (EC) has primary responsibility for the broad functioning of faculty governance within the LGS. It is an elected body of 9 members with faculty from three divisions (Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities) electing 3 members each. Electronic balloting is specified. EC members serve staggered three year terms. The EC is presided by their elected Faculty Chair and a Faculty Chair-Elect. The EC meets monthly during the academic year. An electronic meeting of the EC may be called during the summer months in the event of extraordinary or urgent circumstances. The EC may take votes electronically on an as-needed basis. The EC is the primary point of interaction between the faculty and the Dean of LGS and liaises with the faculty mainly through the EC Faculty Chair or a designated representative who can attend monthly DGSs and Program Director meetings. The bylaws are very specific about what the role of the EC and the Dean of LGS are in governing LGS. They state:

“The graduate faculty, observing that the university by-laws provide that the faculty holds responsibility for decisions pertaining to curriculum while the Deans are responsible for administration of programs, recognizes that in practice these domains are closely intertwined. Accordingly the Laney Graduate School Executive Council with input and advice from the Dean will decide matters concerning:

Approval of new programs and courses;
Maintaining, revising, and implementing discipline appropriate standards of quality for admission, instruction, and student research in the Laney Graduate School.
The Dean will consult with the Executive Council who represent the LGS Faculty to review and provide advice and recommendations concerning:
- Evaluating priorities in allocating stipend and tuition budget funds;
- Program development and planning for the Laney Graduate School over multiple years;
- Program review and evaluation;
- Suspension, suspension of admissions, or closing of graduate programs.”

The Dean of the Laney Graduate School is not a voting member of the Executive Council.
Moreover it states:
“The Dean, in consultation with the Faculty Chair of the Executive Council, will set the agenda of Executive Council meetings.”

While the EC is empowered to meet without the Dean of LGS “the only official policy-making meetings shall be those chaired by the Dean.” The Laney Graduate School is represented by two faculty members on the University Senate and Faculty Council. These representatives are elected electronically by the faculty and serve three-year terms. One of the LGS members of the Faculty Council sits ex officio on the LGS EC.

For each graduate program, a Director of Graduate Studies or Program Director (renewable of 3 year terms) has primary responsibility for the graduate program and serves as liaison for the program to the LGS. The bylaws specify how DGSs and Program Directors are to be chosen and that they must be approved by the Dean of LGS. Policy changes affecting the LGS curriculum require a majority vote of the Executive Council, which must be preceded by consultations with and an advisory vote of the DGSs and Program. The DGSs and Program Directors must have at least one-month prior notice of such votes. The Dean must convene a meeting of the graduate faculty once a year at which the Dean and the Faculty Chair of the EC must inform the faculty of important decisions made in the past year. The EC by majority vote, the Dean, or one fifth of the members of the graduate faculty may convene a general meeting of the graduate faculty at any time. The graduate faculty, meeting as a whole or by electronic ballot, may make decisions on any question falling within the competence of the faculty.

The LGS bylaws specify only one standing committee: the Appointments Committee. It consist of three elected members, one from each of the divisions (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences) and two members appointed by the Dean. Elected and appointed members two year terms. The Appointments Committee advises the Dean on the membership and composition of all award and fellowship committees for the LGS and any other committees that may be necessary to the business of the Laney Graduate School.

In addition the LGS bylaws define a variety of procedural matters including: i) membership; ii) divisional membership; iii) procedures for holding meetings; iv) procedures for nominations and elections.

Amendments may be made to the LGS bylaws as follows:
“Proposed amendments to these bylaws must be sent in writing to the LGS Executive Council Faculty Chair by February 1st. Prior to the annual meeting of the graduate faculty, the proposed amendments will be circulated electronically for comment to the DGSs and the graduate faculty. Voting on proposed amendments will occur either at the annual meeting of the graduate faculty or electronically. For voting to be valid on the amendment of these bylaws fifty percent of the graduate faculty must be present for the vote or fifty percent of the graduate faculty must cast a vote if done electronically. In order for the amendment to pass, a two-thirds majority of graduate faculty who vote must cast a vote in favor of the amendment.”

c. Emory College governance structure

The Bylaws. The Bylaws of Emory College Faculty (http://college.emory.edu/home/administration/policy/bylaws.html) describe the structure and composition of faculty governance within the Emory College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS). As a unit of Emory University, any governance policies adopted by the ECAS faculty must be consistent with the governance policies of Emory University as articulated in the University Bylaws (link). The ECAS faculty may make changes to the Bylaws of Emory College Faculty by 2/3 vote of members present and voting at college faculty meetings, provided that the proposed changes were given to the faculty at a prior meeting or communicated in writing at least one week before the meeting at which they are voted upon. The bylaws were first adopted in November 1969 and have been amended on multiple occasions, including the most recent major revisions adopted in January 2003 (Need to confirm this was the date of the major revision).

The Governing Structure. The Governance Committee (GC) has primary responsibility for the broad functioning of faculty governance within the College. The GC is also the primary point of contact for the College administration to seek faculty input regarding program changes and policy decisions as well as regarding priorities and goals for the College. The bylaws grant the GC broad authority to consider the full spectrum of issues facing Emory College and to take positions on these issues on behalf of the ECAS faculty. The GC is also responsible for convening and setting the agenda for regular meetings of the ECAS faculty. Governance Committee members are elected by the ECAS faculty and serve staggered three year terms. There are three members elected from each of the three divisions of the college and three at large members (12 total). In addition, multiple ex-officio non-voting members of the College faculty serve on the GC including the Dean of ECAS and members from the University Senate Faculty Council (2) and the Laney Graduate School Executive Council (1).

The ongoing governance functions within the College are carried out by the Standing Committees of Emory College. Each of these committees reports to the Governance Committee. Standing Committee chairs are elected by the faculty at large, and three elected members from each of the three Divisions of the College also serve staggered three year terms. All Standing Committees except Grievance and the two promotion committees include student members.
Student members are appointed by the Governance Committee, which selects candidates nominated by the College Council. The jurisdiction of each Standing Committee is listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>Students concerns including readmission, non-resident study, requests for waivers of regulations or requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Scholarship</td>
<td>Admissions standards and policies, scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Course approval, deletion, alteration. “Shall study and make recommendations to the faculty concerning the curriculum of Emory College”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Abroad Committee</td>
<td>Reviews study abroad programs and curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
<td>Ongoing review of the “Emory curriculum” to consider opportunities to “improve the quality and variety of undergraduate education” at Emory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>Hears and investigates grievances brought by the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>Reviews appointments, reappointments (e.g. 4th year reviews) and promotions for tenure track faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Track Faculty Promotion</td>
<td>Reviews promotions for lecture track faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Considerations.** Beyond defining the composition and jurisdiction of the various committees the bylaws define a variety of procedural matters including: i) membership; ii) divisional membership; iii) officers; iv) appointment of subcommittees and ad-hoc committees; v) procedures for holding meetings; vi) voting and floor privileges; vii) review and appeals; and viii) procedures for nominations and elections. Each of these items is of critical importance for the overall functioning of the governance system.

**Summary of themes from current committee chairs.** The committee solicited feedback from all chairs of standing committees and received responses from most. All committee chairs thought their committee was doing important work, but they varied in how well they thought the processes were working. Both the faculty and LTF promotion committees were clearest in stating that the committees had clear guidelines, committee members were dedicated, and the process worked effectively. Responses from the other committee chair revealed several themes that should be addressed: 1) committees are not always given clear guidelines and/or are dictated by administrative regulations (e.g., SACs, admissions); 2) committee members do not always show up leading to redundant and/or inconsistent discussions; 3) chairs of committees are often serving their first term and are as naïve as other committee members; 4) there are no clear reporting avenues, either to and from the dean or to and from the college faculty.
4. **Summary of information gathered from other universities and organizations**

The AAUP’s 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities serves as a broad guideline, useful in its recognition of distinct responsibilities for governance that rest in the faculty, the president, and the board. Of particular interest is the AAUP’s emphasis on the way all such agents can find guidance in the central mission of an institution:

Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy.

Four recent models supplement the review of literature given in section 2, above, with specific focus on processes related to the closing of a department or program:

- Rice University’s “Elimination of Graduate Programs: Procedures and Best Practices,” (May 3, 2013)
- University of Cincinnati’s Strategy for Excellence in Doctoral Education (fall 2012)
- University of Illinois, Urbana, process for closing graduate programs (revised 2010)
- University of Oregon closing policy (2004)

**The Rice Best Practices document** outlines a procedure that includes initial consultation among provost, graduate dean, and deans of any other affected school, followed by the development of a clear timeline and plan, addressing such issues as the effect of proposed elimination on current students, other departments, and faculty in the affected department. The plan is then submitted to Rice’s graduate council, the faculty senate, the chair, faculty, and students of the affected department. If a decision to eliminate is reached, the chair of the affected program must submit a response, supporting or rejecting the decision, to departmental faculty, the provost, the graduate council, and the faculty senate. The graduate council then appoints a committee to review the reports and prepares a final report. Rice’s guidelines specify that final decision rests with the president.

**University of Cincinnati** similarly outlines a six-step process for elimination of graduate programs and dedicates itself to the principles of clear criteria, reliance on data, inclusion, and transparency. The six steps, in particular, begin with assessment of program strategy and position, followed by assessment by the college dean, external peers, a university faculty panel, the graduate school, and the provost. At each stage of this process, both the dean and the faculty are allowed to provide written response, which is reviewed at the next stage. Final decision in the Cincinnati process rests with the provost, who communicates the decision to the faculty.
**University of Illinois, Urbana**, created a document that outlines general considerations and questions relevant to program closing—questions intended to shape rather than define criteria. These questions address both the long term viability of a program, and, by contrast, issues that would indicate inviability. UI’s broad statement on principles of procedures is worth citing in full:

*Both unit chairs and the Dean of the College can initiate proposals for creating new units or changing the status of existing academic units. All units significantly impacted by the proposed change should submit position statements focused on a description of the rationale for reorganization (see below) to both the Dean and the College Policy Committee. All members of the faculty in these units, and the prospective faculty of a new unit, should be afforded an opportunity to express support for or objections to the proposal. When deemed appropriate, the Committee may extend the remonstrance to the entire College faculty. The College Policy Committee will review the position statements, as well as reports from internal and external review committees, and then recommend approval or disapproval of the proposal to the Dean. While unanimity is desirable, it is understood that all parties involved may not agree; the final decision for recommendation for action rests with the Dean.*

**University of Oregon**’s document is least relevant to Emory’s situation because of Oregon’s relationship to state government. Sections of the UO’s document on elimination of programs cite and emphasize existing state law regarding, for example, termination of tenured and untenured staff. The UO document is valuable, however, for its effort to define criteria for elimination, such as 12 criteria “supporting reorganization” (e.g. “Two or more programs have a substantial similarity or affinity of objectives”), followed by 7 “criteria contra-indicating elimination” (e.g. “The programs, though dealing with similar subject matter, are substantially different in orientation”); and similarly for elimination of programs. Initiation of a process toward elimination or reorganization lies with the provost. Review is carried out by a faculty consultative group, which presents its report to the full faculty at such time as the provost, with whom final authority rests, announces a closure or reorganization.

**Conclusions to be drawn from other institutions.** In all cases, clear criteria, faculty involvement, and transparency of process are emphasized. Timelines, procedures for communication and feedback, and shared, written reports, reviewed by specified faculty committees, administrators and, in at least one case, outside reviewers, are the means by which the principles of best practice are implemented. Both the Rice and UI models are valuable for the way that faculty response is incorporated into the process. Finally, in all cases, the officer who has final decision—generally provost or president—is clearly indicated.

5. **Summary of information gathered through initial interviews with Emory College constituents**

Committee members had separate discussions with individual stakeholders, including Dean Robin Forman, former Dean Bobby Paul, President of the Emory chapter of AAUP, Sharon Strocchia, and former chair of govcomm, Micheal Giles. These individuals were selected to provide a perspective on both the possible advantages and problems associated with current
faculty governance at Emory, and to brainstorm ideas about how this process could be improved. Structured interview questions are appended to this report.

Following the completion of these interviews, committee members met to discuss what we had learned across these interviews. Here we summarize the major themes and tensions that emerged in these conversations, as well as ideas for solving some of the emergent issues.

**The larger context:** Especially as the college faces both financial and scholarly challenges that will necessitate interdisciplinary strategic planning, and that involves a larger faculty discussion of our scholarly mission and how to best accomplish it, how do we facilitate better communication among faculty and administrators, and how do we develop structures and processes that allow open and transparent communication, while respecting the need for confidentiality under some circumstances, and that ultimately allows for effective and efficient decision making?

**Theme 1. Representative governance**

Governance by the full faculty is too cumbersome.

- Because different faculty show up to any given faculty meeting, issues cannot be fully discussed in an organized ongoing fashion.
- because the agenda is not always set in advance and can be negotiated during any given faculty meeting, issues can be brought up by a small number of faculty and acted on before information is disseminated and discussed by the full faculty (e.g., the vote to censure President Wagner this past academic year was not on the agenda, was brought up during the last 10 minutes of a faculty meeting and voted on.).
- The deans further stressed the importance and usefulness of having a small group of faculty advisors.
- Faculty representation in developing and implementing strategic plans is essential

Possible solutions discussed at these meetings:

- Reiterate the role of govcomm as a body elected to set the faculty meeting agenda, and as the governing body whose role is to bring all critical issues to the full faculty for discussion.
- Propose a representative college faculty senate, elected by the full faculty. The college senate would be the governance body. The full faculty would meet at least once a semester (or more often if deemed necessary by the college senate) for discussion, dialogue, input and feedback.
  - How large should such a body be?
  - Could govcomm continue as a smaller executive committee of this larger senate? If so, exactly how would roles and responsibilities be allocated to each body? Could this smaller group constitute a dean’s advisory committee?
- Both deans stressed the tension between relying on identified (selected) faculty leaders and more representative (elected) faculty.
  - Perhaps the dean could constitute an advisory committee that was a mixture of elected representatives (from govcomm?) and selected faculty advisors?
  - Or perhaps the dean could select possible faculty advisors and then the full faculty could elect the members from this selected group?
• Should there be a separate faculty strategic planning committee? Or should this responsibility fall to govcomm or the executive committee or the deans’ advisory committee, however constituted?

