Senate Review Working Group
PRELIMINARY SENATE REVIEW REPORT

Submitted to the Emory College Faculty
21 December 2018

Senate Review Working Group:
Karen Hegtvedt (Sociology), co-chair
Kim Wallen (Psychology), co-chair
Alan Abramowitz (Political Science)
Irene Browne (Sociology)
Angela Porcarelli (French & Italian)
Vicki Powers (Math)
Rachelle Spell (Biology)
Leslie Taylor (Theatre)
Senate Review Working Group

PRELIMINARY SENATE REVIEW REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As mandated by Article VI, Section 13 of the 2015 Emory College Bylaws, the Faculty Senate initiated a review of the composition and functioning of the Senate to date. In September 2018, the Senate approved a motion establishing a working group to undertake this task. Here we summarize the preliminary report of that working group based on data from existing documents, listening sessions, and survey of College faculty.

Emergence of the Senate

- Previous governing structure consisted of 12 member elected Governance Committee (GovCom) and decision-making by faculty as a whole
- September 2012 announcement of department and program cuts led to discussions of faculty governance, resulting in elected Shared Faculty Governance Committee (SFGC) in spring 2013
- SFGC interim report in September 2013 benchmarked structures of governance and identified principles for shared faculty governance
- SFGC final report (January 2014) recommended formation of and potential structure for Senate
- GovCom facilitated discussions with faculty over SFGC proposal over the next year and crafted revisions to College Bylaws to establish Senate
- Faculty approved bylaws revision resulting in the establishment of a Senate in February 2015
- Newly elected Senators approve Senate bylaws in Augusts 2015

Senate Activities 2015-2018

- Passed 54 motions, including 21 on Senate procedures, 18 on policy positions, 11 content-oriented to establish working groups on various issues
- Issues with record keeping and documentation inhibit tracing consequences of motions and short time frame disallows assessment of consequences of some of working groups
- Successfully proposed College bylaws revision to allow Senate to call electronic votes; passed at College faculty meeting in fall 2017, the last time a quorum was present

Faculty Perceptions of and Concerns about Senate

- Based primarily on 255 (45% of 564 faculty members) responses to survey
- Quantitative results reveal:
  - Knowledge of senate low (about website) to moderate (on functioning, membership)
  - Interest in being involved in governance low, but know how to get involved
  - Senate compares favorably to previous governance structure and composition adequate
  - Awareness of activities of Senate moderately high
  - Many “don’t know” how effective Senate is; others rate it “somewhat/mostly” effective
  - Faculty characteristics largely do not affect assessments, but awareness of Senate activities tends to increase favorableness of ratings
- Qualitative results show:
  - Preference for new structure, owing to representativeness and openness but worry about lack of engagement of faculty in governance
  - Concerns about representation echo debates during formation of Senate
  - Desire for enhanced communication and faculty power

Recommendation: Senate and whole faculty review report and advise about continuation of Senate and possible changes.
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Article VI of the bylaws of Emory College of Arts and Sciences (ECAS) established the Faculty Senate in 2015 and provided for a review of its composition and functioning (Section 13) after a period of three years. Section 4 of the same article of the bylaws outlines general Senate functions, including: protecting academic freedom; promoting excellence in research and teaching; promoting equity and diversity within the faculty and student body; and advancing the general welfare of the College. Additionally, the section stresses that the College Senate will work with faculty and the College Administration to establish priorities for the College and create and implement policies regarding core missions of research, teaching, and service. The Senate also oversees the work of the standing committees of the college. The Article also establishes the composition of the 23-member Senate (with six Senators elected from each of the three divisions of the College and five faculty elected as At Large Senators).