**Theme 2. Communication within the college**
There are ongoing problems of communication that work both ways, from administration to faculty and from faculty to administration.

- most faculty are apathetic until there is a crisis
- information is communicated through minutes of college faculty meetings and through deans’ quarterly reports, yet faculty often do not read these materials
- Communication from the administration to chairs and directors occurs both at monthly chairs and directors meetings and at the annual department and program planning meetings, but often this information is not communicated to the faculty within departments and programs.
- Avenues of communication are through existing department and program structures, and there is little opportunity to share information across departments and programs.
- There does not seem to be a reporting system for college governance committees to disseminate information about their work to the full faculty on a regular basis.

Possible solutions discussed at these meetings:

- Some information from annual planning sessions could be shared among all departments and programs. Aspects of strategic plans might be especially useful to share.
- Chairs and directors should be encouraged to share information from chairs and directors meetings and from their planning sessions with their faculty.
- Chairs of each of the standing college governance committees should report to the full faculty at least once a year about their committee work, perhaps during an annual full college faculty meeting as well as in an annual report.
- It is not clear how to create a less apathetic faculty

**Theme 3: Communications among levels within the university**
The central administration does not recognize college faculty governance within the university governance structure.

- The university senate is the governance body that crosses all units.
- There is a faculty council of the senate on which college faculty sit, but there is little communication or coordination between the university senate and college governance.
- There is the ongoing issue of communication and coordination between the college and the graduate school.

Possible solutions discussed at these meetings:

- College faculty must take the university senate more seriously. College faculty elected to the university senate need to be an integrated part of college governance.
  - Faculty on the faculty council of the senate should report at least annually to the full college faculty about the activities of the senate, and more often on an as needed basis when issues emerge in the university senate.
  - Faculty on the faculty council of the senate should continue to be ex-officio on govcomm and/or whatever executive committee is formed.
• College faculty should take a more proactive role on the university senate. Issues of importance to the college need to be brought to the attention of the larger university using existing governance channels.
  o College faculty serving on the university senate should provide an annual written report to the senate outlining the concerns and issues currently being discussed by the college faculty.
• Existing administrative and governance structures that divide the college and the graduate school should be re-visited by a task force mandated to develop a set of implementable recommendations for increasing communication and coordination.

**Larger issues**

• Faculty “buy-in”
• Faculty leadership
• Reconsidering the full committee structure of college governance – do we currently have the right set of committees or should we consider streamlining and consolidating committees in ways that would make the work more coordinated?
• The need for long term strategic planning. Faculty need to be engaged in thinking through the larger issues for long term planning.
  o The changing landscape of higher education provides both challenges and opportunities. How do we meet these in a coordinated way?
  o Interdisciplinarity is at the core of the future of liberal arts. How do we build this into our faculty governance structures in ways that allow current departments and programs to provide more flexible and permeable strategic planning?
Appendix A. Notes from committee meetings

Notes: Meeting 3/7/2013

I am providing three views on our discussion: 1) how we are responding to each of our specific mandated tasks; 2) a table with time line and specific actions items; and 3) a set of emerging ideas/themes.

Specific to our appointed tasks and ideas for accomplishing them (from the resolution):

1. Review existing governance structure of ECAS
2. Review bylaws on faculty governance
   
   Robyn will provide a summary that will be included in our final report.

3. Review relationship between college governance bodies and other governance bodies of the university, particularly the LGSAS executive council
   
   Committee will meet individually with Dean Forman, Dean Tedesco and Provost Sterk.
   
   Committee will meet with current members of the LGSAS executive council

4. Investigate other models of faculty governance
   
   Ongoing: We will examine:

   a. Duke (Ron)
   b. Vanderbilt (Ron)
   c. U of Illinois (Kevin)
   d. Wash U (Alan)
   e. Stanford (Robyn)

   In addition, we will send an email to the college faculty soliciting their input on good models of faculty governance. Robyn will draft email and send to committee for comments.

5. Consult organization such as the AAUP with expertise in faculty governance
   
   Peter will post info from AAUP and will speak with Sharon Strocchia, President of the Emory chapter
   
   Robyn will search for other organizations and documents that might be relevant.

6. Solicit faculty input thru open meetings and other venues
   
   Once we develop a set of three or four models of faculty governance, we will present these to the faculty for discussion and input (probably in the early fall)
What groups? College faculty meetings? Chairs meetings? Divisions (e.g., Faculty Science Council, Humanities council) Faculty forums?

7. Interview faculty with particular expertise

We did not discuss this – will discuss at next meeting

8. Write a report including lit review of other models of governance

Timeline:

| By mid April       | Committee members will provide brief summaries of faculty governance models at peer institutions  
|                   | Email will be sent to college faculty requesting information about good faculty governance models elsewhere  
|                   | Information gathering from AAUP and other organizations about faculty governance best practices  
|                   | Committee will develop a structured interview based on information gathered for meetings with administrators and faculty involved in governance  
| By mid May        | Committee meets with Dean Forman, Dean Tedesco and Provost Sterk  
|                   | Committee meets with the LGSAS executive council  
|                   | Committee meets with current and past chairs of gov.com  
| By end of summer  | Preliminary report that includes best practice faculty governance structures  
| Early Fall semester | Committee meets with faculty groups: college faculty meeting, faculty science council, humanities council, social science chairs council, chairs, etc. for discussion and input  
| By end of fall semester | Final report of the committee to the faculty.  

Emerging themes/ ideas (in no particular order):

Faculty need to be involved in ongoing strategic planning of the college and the LGSAS. This includes faculty input to the development and implementations of strategic goals across the college, as well as input to resource allocations.

The college planning sessions could be put to better use as a strategic planning tool for both the college and the departments. However, the planning sessions are limited in that they focus on the needs and resource allocations for existing departments and centers, rather than thinking through strategic planning that cuts across existing silos. There must be additional venues for faculty discussion and input on cross-cutting interdisciplinary initiatives, especially those that cross traditional divisions of sciences, social science and humanities.
Faculty input is needed for developing criteria for establishing interdisciplinary programs and centers, and especially for evaluating such centers and programs, as well as processes for closing such programs and centers. Although such criteria can and should be established, it is also clear that “one size does not fit all” and multiple criteria must be considered simultaneously to allow maximum flexibility as well as maximum transparency. Criteria must include both the teaching and research missions of the college, and as such, LTF must continue to play an equal role in faculty governance.

Faculty involvement in strategic planning must be placed in the landscape of a changing academic environment, in which interdisciplinarity will be critical. Ways in which interdisciplinary initiatives will impact on existing department structures, including allocation of resources and teaching, must be addressed and faculty must be involved in these discussions and decisions. True interdisciplinarity will involve flexibility and permeability of structures, and thus existing avenues of communication (e.g., from dean to chair to departmental faculty) may need to be re-evaluated. Related to this, the means by which chairs are appointed should involve (more?) faculty input.

Meeting 3/27/2013: Notes

Since the last meeting, we had each looked at websites describing faculty governance structures at many of our peer institutions and read multiple empirical and philosophical articles on shared faculty governance, and we shared this information among ourselves.

The meeting began with a discussion of the new policies and procedures regarding shared faculty governance in the LGS developed by the graduate executive committee and now posted for faculty comments. The new policies make more explicit the domains that faculty and administrators have control over and the procedures for faculty consultation in all decision making by the deans. We agreed to take a closer look at this document for further discussion.

This brought up the larger discussion of our committee’s mandate. As we are a committee convened by the college faculty, our mandate is to provide recommendations about shared faculty governance for the college. The question of relations between the college and the LGS, always a difficult one, is one that we must acknowledge as well. We agreed that our mandate was specifically about the college but that we must place our recommendations in the context of the complicated governance structures between the college and the LGS in our final report. Related to this concern, we also noted that one of the ongoing problems in faculty governance is multiple committees at multiple levels (college, graduate school, university) that may be redundant and may actually be working at cross purposes (e.g., multiple college committees currently examining interdisciplinarity while the university is currently convening a committee to examine the future of liberal arts). In our final report, we will note this problem and make recommendations about coordination of efforts across levels of governance.

We then turned to a more detailed discussion of our specific mandate. Our examination of the literature indicates that the structures of faculty governance play a substantially more minor role in outcome than do processes, especially processes of how and when in the process of decision
making faculty input is solicited and used. Thus we decided an important focus of our discussions should be on processes.

We then discussed whether our mandate was to consider the organization and functions of each of the current faculty governance committees (e.g., the educational policy committee, the curriculum committee, etc.) or to focus more on issues of strategic planning and consultative processes. We agreed that a full examination of structure and function of all governance committees would be a year long process, which is longer than this committee has before reporting back to the faculty. At the same time, we also agreed that this closer examination was a good idea for the future and we will include both some recommendations about structure in our report, as well as a strong recommendation for an ongoing examination of structure and function of all college governance committees. However, our fall report will focus on strategic planning and consultative processes.

In terms of strategic planning and consultative processes, ideas that we discussed include:

1. The need for strong departmental input
2. Coordination between the college and the LGS
3. The need for external reviews of departments and programs.
   a. The issues of consistency in policies across departments, including policies concerning the evaluation and promotion of LTF
   b. The issue of evaluation criteria – although also an acknowledgement that “one size does not fit all” and the need for flexibility depending on the individual department or program as well.
4. The need for representation across college faculty. Here we further noted that Emory may provide a national model for the inclusion on LTF in all aspects of college strategic planning.
5. The need for balance between open communication and confidentiality

Steps to move forward:
1. We will interview Dean Forman, Dean Paul and Michael Giles (who was instrumental in forming gov.com) about their ideas regarding faculty input to strategic planning. We emphasize that these interviews will focus on their ideas for moving forward in productive ways. Kevin and Robyn will meet to develop the set of questions to be approved by the full committee for these interviews. Robyn will schedule these interviews. Given scheduling issues, Robyn will try to schedule these interviews when the most committee members are available. Possible questions generated by the committee thus far include:
   a. How do you build a system in which faculty are consulted and also feel they were consulted?
   b. What would be the possible pitfalls of more open communication earlier and throughout the process of strategic planning?
   c. What kind of consulting body might work best? Full faculty, larger representative body (e.g., council of chairs; representatives from each department/ program?), smaller representative body?
2. We will examine peer institution models of faculty governance specifically around issues of strategic planning and faculty consultation.
3. Based on our investigation and the interviews, we will develop a description of alternative models for faculty governance in issues of strategic planning.

Notes from 4-25-2013

Emerging themes/ tensions from discussions with Deans Forman and Paul and Michael Giles: Included in the body of this report.

Remaining meetings were discussions of the report and recommendations – no notes were taken but the documents represent the discussions.
Appendix B. Structured interview

Questions for interviews with Forman, Paul and Giles:

1. What were the most effective ways that you sought and used faculty input in strategic planning?
2. What were the least effective ways?
3. What do you think could be the most effective ways of balancing the need for confidentiality and the goal of transparency?
4. Under what circumstances do you think confidentiality is necessary and what are the implications of this for faculty involvement?
5. What do you think could be the most effective ways of balancing the goal of faculty input and the need for effective and timely decisions making?
6. How can we strengthen the role of LTF in strategic planning?
7. How might we better use the department and program planning meetings in ways that would facilitate more overarching strategic planning?
   a. Do you think it would be possible to share department and program strategic goals among chairs and directors in ways that might facilitate effective cross-department and program planning?
   b. How could we use these meetings to develop better communication between the college and the graduate school?
8. How would you envision a governance system would best be configured so as to be both responsive to the many voices of the faculty but also effective and efficient in its implementation?
9. Are there any of the functions we call "governance" which would work better (from the perspective of a dean) with LESS faculty input? If so, why, and how would you see that working in practice?
10. What kinds of things are faculty not currently doing or needing to do more of - individually or collectively - that you feel would make faculty and faculty governance effective partners with administration in institutional planning and governance?
11. What would you like us to know as we prepare our report?
Shared Faculty Governance Committee: PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

September 2013

Members:
Alan Abramowitz (Political Science)
Keith Berland (Physics)
Ron Calabrese (Biology)
Kevin Corrigan (ILA)
Robyn Fivush (Psychology) (Chair)
Peter Wakefield (ILA)

Based on our mandate, and information gathered through reviewing the theoretical and empirical literature, as well as our interviews with key stakeholders, we begin with a set of principles for efficient and effective shared faculty governance. We then expand upon these principles in suggesting ways in which they can help inform best practices for shared faculty governance.

Best practices must be defined in terms of the overall objective of shared faculty governance, which is to be an effective voice for charting the future direction of Emory College. Faculty must be an integral part of curriculum development and reform, including the organization and re-organization of college departments and programs, and for developing and implementing an innovative and creative vision of the undergraduate curriculum as well as for the overall undergraduate experience. The committee feels that some changes in the governance processes are likely needed to better support ongoing strategic planning and decision making, and will be important for faculty to partner productively with the administration in developing and implementing a faculty lead vision for programs and structures.

The principles of effective shared faculty governance include:

1. A focus on the academic mission of the college

2. Maintaining open avenues of communication to facilitate an informed and engaged faculty

3. The need to specify processes that allow adaptability and flexibility to meet changing circumstances and demands in a timely fashion

4. A governance structure that allows significant investment of time from those faculty making decisions to fully study and advise administrators on current issues.

5. Strong partnerships and trust between faculty and administration
We note that these principles require both faculty and administrators to be responsible and accountable partners. Most important, shared faculty governance requires that faculty are engaged. Our current voting procedures do not allow the inclusion of those faculty who are unable to attend specific meetings, and thus disenfranchises faculty voices.

**As a first and immediate step toward more representative faculty governance, the committee strongly recommends that the college faculty change the bylaws to allow electronic voting. This is a critical step in allowing all faculty to have a voice in deciding the future of shared faculty governance.**

In addition, we make several interrelated recommendations regarding structure and processes of shared faculty governance. The most immediate and critical recommendations are in *italic bold*:

1. **A focus on the academic mission of the college.** The committee’s overarching recommendation is to create a process that will involve faculty in evaluating and re-visioning ECAS mission. The committee members emphasize that decisions about the future of shared faculty governance must be made within the changing landscape of higher education. We need to think about how we can provide the best possible education to our students and best foster an environment where world class research is carried out. Our goal in considering any changes is a governance structure that is forward looking in thinking about how to create the best possible Emory rather than simply trying to preserve its current structure with as few changes as possible. Our faculty are full of creative energies that our current structure can often stifle. If we take shared faculty governance and ownership of the curriculum seriously, it will require transformative change in the way in which we currently “do business.”

Until we have a clearly articulated vision of what our academic mission is, it will be difficult to engage in strategic planning. A more clearly defined academic mission will allow:

- departments and programs to plan and devote resources and energies toward specific contributions to shared mission
- annual departmental reviews and evaluation to be based on such contribution (or lack thereof) to such shared mission
- Strategic decisions, made by the dean, in full and proper consultation with the faculty, to be justified in terms of contribution (or lack thereof) to such shared mission.

**To achieve this objective, the committee recommends that either Gov Comm or a representative group of elected faculty, in consultation with the dean, begin to articulate a new vision for ECAS, that will be honed and revised through broader faculty input.**
As part of this process, the committee recommends that this group conducts a thorough review of the structure and processes of the current college standing committees to ascertain if and how these committees might be better constituted.

2. Maintaining open avenues of communication to facilitate an informed and engaged faculty will require increased communication. It is the responsibility of the administration to provide clear and updated information to the faculty and it is the responsibility of the faculty to remain aware of important issues under consideration within the college. Already existing avenues include the BB site maintained by Gov Comm, the dean’s quarterly report, monthly chairs’ meetings and annual planning sessions, among others. To increase the flow of information, we might further include:

   a) Increased training of chairs, especially in terms of facilitating ways that chairs can better communicate with their departmental faculty about information shared at chair’s meetings and at annual department planning sessions.

   b) Increased access across departments and programs to annual planning materials. Although many aspects of planning must remain confidential, other aspects could be fruitfully shared. We suggest that the dean appoint a subcommittee of directors and chairs to develop guidelines for a consistent set of information generated in the annual review process that might be made publically available, especially any data that are routinely considered in strategic decision making.

   c) Specifying what information Gov Comm should post and when it needs to be posted to facilitate early and ongoing faculty access to information.

3. The need to specify processes that allow adaptability and flexibility to meet changing circumstances and demands in a timely fashion

   a) The committee feels that governance by the full faculty is too cumbersome and does not lead to the best possible decision making given differing levels of time and commitment that faculty make to studying the issues at hand. In fact, Emory is rare among its peers in governance by the full college faculty.

   The committee recommends a representative governance structure that could take one of several possible forms:

   i) Gov Comm could continue to be the elected faculty representative body. Under this model, Gov Comm would be empowered to carry out governance functions consistent with their responsibilities to report to the faculty. Thus, Gov Comm will be invested with all the voting privileges currently held by the full college faculty.

   ii) College faculty senate. A larger representative body could be elected. Representation within a senate would need to be carefully examined, perhaps determined based on factors such as departmental size, strategic importance to the mission, etc. With a senate governance model, there would likely
continue to be a need for a smaller elected unit, like the current GovCom, that would serve as an advisory committee to the dean.

In addition, to include faculty in decisions to create or close programs, the committee recommends that reviews should follow a multi-stage process to be defined formally by Gov Comm.

The committee notes that creating or closing programs or departments must be part of a longer-term consultative process with clear criteria from the start.

Reviewing how other universities have created processes for closing departments and programs, the committee recommends the following as guiding principles in establishing such a process:

- Creating a clear timeline
- Eliciting early and ongoing input from faculty
- Providing ample opportunity for faculty response
- Creating processes that operate with respect and dignity.
  1. Respect entails justification and communication with those affected. Respect is undermined in situations of secrecy and assertion of authority.
  2. Dignity presupposes the worth and value of those affected. Transparency and communication uphold dignity.

i) The committee notes that one potential model for such review is the University of Cincinnati. Their process involves programmatic data provided by the department or program according to guidelines and specifically related to the mission, evaluation by the dean and other administrators, review of the planning documents by Gov Comm, possibility of response, appeal, or clarification, review by the Provost's Office or a representative thereof, and final possibility for appeal.

ii) Evaluations must be carried out mindful of opportunity costs, meaning existing programs should be evaluated not only with regards to their current effectiveness, but also relative to what other programmatic opportunities might be realized with the same faculty or financial resources.

iii) The committee also notes the strong possibility that changes in college programs and structures will impact LTF in different ways than tenured faculty. The committee thus wishes to emphasize the critically important role of LTF in the college mission, and advises that these differences be fully considered and integrated in review processes.

iv) Finally, the committee feels it is important to emphasize that while an open and transparent process for reviewing programmatic changes is highly desirable, faculty can only be effective partners if faculty collectively accept the outcome of the review process in which they have served as partners. If faculty are unable to partner with the administration in leading strategic changes, the administration will in turn be hard pressed to follow faculty input into the process.
4. A governance structure that allows significant investment of time from those faculty making decisions to fully study and advise administrators on current issues.

(1) Effective governance and partnering with administration will require faculty who participate to be well informed about the broad spectrum of issues facing the college. Representatives would need to be selected by a process that is mindful of this requirement. The committee notes that the respect and commitment of members of the Tenure and Promotion committee has been highly effective in faculty governance and might provide suggestions for constituting other governance committees.

5. **Strong partnerships and trust between faculty and administration** will be forged through implementation of some of the recommendations above. In particular, the committee emphasizes the importance of providing access to information early in strategic planning processes and providing multiple avenues for eliciting faculty input throughout the process.

However, we further note that in the current governance structure, ECAS faculty committees do not have formal standing in the bylaws of Emory University; current University Senate (US) and Faculty Council (FC) representation is not structured in such a way as to allow adequate consultation and communication between University administration and ECAS faculty. To alleviate some of the issues that arise from this situation, the committee recommends:

a) Training for ECAS representatives to US and FC should be instituted, with guidance from Gov Comm.

b) The Dean and Gov Comm should initiate conversations with the Provost aimed at finding more avenues for communication and consultation between ECAS faculty, especially ECAS faculty committees, and university administration, which should then be formalized in the bylaws of the University.

c) Emory University should revisit the relationship between LGS and ECAS, with specific consideration of creating a single dean above both schools. The Dean and Gov Comm should consider making a formal proposal of such a question to the dean of LGS and to the Provost.

Finally, the committee notes that shared faculty governance occurs within intellectual communities of respect in which individual faculty are dedicated to the community. As an intellectual community, the academy should set a model and hold itself to higher ethical standards than other institutions. This kind of commitment is time-consuming and needs to be appropriately evaluated and rewarded. We should explore governance and organizational changes that liberate faculty to fully serve the institution as they are best able to do so. This will require new ways of measuring contributions: What if “contribution to mission” or such replaced “teaching, research, service”? To this end, we further recommend that a task force be convened to develop a series of
recommendations for creating a culture of service and trust at Emory College. This task force should consider issues including:

- Developing and rewarding faculty leadership training, especially for chairs and directors
- Developing reward structures for faculty who are dedicated to institution-building.
- Better integrating the critically important work of the LTF in innovative curriculum and program building into the college mission.
- Education about the role and rewards of service in the academy.
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The committee makes two recommendations:  
1. The Committee on Shared Faculty Governance recommends a representative college faculty senate for faculty governance.  
2. The Committee on Shared Faculty Governance recommends the establishment of a clear process for the closing of programs and departments.  

Each of these recommendations is spelled out in detail:  

**Recommendation 1:**  
The Committee on Shared Faculty Governance recommends a representative College Senate for faculty governance.  

We think a College Senate model of representative governance is necessary for several interrelated reasons:  
1. The college faculty has reached a size where governance by the full faculty is too cumbersome. All of our peer institutions of a similar size use some form of senate model.  
2. Different faculty attend different college faculty meetings, leading to iterative rather than progressive discussions.  
3. Being informed on the critical issues takes time and effort, and requires more focused attention than full faculty governance allows.  
4. Faculty want to be able to focus on their teaching and research, and representative governance will allow all faculty to participate through electing representatives and then having these individuals spend the time to fully understand and discuss the issues.  
5. For representative government to work, faculty must trust their representatives. Having representative government that is second-guessed by faculty on all decisions undermines both the principles of representative government and, perhaps more importantly, leads to the lack of ability to move forward on important initiatives, thus hamstringing the very idea of shared faculty governance.  

We note that if the faculty adopt this model, there will need to be a transition phase. At the end of this document, we provide guidelines for this transition.
Logistics:

1. **Size:** a College Senate consisting of 21 elected members plus one ex-officio member, the past-president of the senate (see below).
2. **Composition:** There shall be 6 representatives from each of the three divisions (humanities social sciences, and sciences), plus 3 at-large members. At any given time, at least one representative from each division must be a full professor, one must be an assistant professor and one must be LTF. The remaining representatives can be from any rank.
3. **Election of senate members (would need to be phased in)**
   a. Slates shall be developed by the nominating committee, composed of the chairs of each of the standing committees. The nominating committee shall seek advice from chairs and directors in developing the slates.
   b. Individual faculty shall vote for the representatives from their division and the at-large members
   c. Term of office shall be three years. Because serving on the college senate will involve a great deal of work, senate members shall be released from other service responsibilities during their term of office.
4. **Senate leadership (would need to be phased in)**
   a. The senate shall have a president, a president-elect, and the past-president to serve as the executive council. The executive council will be responsible for setting the agenda.
   b. The president shall be in their third term of office.
   c. The president-elect shall be in their second term of office.
   d. The past-president shall serve as an ex-officio member of the senate for one year following their term as chair.
   e. Candidates for president-elect should be nominated by the senate in a secret ballot; the two top vote getters who are willing to stand for election will be voted on by the full faculty (electronic ballot) after speaking before the full faculty meeting at the end of the preceding academic year. The elected candidate will be designated President-elect during their second year in office and will be President in their third year in office.

Process:

**Responsibilities:**

1. **Jurisdiction and Functions** The College Senate represents the Emory College Faculty. It may consider and take positions on any matter of interest to Emory College faculty including those having to do with the role of the College within the University where action by the Faculty of the College is presently limited by University Bylaws.
   a. The Administration shall consult with the College Senate on all matters pertaining to the College and to the Faculty of the College. This consultation shall include but not be limited to proposals for the development and modification of College programs and the setting of priorities and goals for the College. Consultation shall include reference to the budgetary implications of such proposals. The Committee
shall have access to information necessary to conduct studies and to make recommendations to the Administration.

b. It is the responsibility of the College Senate to bring all significant matters to the attention of the faculty in a full Faculty Meeting and, as a body, to entertain questions from the full faculty at such meetings. Issues that involve significant changes to the curriculum must be brought to the full faculty for discussion, input and feedback. Either the College Senate or the college faculty can ask for a vote of approval or disapproval of the senate’s recommendations (if 25% of the faculty request such a vote as per guidelines below), and the College Senate should take this vote into consideration, although the College Senate ultimately has full responsibility for making recommendations to the administration.

2. **Standing Committees.** The standing committees of Emory College shall report to the College Senate. Issues which the Administration wishes to be considered by a Standing Committee shall be directed to the College Senate, which shall determine the committee(s) to which the issue is to be assigned. The College Senate shall consider any matters presented to it by Standing Committees and may take whatever action concerning such matters as the College Senate deems appropriate. The College Senate will have responsibility for overseeing all aspects of the standing committees, including the authority to re-define committees and their mandates.

3. **Sub-committees, working groups and task forces.** The College Senate may decide that certain tasks are best accomplished in smaller working groups. They may do this in one of two ways:
   a. A working group composed of elected senate members can be constituted at any time.
   b. The senate may seek advice and guidance from any faculty they deem appropriate, but these faculty may serve only in an advisory role to the senate. All issues must ultimately come back to the College Senate for discussion before making recommendations to the administration.

**Communication:**

1. **From the College Senate to the faculty:** The College Senate shall provide open avenues of communication between the full faculty and the senate in the following ways:
   a. Electronic posting of all meetings and minutes
   b. An executive summary each semester of discussions, activities and decision.
   c. At least one full faculty meeting each semester, consistent with responsibilities outlined above. College Senate members will provide information about all issues under discussion in the senate, and the faculty will have the opportunity to ask any questions, or raise any discussion items with the college senate members.
   d. At least a few members of the College Senate should try to attend one meeting each year with the chairs and directors.
   e. If at least 25% of the full faculty want to call a full faculty meeting, the senate must do so.

2. **From the faculty to the College Senate:** There would be multiple avenues by which faculty can bring issues to the senate and/or the full faculty
a. Any faculty member can request any issue to be placed on the senate agenda; if the item does not appear on the published minutes, the president of the senate or a designate should communicate with the requesting faculty.
b. If at least 25% of faculty request an item to be brought to the full faculty, the senate must do so. If this requires additional college faculty meetings, the senate must schedule these.
c. Faculty can post on the College Senate BB site.

Recommendation 2:
The Committee on Shared Faculty Governance recommends the establishment of a clear process for the ongoing evaluation of programs and departments. First and foremost, there should be clear criteria for program and department evaluation that include at a minimum:

1. Centrality to the educational and research missions of the college and university
2. Learning outcomes and discovery

In developing a process for program and department evaluation, we emphasize several guiding principles. We note that each and every situation poses unique considerations and thus we recommend a process that is both flexible while simultaneously providing clear, transparent and fair processes of evaluation. Specifically:

1. The process must be data driven and consultative. In addition to discussion between the administration and the College Faculty Senate, there should be discussions with program and department chairs about ongoing evaluations. Discussions in the context of Academic Planning Sessions should be used for open dialogue about possible or potential challenges and/or difficulties in ways that allow disclosure and discussion of possible negative consequences for programs and departments.
2. The process must be transparent within the constraints of confidentiality of individual faculty. We emphasize that transparency must exist among the administration and the concerned faculty (as well as the senate members), although not necessarily among the full faculty. Although deliberations about programs or departments may be confidential, all recommendations and justifications, especially about possible negative consequences, should be made available to the concerned program or department, in writing and orally in appropriate meetings.
3. The evaluation process should be multi-stage, allowing the designated program or department to respond in person and in writing to both the administration and to the College Faculty Senate during discussions about challenges and possible negative consequences.
4. In the rare circumstance of program or department closing, the dean should express in writing the intention and justification to close a program or department to the chair, and the chair should be provided an opportunity to respond in writing and in person in response to this possibility. Possible closing should be discussed in as much detail as possible with the College Faculty Senate. The administration, senate members and chairs should engage in multiple discussions before final decisions are made.
5. If a decision to close a program or department is made, there should be a clear process of appeal in place that allows a department or program to appeal on the basis of procedure. Grounds for appeal would include lack of information in writing about possible closing and/or lack of opportunity to respond in writing and in person to the reasons for closing.
The senate must refer appeals to an appeals committee which will judge whether the preceding process has been followed. Appeals would go to a committee constituted of chairs of the standing committees. Recommendation of this committee goes back to the senate.