In fall 2018, the ECAS Faculty Senate adopted a Motion to create the Senate Review Working Group (WG), charging it to:

a. Investigate the impact of the Senate to date by considering how recommendations from previously established working groups have been carried out, as indicated in the report presented at the College faculty meeting on April 4, 2018.

b. Collect information regarding the views and evaluations of College faculty members.

c. Present a preliminary report of the findings and recommendations based on (a) and (b) at the December 5, 2018 ECAS Senate meeting and offer a written report to the College faculty by December 21, 2018.

d. Conduct discussions of the report among College faculty members in January and/or February 2019 to elicit views on potential revisions to the Senate, including its bylaws. These discussions shall precede and inform the motion of the President of the College Faculty Senate to the faculty on whether the Senate should continue in its present form or be revised, which will be presented at the February 27, 2019 College Faculty meeting.

The Senate Review WG included the following: co-chairs Karen Hegtvedt (Sociology) and Kim Wallen (Psychology); Senators Irene Browne (Sociology), Angela Porcarelli (French and Italian), and Rachelle Spell (Biology); and faculty members Alan Abramowitz (Political Science), Vicki Powers (Mathematics), and Leslie Taylor (Theatre Studies). Carlee Beard assisted the WG in providing relevant documents. Lane DiNicola provided invaluable support in the execution of the Senate Review survey.

The WG reports its findings from four data collection efforts: 1) review of documents regarding the foundation of the Senate, including a comparison to the functioning of the previous form of governance in Emory College; 2) analysis of the activities of the Senate in terms of motions and their consequences; 3) examination of concerns voiced during “listening sessions” with ECAS faculty members; and 4) results of a survey of the perceptions of faculty regarding the composition and functioning of the Senate. Sections of the report pertain to each data collection endeavor, with information gleaned from listening sessions combined with responses to open-ended questions included on the survey. The report concludes with observations emerging from the review process and a recommendation to submit the report to the Senate for discussion and specific recommendations about its current state and potential changes to its composition and operation.
In addition, the WG plans discussions with faculty members in January and February 2019 to elicit views on the report and its recommendations. A summary of these discussions will be reported to the Senate at the February 20, 2019 meeting in preparation for a presentation to the ECAS faculty at the February 27, 2019 meeting. As noted under part (d) of the WG charge, the President of the ECAS Faculty Senate will present a motion regarding whether the Senate should continue in its present form or be revised. The faculty will vote electronically on the motion subsequently.

BACKGROUND ON THE EMERGENCE OF THE SENATE

In this section, we detail the history of the emergence of the ECAS Faculty Senate. We begin with a brief description of the form of faculty governance within Emory College prior to the Senate (adapted from College Bylaws dated February 22, 2012), which consisted of a Governance Committee (GovCom) in conjunction with the entire College faculty. We then offer a narrative describing the events providing the basis for the impetus for a new form of faculty governance in the College and the goals for establishing a new structure. Information comes from minutes of meetings involving the GovCom and reports from the Shared Faculty Governance Committee (SFGC, noted in GovCom minutes as Shared Governance Committee or SGC), which investigated potential alternative structures after the department closures of 2012 and proposed the Senate model. Additionally, we sought the reflections of Dr. Robyn Fivush who chaired the SFGC, and Dr. Clifton Crais who, as chair of GovCom, shepherded the changes in the College bylaws to allow for a Senate and then developed the Senate bylaws that cemented its creation and operation.

Prior Faculty Governance Structure: Governance Committee/Faculty of the Whole

The Governance Committee consisted of 12 members elected for staggered three-year terms by the faculty (three members elected from each of the three divisions of the College by the members of that division and three members elected by the College faculty at large). Several members (including the Dean of Emory College) served in ex-officio positions. From this group, a chair was elected to serve a one-year term. GovCom met monthly to consider issues of interest to Emory College faculty and regularly oversaw the agenda for College faculty meetings and the activities of the standing committees. Additionally, the bylaws specify that “The Administration shall consult with the Governance Committee on all matters pertaining to the College and to the Faculty of the College...[including] proposals for the development and modification of College programs and the setting of priorities and goals for the College... [and] include reference to the budgetary implications of such proposals.” GovCom could make recommendations to the administration and appoint subcommittees.