Following these principles, we make the following recommendations regarding a process for consideration of program or department closure:

1. The multi-stage process should take at least one academic year, to allow departments and programs to represent themselves to the dean and to the senate.
2. The closing process should begin in annual planning sessions (with either ECAS or LGS, or both, as applicable). The Dean's letter as part of the annual planning should state unequivocally the intent to close a program as well as specific criteria that justify such a decision [NOTE: Cincinnati spells out five broad assessment criteria (click link): centrality to mission; learning; discovery; global engagement; diversity.]
3. In consultation with the department, the chair or director should prepare a written response or sign the dean's letter; these written documents are to be reviewed by the senate.
4. In the presence of the chair of the affected department and with the dean present ex officio, the senate should discuss the proposed closing or transformation.
5. The senate should vote on the proposed closing or transformation and the result of the vote be recorded in the minutes.
6. In consultation with the affected department, the chair can submit a response to the senate discussion and vote, which should be shared with the full faculty.
7. The senate should bring the proposed closing to the full faculty, for a vote if the decision is curricular, or to provide the full faculty an opportunity to register its opinion on the proposal.
8. After the proposal has been brought to the full faculty, if the affected department feels that the preceding process has not been followed, the chair may appeal the closure or transformation in writing to the senate.
9. The senate must refer appeals to an appeals committee which will judge whether the preceding process has been followed:
   a. Appeals would go to a committee constituted of chairs of the standing committees
   b. Recommendation of this committee goes back to the senate.

In addition to these two recommendations, the Committee on Shared Faculty Governance strongly endorses the faculty taking the following steps:

1. Development of a new ECAS mission statement that will focus on strategic goals and objectives especially concerning the curriculum.
2. A full review and possible revision of the standing committee structure of ECAS.
Transition Process to the representative Senate model.

1. Current Gov Comm members will become members of the senate for the 2014-2015 AY. Two will be appointed for a one year term to the new senate, and one will be appointed to a two year term. One member of Gov Comm will be elected to be president of the senate.

2. Slates will be developed and 3 new members of the senate from each division will be voted in in the spring 2014 semester. One will be elected for a two year term and two will be elected for a three year term. This will yield a rotation of 2 of the 6 division representatives being elected each year.
APPENDIX 6

Faculty Senate Review
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ARTICLE I
AUTHORIZATION

In accordance with the bylaws of Emory College, the following bylaws are adopted to further govern the organization and procedures of the Emory College Faculty Senate (Senate).

ARTICLE II
JURISDICTION AND FUNCTIONS

Jurisdiction, authority, functions, membership and appointments, Executive Council, and meeting rules, including quorum requirements, of the Senate are set forth in the bylaws of Emory College, Article VI (Appendix A).

ARTICLE III
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Section 1. Meetings.

The Executive Council (President, the President-elect, the immediate past-President, and one senator from each division and one senator at large elected by and from the members of the College Senate) shall meet no later than one week in advance of meetings of the Senate and College Faculty. The primary responsibility of the Executive Council is for setting the agenda of the College Senate and College Faculty meetings. Conditions under which Executive Council meetings can be closed are listed under the Emory College Faculty Bylaws, Section 9, Item B2, and Section 9, Item E.

Section 2. Visitors.

Meetings of the Executive Council may be restricted to members of Emory Faculty or Administration by majority vote of the council.

Section 3. Proposals of Items to Include on Agenda.

A. General Discussion. A Senator, member of the faculty, or member of the Administration, may submit to the President an item for general discussion for inclusion on the agenda for the Senate.

B. Motions. A Faculty Senator, or any faculty member with the supporting signatures of twenty other faculty members, may submit to the President a proposed motion for inclusion on the agenda for the Senate. To be in proper form a proposed motion must be written and should contain a single item for adoption by the Senate. Proposed motions not in proper form may be put into proper form by the Executive Council as long as the intent is not altered;
if this is not possible the proposal will be returned to its author within seven days of the decision.

C. **Determination.** Upon receipt, the President will place the proposed item on the agenda of the next Executive Council meeting. At that time the Executive Council may add the proposed item to the agenda of a Senate meeting, deny it a place on the agenda, or table the proposed item until the next meeting of the Executive Council. The president shall communicate the decision of the Executive Council to the individual who submitted the proposal within seven days.

**ARTICLE IV**
MEETINGS OF THE SENATE

Section 1. **Chair.**

The chair of College Faculty Senate meetings shall be, in order, the President, the President-Elect, or another senator designated by the President.

Section 2. **Order of Business.**

The regular order of business is established in Appendix B (Standing Rules).

Section 3. **Motions.** The work of the Senate, besides announcements, reports and general discussion, will be handled by main motions introduced under new business (see Attachment A).

   **A. Main Motion.** A main motion is a written proposal for the Senate to take an action on a subject. A main motion may only be considered under new or unfinished business. To be in order, a main motion must be published verbatim in the agenda of the meeting in which it is to be considered. No main motion can be introduced while another motion is pending.

   **B. Proposals from the Floor.** A proposal from the floor is a request by a Senator to consider an item of business. Proposals from the floor are to be introduced under “New Business.” Proposals must be available in writing to Senators at the meeting in which the proposal is made. The proposal must be introduced by a Senator and seconded prior to discussion and vote, and may not be amended. With a majority vote in favor of the proposal, the proposal becomes a main motion that the Senate will immediately consider. As a main motion the item may be amended, tabled, approved, rejected, etc.

Section 4. **Debate and Voting.**

Unless otherwise specified, all motions shall be decided by a majority vote of those present and voting by show of hands. After debate on a main motion and before
voting has begun, any senator may call for the vote to be taken by secret ballot. A motion for secret ballot must be decided by an open vote.

Main motions that are passed shall be called a “Resolution of the Emory College Faculty Senate” and provided a title, date and number (see Attachment B.)

Section 5. **General Discussion.**

The agenda may include or the Chair may at any time call for general discussion of any topic. Senators may make a proposal from the floor for general discussion of any topic. No motions may be made during general discussion.

Section 6. **Visitors.**

A. Meetings of the Senate may be closed to visitors (not members of the Emory faculty or administration) by majority vote.
B. Visitors who are neither Emory faculty nor Emory administrators must seek prior approval to attend Senate meetings from the ECAS Faculty Senate Executive Council by contacting the ECAS Faculty Senate President.

**ARTICLE V**

**WORKING GROUPS**

The bylaws of the Emory College Faculty provide the Senate with the authority to create working groups and task forces. Section 3 of Article VI gives the Senate those powers and duties which have been or which may be delegated to it by Emory College faculty. Section 4 (F) grants the Senate the authority to create working groups and task forces. Section 10 specifies two kinds of working groups and task forces: those composed of elected senators, and those composed of faculty. The bylaws do not limit the Senate to only these two kinds of groups. The Senate, for example, may want to create a working group or task force that includes students, members of the administration, trustees, or individuals outside the College or University.

Section 1. Working groups or task forces composed of senators can be formed and dissolved by the Executive Council at any time. Senators wishing to create a working group or task force shall make a request to the President.

Section 2. Working groups or task forces composed only of faculty not currently serving on the Senate shall be constituted by nomination and election by the full faculty.

Section 3. Working groups or task forces which do not fall under Section 1 or Section 2 above, shall be created by a motion of the Senate. The motion must specify how the working group or task force is to be composed, such as by appointment, or nomination and election, or by some other mechanism.
ARTICLE VI
COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION

Section 1. Web Site.

The staff person assigned to the Senate will maintain the College Faculty web site, which shall be accessible to all members of Emory University. Senate membership with contact information, bylaws, motions, minutes, working groups and additional documents will be posted on the web site and kept up to date. The web site shall be the primary record and archive of the Senate.

Section 2. Communication.

In addition to the web site and reports at regularly scheduled faculty meetings, the Senate shall issue reports through its newsletter, prepared by the President with the approval of the Executive Council and issued electronically.

Section 3. Minutes.

The staff person assigned to the Senate will record the minutes of Senate meetings and provide them in a timely manner to the President, who shall transmit them electronically to the members of the Senate.

Section 4. Availability.

Members of the Senate shall make themselves available to departments and programs.

Section 5. Access to Information.

In order to carry out its functions, the Senate requires from the various administrative departments of the College full access to pertinent information (financial, budgetary, personnel, admissions). If the Senate and the Dean should disagree about the pertinence of information, it is understood that the Dean is empowered to override the judgment of the Senate and may choose to do so. Should the Senate require information from an administrative department that does not report to the Dean, the Senate may request the information from the President or Provost, as appropriate, and they, too, are empowered to override the judgment of the Senate on this issue. When such information is of a sensitive nature, the Senate will take appropriate precautions to limit its distribution.

ARTICLE VII
ABSENTEEISM

The President, acting with the advice of the Executive Council, may ask a senator to resign if she or he is absent without cause for an excessive number of meetings. The
resulting vacancy shall be filled by appointment according to the Emory College
Bylaws, VIII, 5, A.

**ARTICLE VIII**
**AMENDMENTS**

These bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the Senate by two-thirds vote of
those present and voting, provided that notice of any proposed amendment has
been given to the Emory College faculty Senate at a preceding meeting or in writing
at least one week in advance of the meeting at which the proposed amendment is to
be acted upon.

**ARTICLE IX**
**PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY**

shall govern the College Senate, in all cases to which these rules are applicable and
in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws, the bylaws of Emory College,
the bylaws of Emory University or any special rules of the Emory College faculty, as
determined by the chair. The Senate may appoint a parliamentarian by a majority
vote of those present and voting.
APPENDIX A  
(FROM THE COLLEGE BYLAWS, ARTICLE VI) 

COLLEGE SENATE

Section 1. **Jurisdiction.**

The College Senate of Emory University’s College of Arts and Sciences is the elected and representative body of the Emory College faculty. It may consider, take positions, and vote on any matter of interest to Emory College faculty, including those having to do with the role of the College within the University.

Section 2. **Succession.**

The College Senate replaces the Governance Committee (GovCom). Any reference in Emory College policies and procedures to the Governance Committee or GovCom shall be understood as referring to the superseding College Senate.

Section 3. **Powers and Duties.**

The College Senate shall have those powers and duties which have been or which may be delegated to it by the Emory College faculty in these bylaws or by vote at a meeting of the Emory College faculty or by the Board of Trustees of Emory University.

Section 4. **Functions.**

A. The College Senate shall:
   1. protect academic freedom,
   2. promote excellence in research and teaching,
   3. promote equity and diversity within the faculty and student body, and
   4. advance the general welfare of the College.

B. The College Senate will work with faculty and the College Administration to:
   1. establish priorities and goals for the College and
   2. create and implement policies regarding the core college missions of research, teaching, and service, including the development, evaluation, and reorganization of College programs.

C. The College Senate will have responsibility for overseeing all aspects of standing committees, including:
   1. The authority to redefine standing committees and their mandates.
   2. Receiving reports from standing committees with the exception of the
confidential deliberations of the Grievance Committee, the Lecture Track Promotion Committee, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

D. Issues which the College Administration wishes to be considered by a standing committee shall be directed to the College Senate, which shall determine the assignment to a standing committee(s).

E. The College Senate shall consider any matters presented to it by standing committees and may take whatever action concerning such matters as the College Senate deems appropriate.

F. The College Senate shall have the authority to create working groups and task forces.

Section 5. Authority.

A. Impact. Matters voted on by the College Senate shall be the decisions of the faculty subject to appeal as outlined in these bylaws.

B. Recommendations. The College Senate may submit recommendations and resolutions to the Administration, including the Board of Trustees, the Provost and President, the Dean of the Laney Graduate School, and the Dean of Emory College Arts and Sciences.

Section 6. Membership and Representation.

A. Composition. The College Senate shall consist of twenty-three (23) voting senators and seven (7) non-voting, ex officio senators.

B. Eligibility. All regular members of the faculty of Emory College shall be eligible to serve as senators of the College Senate.

C. Representation. The College Senate shall be comprised as follows:
   1. Six (6) senators each from the Division of the Humanities, the Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the Division of Social Sciences, elected from and by members of each division.
      a. A minimum of three (3) senators from each division shall be faculty who hold appointments at the rank Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor.
      b. A minimum of one (1) senator from each division shall be faculty who hold appointments at the rank of Professor of Pedagogy/Practice/Performance, Senior Lecturer, or Lecturer.
2. Five (5) at-large senators elected by the entire faculty.
   a. A minimum of two (2) senators shall be faculty who hold appointments at the rank Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor.
   b. A minimum of one (1) at-large senator shall be a faculty member who holds an appointment at the rank of Professor of Pedagogy/Practice/Performance, Senior Lecturer, or Lecturer.

3. Seven ex-officio positions with no vote and not counted toward quorum:
   a. Faculty representative from the Faculty Council of the University Senate, (selected by the College Senate).
   b. Faculty representative from the Executive Council of the Laney Graduate School, (selected by the College Senate).
   c. Chair of the Curriculum, Assessment and Educational Policy Committee.
   d. Immediate past-President of the Senate.
   e. Dean of College.
   f. Dean of Admissions.
   g. Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education.

D. Tenure. No Senator may serve more than seven consecutive years in the College Senate.

E. Restriction. No person shall concurrently hold more than one College Senate seat. Administrators at the level of Senior Associate Dean or above may not stand for election to the College Senate.

Section 7. College Senate Officers.

A. Officers. The officers of the College Senate shall be President and President-elect.

B. Nominations. Two candidates for President-elect shall be nominated annually by the College Senate by secret ballot.

C. Election. The full faculty shall by electronic ballot elect the President-elect by majority vote from the two candidates nominated by the College Senate.

D. Start of Term. The elected candidate will begin to serve as President-elect at the beginning of the academic year following his/her election.
E. **President Term.** The President-elect shall serve in the capacity of President at the beginning of the academic year in the calendar year following his/her election and shall automatically assume the duties of that position at that time.

Section 8. **Meetings.**

A. **Frequency.** The College Senate shall meet at least monthly during the academic year, except during meetings of the full faculty. Meetings shall be open to faculty and administration.

B. **Non-faculty Members.** Visitors shall be seated in such a manner as not to interfere with decorum and proper deliberations of the body. Meetings may be closed to visitors who are not regular or associate members by a majority vote of the College Senate.

C. **Protected information.** The College Senate may refer issues involving legal or statutorily protected information to the executive council to be considered in closed session.

D. **Department /Program Representation.** Provision shall be made for departments or programs to make representation in person and in writing to the College Senate and to receive a response.

E. **Public Session.** The President of the College Senate shall reserve a time at the beginning of each meeting for public comment.

F. **Quorum.** At least fifteen (15) of the elected senators of the College Senate constitute a quorum.

G. **Permissible Actions.** In the absence of a quorum, discussion may proceed at the discretion of the chair, but no action (motion, resolution or other formal proposal) may be taken except adjournment to a specified future time.

H. **Restrictions.**

1. No absentee or proxy voting is allowed in the College Senate.
2. The College Senate may seek advice and guidance from any faculty member or administrator it deems appropriate, but such individuals may serve in an advisory role only.

Section 9. **Executive Council.**

A. **Composition.** The College Senate shall have an Executive Council consisting of the President, the President-elect, the immediate past-
President, and one senator from each division and one senator at large elected by and from the members of the College Senate.

B. Function.

1. The President, in consultation with the Executive Council, shall be responsible for setting the agenda of the College Senate and College Faculty meetings.

2. May consider matters referred from the College Senate involving legal or statutorily protected information in closed session.

C. Ex-Officio. The immediate past president shall serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the executive committee for one year following their term as President unless re-elected to the College Senate.

D. Ineligibility. If the immediate past president is ineligible or unable to serve for any reason including being reelected to the College Senate that slot on the Executive Council shall remain vacant for that term.

E. Closed Session. Meetings of the Executive Council shall be open to faculty and administration unless the Executive Council votes by two-thirds vote to go into closed session to consider legal or statutorily protected information.

1. Any person whom the Executive Council may determine to be necessary to its deliberations may be allowed to participate in the council’s closed session meeting for that purpose.

2. The Executive Council shall report to the College Senate exclusive of any confidential findings or actions.

Section 10. Working groups.

A. A working-group or task force composed of elected senators may be constituted at any time.

B. A working group or task force composed of faculty shall be constituted by nomination and election.

C. All decisions by working groups and task forces must be referred directly to the College Senate for discussion before final determinations are made, or before making recommendations to the College Administration.

Section 11. Communications.
The College Senate shall report on its work to the Emory College faculty through minutes of its meetings and in regularly scheduled faculty meetings.

Section 12. **Bylaws and Organization of the Senate.**

The College Senate shall adopt its own bylaws for further organizing itself and conducting business. The bylaws of the College Senate must also contain procedures by which any member of the college community may, in a timely manner, obtain the schedule, agenda, and minutes of College Senate meetings and may attend Senate meetings. No provision of the College Senate bylaws may conflict with the bylaws of the Emory College Faculty.

Section 13. **Review.**

A. After a period of three (3) years following its first meeting, the College Senate will review the senate, including its composition and functioning, and will report its findings and recommendations to the faculty by the end of the first semester of the fourth (4th) year.

B. This report shall be voted on by the regular members of the faculty by electronic ballot.

C. After the initial review, the Senate shall review itself every five (5) years and shall report its findings and recommendations to the faculty for approval.
APPENDIX B
STANDING RULES

1. The regular order of business for the College Faculty Senate meetings shall be as follows:

   Call to Order
   Approval of Agenda
   Submission and Approval of Minutes
   Announcements
   Public Comment
   Report of Executive Council
   Report of Working Groups
   Unfinished Business (main motions, reports)
   New Business
   Adjournment

2. Items not on the announced agenda may be added by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting if a quorum is present.

3. These standing rules may be suspended by a majority vote at any meeting of the Senate.
ATTACHMENT A
Types of Motions

1. Main Motion. A formal written proposal to take an action. Main motions that come from the executive council or a working group do not require a second. According to RRO, §3, 34-5, “The main motion sets a pattern from which all other motions are derived.”

2. Motion from the Floor. A request by a Senator to consider an item of business, introduced under “New Business.” Proposals must be available in writing to Senators at the meeting in which the proposal is made. The proposal must be introduced by a Senator and seconded prior to discussion and vote, and may not be amended. Upon an affirmative vote the Senate will immediately consider the item of business as a main motion.

3. Secondary Motions. These are to assist the Senate with the main motion.
   i. Motion to Postpone Indefinitely. Does away with the main motion without a direct vote.
   ii. Motion to Amend. Changes the wording of the main motion. May not be tabled. If not voted on by the end of the meeting, the motion fails.
   iii. Motion to Refer. This sends the main motion to a group for additional modification.
   iv. Motion to Postpone. This moves consideration of the main motion to a later time, either within the meeting or to another meeting.
   v. Motion to Lay on the Table. This sets the main motion aside temporarily without specifying a time to renew debate. A majority can resume discussion whenever it decides.
   vi. Motion to Limit or Extend Debate. Sets specific limits on the discussion of the main motion.
   vii. Calling the Question. Immediately closes debate with the exception of a motion to lay on the table. Requires a two-thirds vote and may not be amended.
   viii. Motion for Secret Ballot. This motion must be made after debate on a main motion and before voting has begun, and must be decided by an open vote.
   ix. Motion to Adjourn. Ends the meeting.
ATTACHMENT B
EXAMPLE OF AN APPROVED MAIN MOTION

01-2050

Resolution of the Emory College Faculty Senate
Title

[Text of approved motion]

Approved by the Emory College Faculty Senate, September 15, 2050
ATTACHMENT C
Bringing an Item before the College Faculty Senate

Faculty, Senators or Admin. may submit

Proposals received by President, who places item on Executive Council

Executive Council accepts,

Item printed on Senate agenda

Senate discusses item under new business. Motions may be amended

Senate publishes outcome

Faculty Senators, or Faculty with support, may submit motions

Proposals from floor
APPENDIX 8

Senate Review Report
CATEGORIZED SUMMARY OF MOTIONS PASSED BY ECAS FACULTY SENATE 2015-2018
(August 26, 2015 – October 17, 2018)

SP Motion 01-2015 Senate-Department and Program Relations
Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: Named departmental liaisons from ECAS Faculty Senate.

PO Motion 02-2015 Letter to Board of Trustees re: Selection of New University President
Type of motion: Position statement
Action: Request to Board of Trustees for ECAS Faculty Senate involvement in the selection of the New Emory University President
Results: No record of response

CO-Motion 03-2015 Creation of Working Groups for College Strategic Planning
Type: Content-oriented
Action: Created 4 workings groups: 1) Faculty excellence; 2) Research, Scholarship, and Creativity; 3) Undergraduate Education; 4) Philanthropy, Development and Public Engagement
Results: Each working group prepared a strategic plan, only the preliminary plans are in the archive. No record of senate vote on reports, which were forwarded to the Dean.

PO Motion 04-2015 Statement of Solidarity re: Racial Climate at Emory
Type: Position statement
Action: Commits senate to seeking ways to support and increase diversity on the campus
Result: No specific result found

PO Motion 05-2015 Statement on Diversity and Freedom of Expression
Type: Position statement
Action: statement of senate commitment to diversity, to also facilitating freedom of expression
Result: No specific action beyond the resolution taken.

SP Motion 06-2016 (incorrect- is 06-2015) 2015-16 Procedure to select nominees for President (2016-7 term) and President-Elect (2017-8)
Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: Procedure to select nominees for President (2016-7 term) and President-Elect (2017-8 term)
Result: Senate set procedure for selecting President and President-elect for the 2015-16 academic year
PO Motion 07-2015 (date appears to be incorrect) Curricular Implication of the Emory Integrity Project (EIP) with respect to PACE 101

Type: Position and procedure statement
Action: Stated Senate’s position that a first-year reading was part of the curriculum and needed approval of the curriculum committee
Result: Curriculum Committee was consulted

Motion 08-2016 Curricular Implications of the Emory Integrity Project (EIP) with Respect to a Common Reading for all Entering First-year Students

This is a duplication of Motion 07-2015. It is unclear why this happened.

SP Motion 09-2016 Amendment to Senate Bylaws, Proposals from the Floor (IV, 3, B)

Type of motion: Senate procedure, change in bylaws
Action: Amended bylaws to clarify procedure for proposals from the floor

SP bl Motion 10-2016 Amendment to Senate Bylaws, Working Groups (V)

Type of motion: Senate procedure, change to bylaws
Action: Amended the bylaws to Clarify the types of working groups and their composition

CO Motion 11-2016 Amendment to Composition of the Philanthropy, Development and Public Engagement Working Group

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Amended composition and changed name of working group.

PO Motion 12-2016 Letter to University Senate President re Title IX

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: Concerns about sexual harassment and title IX and mandatory reporting.
Results: Not clear what response the University Senate took on this matter.

PO Motion 13-2016 Endorsement, with Comment, of Dean Forman's Final Draft 2016-2021 Strategic Plan

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: Senate endorsed the draft of the strategic plan.

SY Motion 14-2016 Statement of Appreciation for ECAS Dean Robin Forman

Type: Symbolic
Action: No action beyond statement of appreciation

SP Motion 15-2016 Approval of Student Members of Standing Committees

Type of motion: Senate procedure

SP Motion 16-2016 Amendment to Senate Standing Rules (Appendix B)

Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: added “Public comment may be solicited on each action item.”
PO Motion 17-2016 Letter to President-elect Sterk re: Selection of New University Provost

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: Stated the ECAS Faculty Senate’s role in selecting a new provost.
Result: Senators did not serve on the search committee and only the finalist was revealed

PO Motion 18-2016 Letter to Interim Provost Zola re: Selection of New Emory College Dean

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: ECAS Faculty Senate invited interim provost to meet with the ECAS senate to discuss search for new College Dean.
Result: The Interim provost met with the ECAS Faculty Senate to discuss the search for a College Dean and the candidates for Dean held meetings with the senators

SP Motion 19-2016 Approval of Ex Officio Members of Senate from University Senate and LGS

Type of motion: Senate procedure

SP Motion 20-2016 Approval of Change in Student Member to Academic Standards Committee

Type of motion: Senate procedure

CO Motion 21-2016 Creation of Working Group to Evaluate and Enhance Student Academic Engagement

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Working group was created
Result: A report of the working group was submitted to the senate in 2017

PO Motion 22-2016 Recommendation for the Implementation of the New Standards for Tenure and Promotion

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: ECAS Faculty Senate recommended that the standards for all pre-tenure faculty be those in effect when they were hired
Result: The Dean grandfathered in only those faculty who had undergone their 4th year review

CO Motion 23-2016 Creation of Working Group on Teaching Evaluation

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Working group was created
Result: A report of the working group was submitted to the senate in 2017. The recommendations in the report have not been translated into changes in evaluation.

CO Motion 24-2016 Change in Composition and Reporting of Working Group to Evaluate and Enhance Student Academic Engagement

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Composition and report date changed.
CO Motion 25-2016 Change in Reporting Date for Working Group on Teaching Evaluation
   Type: Content-oriented
   Action: Report date changed.

PO Motion 26-2016 Resolution in Support of Emory University as a Sanctuary Campus
   Type of motion: Position statement
   Action: Resolution of support passed
   Result: No apparent result

PO Motion 27-2016 Statement in Support of an Open Search Process for the Next Dean of Emory College
   Type of motion: Position statement
   Action: ECAS Faculty Senate encouraged open search involving Emory faculty for a new ECAS College Dean.
   Result: Search was open and faculty were involved.

PO Motion 28-2017 Statement of Emory College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate re: the January 27, 2017 Presidential Executive Order "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States"
   Type of motion: Position statement
   Action: Stated opposition to Presidential Executive Order and support for DACA students
   Result: Courts blocked Executive Order

PO Motion 29-2017 Support of Teach-In on Intellectual Responsibility
   Type of motion: Position statement
   Action: Stated support for Teach-in

SY Motion 30-2017 Letter of Thanks to President Sterk re DACA Statement
   Type: Symbolic
   Action: Thanked President Sterk for public support of DACA students.
   Result: President Sterk thanked the ECAS Faculty Senate for their support.

PO Motion 31-2017 Letter to Provost McBride re: Identification and Selection of Candidates for Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
   Type of motion: Position statement
   Action: Requested senate involvement in filling these positions by being part of the search committee
   Result: The hires were internal with no search committee. Members of the ECASF Faculty Senate were invited to meet with the candidates.

SP Motion 32-2017 Approval of Senator Replacement While on Leave
   Type of motion: Senate procedure
   Action: Approved Jim Rilling to replace Karen Hegtvedt while on leave
SP Motion 33-2017 Approval of Ex Officio Member of the Senate from University Senate

Type: Senate Procedure
Action: Approved Juliette Stapanian Apkarian as Ex Officio member of the ECAS Faculty Senate, from the University Senate.

CO Motion 34-2017 Creation of Initial Working Group on Undergraduate Curriculum and GERs

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Created working group as specified in motion

SP Motion 35-2017 Approval of Student Members of Standing Committees

Type of motion: Senate procedure

CO Motion 36-2017 Creation of a Senate Task Force on Student Demand 13 – Diversity GER

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Created Working group to address student concerns
Result: Working group issued a report advocating for a pilot program for a diversity GER. The report was transferred to the Curriculum Committee, because this is a curricular matter.

SP-bylaws Motion 37-2017 Amendment to Article V, Section 3A, Authorization of Electronic Voting

Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: Developed the language of a motion to be presented to the faculty as a whole at their 11/1/2017 meeting. The motion would allow the ECAS Faculty Senate to authorize an electronic vote on any topic.
Result: The proposed amendment was approved by a majority of the faculty participating in the 11/1/2017 faculty meeting

SP Motion 38-2017 Moderation of Emory College Faculty Discussion Listserv

Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: Described that the moderator of the College Faculty Listserv would be the past President

PO Motion 39-2017 Statement of Support for Math and Computer Science Genesis Proposal

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: ECAS Faculty Senate endorsed the plan of Math/CS to become two departments: Mathematics and Computer Science.
Result: The two departments were approved and have formed

SP bylaws Motion 40-2017 Amendment to Article VIII, Section 5A and D, Senate/Committee Vacancy

Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: clarified that when a senate or standing committee vacancy is filled that the senator of committee member may return to senate or standing committee as long as the absence is 2 semesters or less.
SP bylaws Motion 41-2017 Amendment to Article VIII, Section 5C, President-Elect Vacancy

Type of motion: Senate procedure

Action: Clarified that election of a President-Elect pro tempore when the President-Elect office is vacant. Also authorizes the direct election of a President when there is not President-elect.

PO Motion 42-2017 Endorsement of the ECAS Strategic Plan, "Leading the Liberal Arts and Sciences: Strategic Priorities for Emory College of Arts and Sciences"

Type of motion: Position statement

Action: Endorses the ECAS College strategic plan.

SP Motion 43-2018 Procedure to select nominees for President and President-Elect when both occur in a single academic year

Type of motion: Senate procedure

Action: Describes the procedure to be used when both a President and a President-elect will be elected at the same time for the following academic year.

SP Motion 44-2018 Procedure for implementing the review of the ECAS Faculty Senate as presented in Proviso 9 of the ECAS Faculty Senate Bylaws and in Article VI, Section 13 of the ECAS Faculty Senate Bylaws

Type of motion: Senate procedure

Action: Describes the procedure to be used to review the function of the ECAS Faculty Senate as required in the bylaws.

SP Motion 45-2018 Resolution of the Emory College Faculty Senate concerning guidelines for the Nominations Committee for conducting elections

Type of motion: Senate Procedure

Action: Describes the procedure to be used for conducting elections by the Nominations Committee.

SP –bylaws Motion 46-2018 Amendment to Article IV, Section 6. Non-ECAS Visitors

Type of motion: Senate procedure

Action: Describes the procedure for closing meetings to Emory visitors and for non-Emory visitors to be allowed to attend ECAS Faculty Senate meetings.

PO Motion 47-2018 Endorsement of the report and recommendations of the Teaching Evaluation and Mentoring Working Group

Type of motion: Position statement

Action: report accepted.

PO Motion 48-2018 Acceptance of the report of the initial Working Group on Undergraduate Curriculum and General Education Requirements (GER) and proposed continuation of the Working Group

Type of motion: Position statement

Action: report accepted.
PO Motion 49-2018 Resolution to refer the report of the task force on student demand 13 to the Curriculum, Assessment and Educational Policy Committee

Type of motion: Position statement
Action: report accepted and referred to Curriculum, Assessment and Educational Policy Committee

SP Motion 50-2018 Approval of Senator Replacement While on Leave

Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: approved two replacements for senators on leave

CO Motion 51-2018 Creation of Working Group on Pre-Major Advising

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Created working group on Pre-major advising.

CO Motion 52-2018 Creation of Working Group on the Review of the College Senate

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Created working group on Review of the College Senate

CO Motion 53-2018 Creation of Working Group on Faculty Responsibilities

Type: Content-oriented
Action: Created working group on Faculty Responsibilities

SP Motion 54-2018 Approval of Student Members of Standing Committees

Type of motion: Senate procedure
Action: approved Student members of standing committees
DISCUSSIONS

2017-18
- Discussion on the AAUP Resolution in Favor of Continuous Employment for All Post-Probationary Emory Faculty
- Discussion on the Math and Computer Science ‘Genesis’ Plan
- Discussion on the Inclement Weather Policy
- Discussion with Dean Elliott on the College Strategic Plan
- Discussion on pre-major advising with a report by Joanne Brzinski and Shari Obrentz
- Discussion with Nancy Bliwise on additional faculty evaluation questions
- Discussion/ Report from Tracy Scott on the QEP
- Discussion/ Report from Rachelle Spell on the work of the Teaching Evaluation and Mentoring Working Group
- Discussion with Pamela Scully on the Common Read Program
- Discussion/ Report of the Working Group on Curriculum
- Discussion/ Report of the Task Force on Student Demand 13
- Discussion of the draft of revision of Lecture Track Faculty Promotion Committee Policy with Mark Risjord

2016-17
- Discussion on reorganization of the Office for Undergraduate Education
- Discussion of undergraduate research initiatives
- Discussion of proposed changes to the Honor Code
- Discussion of profile of new Dean of Emory College
- Discussion of Dalai Lama Center for Compassion and Universal Ethics
- Discussion of proposed changes to tenure and promotion guidelines, timeline for implementation, and memorandum on teaching evaluation

2015-16
- Discussion with members of the Presidential Selection Committee
- Discussion of course evaluations and Student Demand #4
- Discussions of College Strategic Planning: considering concrete steps/actions that would actualize the principles and general goals of various working groups
- Discussion and presentation by John Latting and Joel Dobben re: plans to engage academic departments in the freshmen selection process
- Discussion on the curricular implications of the Emory Integrity Project (EIP)
- Discussion of the relationship of the College and Campus Life with Ajay Nair
- Discussion of Admissions and Scholarships report of May 8, 2015
- Special meeting and presentation by Michael Sacks, Vice Provost, University Strategies in the Office of the Provost
- Discussion and presentation by Michael Kutner re: forming an Emory Faculty Club
APPENDIX 10

Faculty Senate Review
LISTENING SESSIONS

24 October 2018 (N=50)

Comments

Vaidy Suggestion: Get chairs to encourage faculty to respond to survey (and attend listening sessions and College faculty meetings)

Valerie On Gov. Comm. on last year and Senate for 2 years, the structure is unwieldy (Roberts Rules, sometimes silly mechanism of voting)

Kim Loudermilk: Old structure changed because of low faculty attendance, so could have better attendance at infrequent meetings, which is not working. Don’t advise going back

Been helpful having same people at the regular meetings (also having read the materials)

? Old large department would send representatives (of several dept. faculty) to faculty meetings who would report

Pat attended all faculty meetings and was Senator, see Senate works better, but we need to be sure that all faculty are aware of our work. Best to avoid the secret backdoor committees

Kim Senate listserv: moderated but not used, though it is open to all faculty

Sheila Cavanaugh: Poor attendance here may be a bad sign, indicating faculty are less aware and less aware of each other. This could increase silofication. DO we need to offset that?

Ideas to increase attendance: wine or discord

Robert: Speaking as liaison that they did not realize that they could approach Senator to bring up any issue. They don’t see themselves as responsible to tell the faculty. Sending to whole listserv seems like a barrier.

Liz: I am on the Senate. We have an ongoing issue within the institution that we don’t have a process for discussing issues. The hope was the Senate was a place for that. People may not feel it is an open forum, so it is good that you are emphasizing that.

Joe (History) was the worst rep but was impressed with the Senate and how the History Dept was keyed into the work.
Patty: the people who don’t come are happy to have the Senators do the work. There has not been a crisis.

Clifton: Surprised by the attendance at faculty meetings. I had the fantasy that the two meetings would be widely attended. When there were significant things, then people came (eg Tenure and Promotion or about Electronic Voting). There is something that is not quite right about how it doesn’t work now.

Elena I have a practical reason: I don’t think people know that this is the College meeting and not a Senate meeting.

Valerie: Structure of Jones Room is not optimal for welcoming, with Senators all at the table

14 November 2018 (N=4)

How does it compare to the GovCom?

Both in the past as well as in the present the problem of low attendance to faculty meetings remains, however with the current form of the Senate, some people have regular meetings and work with the Dean. Unfortunately, most people are not interested in participating and it is hard to think about how this might be changed.

Is the faculty better represented by the Senate in its current form?

There were only 11 faculty members in GovCom, .... In the current Senate, therefore, just based on numerical evidence, it is.

At the same time, because of its composition, in the Senate some disciplines have a larger representation (biology, for instance). The issue of representation should be looked at not just in terms of numbers. Also, the proportion between TT and LT faculty is very important to consider when comparing GovCom to the current Senate.

The Senate has an executive committee. The main function of this committee is to set up the agenda for the senate meeting. The executive meetings are open to faculty (Meetings of the Executive Council shall be open to faculty and administration unless the Executive Council votes by two-thirds vote to go into closed session to consider legal or statutorily protected information).

The executive committee can also select people in the WG, which means these people are not elected. The members of all the various standing committees, instead, are always elected. The nomination committee is very powerful and impactful and perhaps should be treated differently. This committee, together with the Tenure and Promotion committee and the LT faculty promotion committee, works very closely with the Dean. Should this committee (and possibly the other two) be treated differently? Should the members of the Nomination
committee be appointed or elected? Should all of some of these appointments go through the Senate? Should people be recruited directly? The election committee needs more support. Carly could play a role and help. Also, it seems as there should be some sort of connection/collaboration between the NC and the Senate, given the importance of its role. One of the biggest challenges for the committee is opening opportunities for junior faculty to participate in shared governance. Perhaps the Chair could be allowed to make a special nomination. Chairs are encouraged to nominate faculty but perhaps this could be done in a more systematic way. The importance of service should also be highlighted. There seem to be a new feeling that service is now important but it should be made apparent. Service should occupy a critical aspect of the tenure and promotion package.

Encourage chairs to nominate some young faculty member. Maybe we can use this as a more systematic way.

- **Do faculty members think that the Senate serves the best interests of the Faculty?**

  The principle behind the structure of the Senate is that of Shared governance, therefore the Senate represents the faculty but works with the Dean too. Is there a sense in the faculty at large that this is what the Senate is doing and what the Senate is supposed to do? The Dean is very committed to shared governance. What if we had a Dean with a different attitude. Would the Senate still able to stand up and represent the best interest of the Faculty? It is important to highlight what the Senate has done so far, the impact it had. It could be helpful to categorize the nature of the motions. Not many motions come as a consequence of faculty concerns. Many things come up as a discussion but do not generate motions. It is also important to highlight the fact that there was a lot of ground work needed to be done during the first years.

  Some actions taken:
  Changes to the requirement in teaching for TT. There was a working group on faculty excellence and the working group recommended not to request excellent in teaching. In this particular case the Senate changed the recommendation of the WG.

  Which things worked really well and which didn’t?

  - New Honors committee.
  - Strategic planning
  - GRE

  The work on strategic planning worked really well. That on the diversity GER did not work well and it is still lost in process. Changes to GRE will ultimately have to go through the Senate. There will have to be a vote and this brings back the issue of low faculty engagement. At the last meeting only 10% of the faculty was present (only 50 people) but hopefully people would participate if there is a vote.
Perhaps there should be only 1 general meeting per semester? The Senate can always call for as many meetings as needed if there is an issue to be discussed, especially before a vote. The role of the liaison should instead become more important. Another possibility could be the creation of faculty listserv based on interests and/or disciplines.

19 November 2018 (N=1)

Attendee began by asking “Why are so many faculty disengaged from the faculty senate?” He then noted that he had voted against the Senate. Although he recognized it as a solution to the failure to get faculty members to show up to faculty meetings, he does not consider it to be a solution to faculty governance per se.

He sees the Senate as mostly going through procedural motions and beliefs that Roberts Rules of order take precedent over content. He envisions that real governance of Emory College would involve an “executive branch” (the administration) and a “legislative branch” (the Senate). He further noted that for the Senate to be meaningful, it must act as a true bridge with the administration, especially in terms of the budget.

He questions: the amount that the College pays in allocated costs to the University and wonders if the College is getting value for what it pays; the number of assistant deans in the college; and how the dean allocates the budget (wondering here if there should be a council that makes decisions about that allocation).

He raised questions about the awareness of faculty members about what the Senate does and suggested that perhaps there could be subcommittees of the senate that participate in decisions about allocations of the searches and the budget. He further questioned the extent to which the Senate can executive “checks and balances” with regard to executive “orders.” He proposes strengthening the “charter” to give Senate more control.
APPENDIX 11

Faculty Senate Review Survey
CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Responses to the open-ended question (Q27): *What additional thoughts do you have about faculty governance in Emory College that you think are important for the Senate Review Working Group to know?*

Comments as entered on the survey:

- Apathy means that a republic (Senate) rather than town hall governance will be the best structure.
- As a new faculty member trying to get a feel for initiatives underway in the College - I would love if committees provided more informative reports of their activities so it would be easier to understand initiatives/activities/priorities.
- As an over-committed tenure-track faculty member (with a young family), I have taken the stance of nearly blindly trusting that my representatives are speaking up for me, and that I will be called upon if some controversy or a large decision is to be made that needs buy-in from a larger group. Thus as a (sorry to say) disengaged voter, the way to reach me is to provide relevant easy-to-digest bite-size information into my overcrowded mailbox, including call for action if there is something acute. Something of the form: "Matter x up for online yay/nay vote. Vote deadline. 2-sentence overall summary. 2-sentence summary of how yay affects you/students/others. 2-sentence summary of how nay affects you/students/others. Direct personal link for vote. Link for more thorough details, arguments, etc."
- As new faculty, including a primer on the faculty senate in new hire on-boarding activities might be helpful.
- Despite its ideals, the Senate form has been an enormous step backward for real faculty control. The Senate could do no greater service than to abolish itself.
- Emory does not have a tradition of real faculty governance. Faculty work to present reports to administrators, who make the decisions, often without any real faculty power to approve, disapprove, veto, etc. As a result, faculty involved in our "advisory" model of "shared governance" work a lot but without much in the way of authority for decision-making. I guess some people enjoy this kind of thing, or feel that they are somehow involved, but in my experience, this work is a waste of faculty time, given the way decisions are actually made. And I don't like it that the administration so often selects faculty for service on decision-making bodies. The ECAS and University Senates should have a role there.
- Engagement is super low. I have no suggestions on how to improve other than look around at other universities that are doing this well. There is also a problem of having enough time to engage in committees, etc like this.
- Faculty governance is difficult at best - too many things to do, too little time. The current form, while not perfect, is better than the GovCom.
- Faculty governance is only functional if the faculty are fully engaged, and this is not the always the case for faculty in departments with large teaching loads in addition to research expectations. In contrast departments that have neither have the time to frequently participate but also have an unrealistic view of of other departments. I feel that faculty senate leadership nominees should be vetted for their academic standing among their peers within the college
and their history of college service, and only those with significant experience and stature should participate in and lead the senate.

- Faculty governors need to represent the university - not the faculty.
- Faculty perception of the importance of governance depends directly on two factors: 1. do things change as result of faculty input?? (sometimes yes, sometimes no and the reasons why are often a mystery), and 2. are there rewards/incentives/disincentives/respect expressed through time and salary/etc. that point faculty toward participation in governance? (full leadership development should be open to faculty of all ranks, faculty who take on governance roles should receive credit for their service, mentoring to help them get through, support for going to conferences that help them understand the higher education landscape better, etc.).
- Faculty Salaries, Administrative bloat, Arcane problem solving structure, Lack of nimbleness
- Finance is an important topic HR is an important topic International faculty are an important topic. How involved is the senate in the real business of higher ed? Finance Eg: Why did Emory switch from a non profit to a for profit —AETNA — overnight some years ago without consulting the Senate or the faculty? HR/Finance Eg: Why are some doctors who have been working here for years only now being told they are part of an Emory unit that does not permit the employee to have a dependent tuition scholarship? When hired it was not made clear to some working at Emory specialists that they do not have the same benefits as Emory clinic faculty. These are just two examples. I am also very concerned about mistreatment of faculty who are visa holders.
- find a way for the Senate to better represent the needs and goals of the faculty to achieve its mission of excellence in teaching and research. to do this, there has to be less emphasis on selfish departmental interests.
- For diversity in faculty representation one must study the factors that keep a small group of faculty rotating through positions while others never serve. I see a group of brave nominations each election cycle, but the winner usually seems to be someone serving in more than one elected or administrative position already.
- governance depends on trust. faculty voted in this new model not just to make things more nimble but to address very real issues of enfranchisement. as it stands the Senate is not and cannot being taken seriously as a venue that advocates for and realizes faculty interests, and this endangers the whole project of faculty governance.
- Honestly I do not the have time/energy to be involved. My teaching, research, and service to the College/Dept. leaves little time to think about the bigger picture let alone actually do something to further our collective goals. I should know more about faculty governance. Unfortunately, I will probably only really care when the lack of action effects me personally. Conversely, that means the current senate is doing pretty well. Thank you for your hard work.
- I am grateful to all who serve and have served on the Senate for their hard work. As a former Senator myself, I know it can be very demanding. I do think many of the Senate discussions devolved into pointlessness and/or issues that many people didn't care about, while other issues were not addressed. I also think the LTF/TT issues needs to be confronted more directly.
- I d like to see a formal mentoring model for service..thru standing committee to senate. Shared governance means shared decisions, not all administrators agree
- I don't get the sense that faculty not on the senate are aware at all of the work the senate is going.
- I don't participate because I believe it is an utter waste of time. The college is run by administration that is not in the least interested in true faculty governance. If they were, more power would be devolved to the departmental level. Power (and staff positions which are necessary to get the work done) are concentrated in College offices for a reason. I wish you
good luck as you keep changing those window dressings. I'm overloaded with research, teaching, and the administrative burdens that the College keeps pushing on me.

• I don't think we'll really know how well it's working until an issue comes along that faculty as a whole are, as one of the questions put it, [really] passionate about.
• I don't want to make assumptions, but I think others may share the same opinion. I view the Senate as a division of labor which allows us to efficiently manage service work. As a non-member of the Senate, I trust that my elected representatives are doing their job effectively. Admittedly, though, I'm not always paying attention. I'm totally comfortable with this arrangement and expect that when it is my turn to serve, I will pay far more attention to what's going on. I suspect that this is the latent feeling of other faculty. The problem, of course, is that some people are probably intent on free-riding, which means that a small group of faculty spend a lot of time doing unheralded service work while others have the time to do their research. I don't know if that problem could or should be fixed, though.
• I feel that a good percentage of the faculty are strongly and fully engaged in governance, but that there is an equal percentage that is not engaged at all. (I have no clue how to change this.)
• I have simply fallen out of touch with faculty governance in the past five years--either because of schedule conflicts with faculty meetings at large, limited discussion with colleagues about the larger issues, or a kind of preoccupation with changes in my department and personal life: I have, perfectly consciously, and with some regret, become a bad college citizen. Frankly, it is difficult to imagine finding the time to engage more than I do. If that's lame, it is nevertheless honest.
• I honestly don't know enough about the new structures. Especially after the college shake-up under Dean Forman when I arrived, I spent most of my time working toward tenure and steering clear of governance duties as a result. i'm a bit ambivalent as to whether the Senate model is indeed best, or to what extent it was simply a reaction to Dean Forman's cuts etc
• I miss monthly meeting with all the faculty, but think this Senate model is more practical and effective. The communication from Senate reps and President is working very well, so I feel informed. Having served the University Senate/Faculty Council, I do think two reps from the college is not sufficient. Thank you!
• I think Emory lacks a robust culture of faculty involvement in faculty governance and the worst excesses of the old system (such as covert "ad hoc" committees) have been contained, but faculty governance is still reactive to administration initiatives. The new system has increased transparency but there is little sense among faculty, especially younger faculty, of any investment in faculty governance. The term one hears a great deal is that Emory has a "corporate culture"—not a good term for shared governance. Very few faculty feel their voice matters outside of their own departments and programs, and many think their voices matter there, especially among LTFs. The ECAS Senate is an improvement but there is a very long way to go for changes in the political culture at Emory.
• I think that ECAS needs clearer guidelines for how new departments take shape. Recent discussions about QTM (as reported to faculty) left me wondering about this process. Personally I think that the process of gathering written support from dept chairs only did not reflect a sufficiently substantive faculty discussion in the Senate. This issue will become more significant as new content areas emerge in coming years. Curriculum is one of the principal domains over which faculty must exercise oversight.
• I very much appreciate the efforts of my colleagues who are currently working on faculty governance in the College, providing vision and leadership, and I regret that at this point in my
Emory career, I've simply run out of steam to do more than support and applaud those efforts from the sidelines.

- I wish leadership of the senate had a longer duration so that the senate does not change so much from year to year. The senate is most effective in being persuasive when it realizes that it is advising the administration and does so with a clear consensus based on clear principles and data.

- I would appreciate more proactive engagement from division representatives. It would be great to have a forum where faculty can discuss areas of concern with their representatives rather than tracking them down and sending an individual email. This may help identify shared concerns if faculty know the problem isn't isolated and aid in prioritizing issues.

- I would love to see the Senate work on better communication and networking between departments and faculty, esp where programming and graduate education is concerned.

- I've been involved in a couple of faculty governance activities, and my experience is that the administration by and large succeeds in ignoring issues or proposals with which it does not agree. The latest was the class and labor committee focusing on the faculty. My preference is that the administration be clear as to whether it adopts / refutes etc. proposals rather than 'make nice' and do little if anything.

- It is my fault that I know so little about the Senate, not the Senate's fault. I work almost constantly and have been unable to serve on university governance committees in the past five years, although I have served in the past.

- It probably would be helpful if department chairs periodically shared the most pressing debates or relevant accomplishments of the Senate at departmental meetings.

- It seems like the faculty liaison function could be better supported. I would guess it depends on who your liaison is as to whether you are aware of what's going on and being asked for your input.

- It's very unclear to me that the Senate is not in effect a committee to give cover and do work FOR the administration. That may not necessarily be a bad thing, but "shared" governance isn't an entirely accurate term for it--no matter how hard and conscientiously people are working. Indeed one thing I was not able to convey in my rather skeptical and uncertain answers to the survey is that I am confident the faculty on the Senate and in the working groups are working very hard, very conscientiously, and have done good things for the college. As indeed I know faculty on the standing committees are doing.

- Maybe have a way of communicating to new faculty how university governance works, like an introductory presentation?

- Most people don't care!,,

- Mostly I think it works, and it works better than what we had. It does allow even more general faculty disengagement, but that was happening before the Senate was created, and the leaders of the Senate have sought to keep discussion open. I do think that is important for representation of TTFs and LTFs to be proportional to their presence within the College (but this is more important for maintaining the credibility of the Senate among TT faculty).

- My impression is that many faculty members do not participate for the most quotidian reason of all: they're busy. The Senate does a good job communicating the business of the faculty and encouraging participation. I'm not sure how to elicit greater buy-in from a broader swath of our colleagues.

- My most pressing concern: equity among faculty and full support of those teaching at a part-time level yet not offered adequate compensation. Recognition of the abuse therein - that
teachers are hired year after year to teach, yet are somehow not "qualified" for permanent, or even Lecture Track, positions.

- My one reservation, based on some discussions I heard while serving in the Senate or attending subsequent meetings after rotating off, has to do with the continuing lack of understanding (or willingness to accept) differing standards--professional, academic, etc.--among faculty belonging to the different divisions. Perhaps these differences are being resolved during the current Senate cycle.

- No system is "perfect." I have been at Emory for over 30 years and faculty meetings of the whole have never been effective--just look at the struggles to assemble a quorum! Some type of representative structure is necessary for effective governance and it seems to me that the current system is working well.

- Perhaps there could be periodic Senate mixers or some sort of social event at which people could speak with Senators informally

- Prefer not to answer

- Regular deliberation in the Senate is better than ad-hoc deliberation in the full faculty meetings of old. But the faculty now miss opportunities to gather and deliberate, both formally and informally.

- Sadly, I have not been as engaged as I should be, but I don't have any major issues, and I don't know whether I would make much of a difference to future planning, etc.

- Salary, salary, salary.

- Sometimes discussions on very important topics don't lead to any decision or action... Sometimes important findings from WG don't lead to actions and if they do there is no follow up on the implemented changes. This is ineffectively and it also discourage people from engaging in shared governance.

- Sometimes I think the Senate spends too much time discussing random statements that the ECAS faculty wish to make to higher administration, or public statements. (This seemed particularly true in the first year, if I'm remembering correctly. I'm recalling the statements by the Senate in support of student demands.) I have memories of earlier pre-Senate faculty governance accomplishments: introducing the Prof. of Pedagogy level for lecturers; overhauling the GERs; changing the student evaluation forms; changing advising from FAME to PACE. These seemed like more substantial and interesting issues for faculty governance to tackle.

- Surveys like this cannot possibly capture the sense of the faculty. They force categorical positions and erase nuance. Talk to people. A representative sample. We

- Thanks for undertaking this review.

- The administration does not listen to the faculty in ANY way, through ANY structure.

- The current and former chairs have done an excellent job leading the Senate. It's a lot of work with little recognition.

- The events of the previous decade have demonstrated that the idea of faculty governance is a myth. The administration will do what it wants to do. Faculty who have wasted time in so-called governance activities have gained little if any benefit. Our individual and departmental interests are best served by doing the best work possible in our research and teaching activities. The administration more often supports the enhancement of those activities based on a good track record.

- The general sense is that faculty don't have much influence over decisions.

- The invitation of ex officio members from other units is an excellent practice to insure communication.
• The most important concern is that the discussion and debate on the Faculty Senate should be (while following Robert’s Rules, etc.) more lively, less stilted, and more transparent.
• The Senate is a HUGE improvement. I think we need to expand it. Also I think old fashioned hard copies of newsletters should be delivered and posted at each department. People’s email boxes are too full and so messages are too easy to ignore.
• The Senate should spend its time focused on issues that unite faculty. That has concerns that every faculty has. For example, The sorry state of technology here in a college, and Perhaps university generally. We spend too much time working with software to account for our work tasks that is too slow and cumbersome. We spend too much time drafting letters of recommendation for fellowships and opportunities for our undergraduate students located within the college or university itself. This is needless busy work. We should be free to focus more on her teaching and research. In short Emory faculty do far too much unproductive, inward-looking service. This is especially true for many of her most productive faculty members.
• The Senate structure is well conceived, and an improvement on the old governance structure. The Senate simply has no power (except to constitute standing committees that actually get work done).
• The structure is good but people have to communicate decisions and agendas more effectively. I know departments also that won’t five representatives a chance to report back in faculty meetings. I don’t know what the Senate can do about that.
• There needs to be more communication to faculty not on the Senate. For instance, many rumors circulate about changing the GRE requirements but no specific and precise information
• Unless the faculty has power it cannot have power.
• Until recently I was not aware that there was a separate College Senate (separate from University Senate). What is the relationship between the two? It is unclear to me that these two faculty governance groups talk to one another. I would like the college senate to have proportional representation by division as well as by track (lecture and tenure). Finally, meetings should be scheduled at a time that does not conflict with teaching duties so that a majority of faculty can attend regularly. Perhaps meetings can be video’ed or there can be videoconferencing options available for those who want to attend but cannot in person. Online voting on all amendments should also be an option
• Ways to increase faculty engagement
• When we were considering the shift to a Senate, I attended a meeting of chairs, and most of what Gray Crouse (who chaired the committe) predicted has come true - that the shift to a delegated body of representatives leads to less engagement and interest.
• You have done a very conscientious job!
APPENDIX 12

Faculty Senate Review Survey

ISSUES FOR SENATE TO ADDRESS IN THE FUTURE

Responses to the open-ended question (Q29): *What do you see as pressing issues for the Senate to address in the coming years?*

Comments as entered in the survey:

- ‘--Protecting tenure-track lines and full-time positions from encroaching adjunctitis. -- Maintaining a priority of in-residence, face-to-face instruction: both a liberal arts college and graduate programs depend on direct connections between faculty and students, with all of its serendipitous communication and community; the more we technologize our teaching, the more technological interfaces for teaching become the norm and even the center of our work with our students, the more we are subject to reductive, rationalized learning outcomes and neoliberal bottom-line efficiencies that betray the very reasons to have a campus and an IRL community. --A better dialogue between unsought technological improvements and the faculty who will use them--BEFORE the new technologies are invested in and imposed on us. --The possibility of a distinctive undergraduate general education program that, while manifesting the spirit of the liberal arts, reflects values specific to Emory--e. g., sustainability, intercultural curiosity, ethics, regional history.
- Continuing inequities in salaries between male and female faculty in every position and at all levels. (2) Continuing inequities in salaries between tenure-track and lecture-track faculty, in which first-year assistant professors have higher salaries than lecture-track faculty with decades of experience. (3) Lack of regular paid sabbaticals for lecture-track faculty.
- I believe Emory should stop endorsing irregular hires and thus cease playing a part in the nation-wide process of precarization of our profession. That, or shut down all our PhD programs. Hiring LTFs holding unclear credentials via connections, sovereign fiat, or friendship is inconsistent with offering PhD programs and telling our graduate students that there is a market in which honest people will examine application dossiers in accordance with each candidate's academic merit. (2) It is imperative that Emory take more meaningful steps to diversify our faculty demographics.
- Importance of undergraduate teaching vs. research. * Student engagement in community and citizenship. * Diversity in faculty hiring.
- Getting more senior faculty with good judgment to participate more actively. 2. Making sure that any new GER diversity requirement serves a pedagogical rather than an ideological purpose..
- A continuing self-study of effectiveness is a great idea. This survey is a good start.
- Adjunct/contingent faculty, faculty/administration diversity, finances of the College and financial aid
- although many excellent steps are being taken by the current ECAS administration, there are many areas of serious concern where a strong faculty voice is called for (to name just a few: there is widespread discontent with tenure and promotion practices; with the online evaluation process; with the lack of faculty voices in creation of new initiatives and departments; with our increasingly bureaucratized, anti-intellectual
environment overall.) Perhaps the most pressing issues are, however: financial inequities. and the drastically inadequate support for research, including our terrible leave policy. as everyone knows, there are significant morale issues at emory, which is unsurprising in an an environment dominated by clientelism and a notable tendency to reward compliance and service as opposed to intellectual achievement. the Senate faces the challenge of how to avoid being part of the problem. without a positive agenda and a systematic commitment to raising problems and advocating for faculty interests and concerns, the current model of governance is arguably worsening the pervasive sense among the faculty that we are disenfranchised from real decision-making. the senate should lead in trying to change this. instead it has become a body for rubber-stamping administration initiatives.

- Are there restrictions that hamper development of creative and interesting new majors (restrictions = too many GERs, or limits on credit hours for a major)? Are there too many majors on the books (if a major only has 1-2 graduates per year, is that OK? Or does that result in an argument for keeping departments staffed just to handle those tiny numbers of students? I don't really know, but it seems like an interesting question to discuss.) Are there ways to strengthen ties with Oxford College? In general: it would be interesting to have the Senate involved more in ECAS finances somehow. I'm thinking of the 2008 financial downturn and the subsequent closure of departments, which led to the creation of the Faculty Senate. During the downturn it became apparent that ECAS had started lots of programs that weren't sustainable. What will happen with the next financial crisis? Can the Senate be pro-active NOW before the crisis so that we don't discover that ECAS has again started lots of unsustainable programs? In general, it would be interesting to see the Senate being proactive about this rather than just needing to react in the next crisis. If the Senate just issues statements saying how sad they are to see ECAS deans having to do something unpleasant during the next crisis (financial or otherwise) then that would be disappointing. I don't think the Senate can prevent crises any more than deans can! But anticipating crises, trying to build up resiliency so that we're more prepared: that would be great.

- Balancing and moderating short-term program growth and decline. Engagement between the Emory faculty community and the City of Atlanta.
- Better leave policy for a university with Emory's research goals. If standards for tenure were raised with Senate's support--as they were--then it would be unfortunate not to pair that with the kind of support for research that reflects a major research university. Pay equity issues. Possibly we need to think about critical response and push-back against new guidelines on Title IX and Sexual Harassment that are likely coming from the Dept of Education--we need to make sure Emory does not use Trump-era retrograde policies as an excuse not to make a safe and fair campus a top priority. Pressure when necessary that the college continue tenure-track hiring.
- Challenges to academic freedom from external sources; impact of funding challenges on ability to achieve college's strategic goals
- Changing demographics of student and faculty.
- Changing the titles for the Lecture track Making recommendations for support of undergraduate research Supporting faculty in acquiring grants through supporting evaluation and other administrative support are all issues the Senate should discuss
• Child care contributions for faculty. Adequate work space for tenure-track professors. Guaranteed yearly funding for travel and research regardless of rank. Given the College’s constant affirmations that we are the peers of highly ranked R1 universities, it needs to review the allotment of resources to faculty at those institutions and make sure it is offering comparable support so that Emory faculty can perform at the level of their counterparts at those institutions.

• College Office devolving more and more of their responsibilities and duties onto departments; non-responsiveness of College Office to faculty concerns; problems of faculty in getting access to College Dean.

• Composition of the faculty and the student body; vigorous and unwarranted growth of the administrative branch of the university.

• continued attention to a changing faculty that includes TTF and LTF whose complementary contributions are essential to the College delivering on its mission.

• Continued lack of clarity about PoP promotion guidelines. Lack of support for faculty research at the LTF level yet a requirement for PoP advancement. Name of lecture track faculty--most want a change. Generally, it would be good to see the senate care about situation and conditions of LTF.

• curriculum, diversity requirement, ratio of LTF to TTF

• Destruction of the College by the administration.

• Developing a new mindset amongst the staff and administration to facilitate the work of faculty rather than impede and interfere with it under the guise of compliance concerns.

• Diversity

• Diversity of faculty and support of faculty of color, best practices around timing of events and meetings at Emory, better communication across departments and programs

• Diversity on campus, particularly among faculty

• diversity requirement (implemented college wide with a requirement that major percentage of course contact focus on issues related to racism), avenue for research-driven LTFs to become tenure track, name change for LTFs (assistant professor, teaching stream instead of lecturer, etc.),

• education reform

• Erosion of faculty governance overall/how to get more faculty to buy into and care about faculty governance Relationship between College Senate and University Senate Increasing assault on faculty time--we don’t have time to do anything anymore. Much of what we do is bureaucratic busy work. How can faculty take back control of our time and our energies? Disempowerment of faculty in general is a big issue.

• Expansion of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences overall

• Faculty and Dept admin need to be trained to help students with mental health issues and stress, and to lower faculty egos to help students get through increasingly difficult times. Special attention to students and faculty on visas is also needed. Remember the sexual harassment workshop ONline that we all had to do? Let’s create one for helping our faculty and students to recognize anxiety, depression, stress, etc and tell them what do so about it, and why it should not be stigmatized as things are going to get even more challenging in the next few years.

• Faculty benefits, including faculty leaves, faculty club, tuition support, sports facility access, etc.
• Faculty engagement in shared governance seems to be low, but I'm not sure it this is an issue the Senate can address.
• Faculty engagement. Emory as a university vs. business with respect to administration, hiring, metrics, and staff.
• faculty hiring, salary inequalities, benefits -- especially the non-portable courtesy scholarship
• faculty salaries/work load and admin support issues
• Follow up on prior recommendations made by the senate so issues dont get lost over time after lengthy committee discussions and many hours of work
• General education requirements.
• GERs LTF title change faculty guidelines advocacy for faculty resources - like assessment consultants
• GERs, expectations of the faculty, making the honors committee a standing committee of the senate, developing guidelines for senate advice to the administration on formation of new departments/playarms and closing departments/playarms.
• Greater support and recognition of faculty members contributing extensively to the teaching mission of the college; classroom space and suitability issues; class issues within the university.
• Greatly increasing racial diversity among students and faculty across the College and University.
• Guaranteed continuous employment for LTF, consistent with academic freedom; re-imagining of the GERs; addressing diversity issues and concerns, with regard to both students and faculty; improving communications with the Provost and reducing proliferation of Vice Provostial appointments.
• How to guarantee a slate for electing Senate officers (President-elect)
• How to maintain a voice in major university decisions
• I suspect the discussion of the GERs will become central. Beyond that, I am not sure.
• I'm honestly not sure. Perhaps the ways in which technology are remaking our classrooms and whether those are really working successfully.
• If you think that you can actually do something, persuade the administration to eliminate or at least permanently freeze annual increases in the graduate enrollment fee (tuition).
• Implementation of "one emory" strategy Better administrative support for research activities (e.g., an overhaul of RAS) Finding ways to increase recognition of great teaching in the college
• Implementation of the "One Emory" strategic plan; assisting faculty in navigating the changes to criteria for tenure & promotion (e.g., excellence in teaching); greater parity between tenure-track and lecture-track faculty across the College; finding concrete ways to encourage, reward, and express the value added by LTF
• Increasing the diversity of the faculty, by race, ethnicity, and gender.
• Inequalities in pay and teaching loads across faculty within departments
• Inequities in salary and support for faculty in general should be addressed in a REAL way through the Senate, thus demonstrating the power of the senate, even in its advisory role, to raise up issues and have them be addressed. These inequities are at the root of a lot of faculty disengagement. Creating a sense of community among faculty is really important, and currently there is a very disjointed sense of things. Working across the university with faculty governance bodies from other units should be a clear focus. We
are on a campus in which it does not make sense to attend ONLY to College governance issues as if they were isolated from the rest of the university. They are not the same issues that others have, but they are not isolated.

- Issues of pay equity (esp. women and people of color) - there are still many issues. Also, we still do a terrible job of talking about race when it comes to faculty and faculty hires. We are doing a lot better...but we have to make some bigger cultural changes.
- Languishing faculty salaries compared to peer institutions; growing work-life imbalance as demands for faculty productivity increase; need to better integrate with the metro Atlanta community; need for less onerous sabbatical policy--i.e., the requirement to apply for external funding (often the timing doesn't work for projects we're working on, and it's a concern to be asking non-Emory colleagues for letters in support of these applications when in fact a project is not advanced enough to really be competitive for an NEH, ACLS, NSF or similar fellowship).
- Making sure all students have a voice; helping undocumented students feel safe at Emory; giving Lecture Track Faculty the salaries that are equitable with other institutions.
- Meeting the One Emory framework, and truly working across schools and divisions.
- no idea
- None
- Online learning, interdisciplinary education (more than IDS offers)
- Overall faculty engagement Nominations (although I believe significant changes have been made since last year)
- Parking!
- Perceptions and clarity regarding the Senate's activities and role, partly with respect to various levels of administration, partly with respect to the wider faculty's role. Maintaining and increasing a powerful voice for the College in relation to the wider University structures and administration.
- Pre-major advising GER revisions Creating more buy-in to faculty governance
- Prefer not to answer
- pressing excellence in teaching as well as excellence in research is an unrealistic position
- Prevention of further destruction of basic liberal arts values and qualities in the pursuit of passing education fads and utterly spurious "efficiencies."
- protection of the rights of the faculty to oversee teaching and to work with the ECAS admin to promote the undergraduate mission .... without undue intrusion from higher university admin, in particular, the Provost's Office. reduce the institution's increasing reliance on outside (and expensive) consulting firms. let's retain the right to make decisions!
- Recognition of service in annual evaluations; Child care; housing subsidies of some sort.
- Reducing the number of courses/credit-hours necessary to fulfill the GER.
- Resisting the erosion of undergraduate education in pursuit of prominence in graduate education that is not actually available.
- Rigorous structure for the GERs Better support for faculty teaching mission (Center for Teaching and Learning in the College, as outlined in the last Strategic Plan) More awards, recognition, requirement (especially by full professors) of service (e.g. special small stipends for Senators for use in teaching, research or travel to offset the extra time commitment that is otherwise unrewarded)
- Role of faculty in long-term planning, faculty compensation.
• Salary, funds for research and conference travel. Salary, salary, salary. Really, if you don't push for more money, and get more money, then you have nothing to say to us.
• See above.
• shift in undergraduate demands/interests, declining interest/revenue from foreign students
• Strategic planning GER Lecture Track Faculty
• Tenure and promotion criteria: in my view, the new requirements for demonstrating excellence in both teaching and research are not sustainable and do not elevate effectiveness. The heavy emphasis on peer evaluation of teaching also can be counter-productive. Strategic planning and faculty retirements are other pressing issues confronting the College with which the Senate needs to engage.
• The continuing growth of the administration and lack of growth in faculty hires. A new administrator to 'help' faculty merely creates more administration and red tape. Funds that could be used by faculty are used to bulk up the administration. A study of numbers of administrators vs faculty for the last 20 years would be useful.
• The curriculum is always important. There will be continuing anxiety over the ever-more-difficult tenure standards. The business offices of the university continue to introduce new procedures and technologies such as the on-line degree tracker, new OPUS and online evaluation system that have not been developed in conjunction with faculty and therefore don't have faculty buy-in. The size of the faculty in relationship to the student body seems to be an ever-diminishing number (8:1 this year, 7:1 in 2015). ECAS faculty doesn't mirror the diversity of our student body as well and this is concerning. As always with Emory, it will be a challenge to deal with the business imperatives of the University while maintaining sufficient faculty autonomy to truly shape the educational experience here.
• The erosion of tenure-track lines in favor of lecture track faculty (who have the same degrees from the same universities as tenure-track faculty, and the same research profile, but who are paid less and teach more).
• The increasing marginalization of tenured and tenure-track faculty in institutional decision-making.
• The largest issue by far is the growth of the administration; the OUE is becoming Byzantine with the number of deanlets, and campus life was allowed to metastasize to life threatening status under the previous leader. The org chart of campus life looks like a star chart of the milky way. This growth has a serious effect on everything, from tuition increases that are becoming immoral and the growing number of offices that feel their function is faculty oversight and governance, as opposed to support.
• The pre-professional character of the campus/student body. It is skewed towards learning practical, 'usable' information and knowledge rather than acquiring a broad, liberal arts education.
• The President is concerned that virtually none of the ECAS departments rates in the top twenty. As Emory sets about the task of addressing this curious situation, the Senate may need to exercise oversight or become centrally involved in setting policies.
• The role and status of lecture track faculty. LTF play a significant role in the College, primarily in teaching, but also in administration, service and even research, yet they are treated as though they are lesser than TTF. That must change.
• The Senate needs to focus on real issues. The problems with IT, the research infrastructure, the resources available for faculty, physical plant, etc.
• The trivialization of ECAS as compared to SOM and Emory Healthcare.
• to make teaching as valued and valuable as scholarship and publications are presently-great doubts that faculty governance will actually turn that priority into reality. Too many mediocre teachers on the teaching faculty of the university to enforce or create that reality
• To me the greatest issues are environmental. Too many Emory staff, students, and employees drive cars to work, contributing huge amounts of CO2 emissions. Other concerns seem to pale in comparison to climate change.
• Trying to foster a sense of community at Emory. No easy thing.
• We need to do more to preserve the tenure process and make it more difficult for the administration to hire off the tenure track. In the meantime, those hired on the lecture track should be fully protected.
• What is the future of the liberal arts when society tells us that education shall be of immediate economic return. What financial structure is imaginable for Emory to keep as diverse a faculty as possible and make higher education available for those that are intellectually gifted.
• What’s the vision for Emory College? And how do we effectively implement that vision.