Dr. Eric Weeks, previous GovCom chair, outlines the activities of GovCom and of monthly faculty meetings for 2008-11 to illustrate the nature of the work (Appendix 1). Although GovCom could vote on issues and take unilateral action in some matters, typically, GovCom framed issues and then put them on the agenda for a vote in the faculty meeting. Dr. Weeks notes (email communication November 27, 2018) that while GovCom voted on various matters, the votes in the faculty-of-the-whole represented the binding votes. In contrast, the Senate may cast binding votes on nearly everything (bylaws and curriculum changes excepted), reducing the frequency of need for faculty-of-the-whole votes. Unlike GovComm all senate meetings are open to the faculty, except if specifically closed as a result of a motion to the senate. The openness of Senate meetings enhances the potential for transparency in the activities of the governing body. As described next, a crisis precipitated revelations of some of the problems inherent in governing through GovCom and the faculty of the whole.
The Establishment of the ECAS Faculty Senate

The establishment of the ECAS Faculty Senate unfolded over a period of years, beginning in September 2012 and concluding with the Senate’s passage of its own bylaws in August 2015. Appendix 2 offers a condensed timeline of the events that contributed to the emergence of the College Faculty Senate.

In the September of 2012, Dean Robin Forman announced a series of changes and cuts to the Emory College departmental offerings. The process that guided these choices and the decisions were met with consternation and dismay by many College faculty, despite the involvement of a “Dean’s Advisory Committee, appointed by Dean Forman. In what follows, we draw from meeting minutes to describe chronologically how the ECAS Faculty Senate emerged from deliberations of the faculty.

After much debate and deep concern about the future and role of faculty governance, the College faculty passed two motions at its December 2012 meeting. One motion proposed a review of faculty governance procedures both at Emory and at peer institutions. The second motion pertained to a retrospective review of the process leading to the announced changes and an investigation of the faculty who served on the Dean’s Advisory Committee. Procedural issues plagued both motions in addition to changes in the wording of each throughout the meeting and in the absence of written documentation about the proceedings. The faculty requested that the proposers of the motions clarify the language for further consideration at the January 2013 College Faculty meeting.

Following the December College Faculty meeting, several issues emerged at the January 8, 2013 GovCom meeting, including:

- Clarifying that the existing College Bylaws are the governing document for the college and that procedures going forward need to follow the existing bylaws until they are changed.
- Defining the term “faculty governance” among the college faculty and specifying the functions of governance and decision-making currently in place and what should exist going forward.
- Determining how to deal with the two motions, whose wording was undocumented and whose passage as motions did not meet the procedural strictures of the College bylaws, in a manner that would allow GovCom to find common ground among the faculty and support a cooperative approach to reviewing both motions.

Much of the GovCom meeting a week later (January 17, 2013) was devoted to how to deal with violations to Roberts Rules of Order, which contributed to the confusion resulting from the December faculty meeting. The other main topic was how to use this as an opportunity to increase faculty efforts and roles in future decision-making processes within the College. GovCom members raised concern that one of the motions requested an investigation of the faculty who had served on the Dean’s Advisory Committee. Additionally, GovCom decided to stabilize leadership by choosing a chair-elect earlier in the spring semester and having the out-going chair remain on in an advisory role.

At the January 23, 2013 faculty meeting, faculty members discussed and voted to approve two revised motions: 1) to investigate faculty governance procedures at Emory and elsewhere; and 2) to examine the process leading to the changes and cuts proposed by the Dean in September 2012. GovCom resolved (February 7, 2013) procedural issues inherent in the two motions by creating two elected committees that would take on the tasks of the initial motions. One committee would undertake a review of faculty governance both at Emory and at peer institutions and make recommendations, (Shared Faculty Governance Committee/SFGC) and the other would review of the Dean’s recent
decisions and the involvement of faculty in that process (Process Review Committee/PRC). The election for the SFGC committee was to be held first and the PRC election second. There was concern among some of the GovCom members that a committee charged to formally investigate colleagues could create an unwillingness of faculty to be involved in governance and advisory roles in the future. Additionally, the February 20, 2013 faculty meeting agenda included a motion (initially proposed for the January 23 meeting) to rescind the PRC motion and thus quelling formation of a committee. The motion to rescind was defeated at the February 20, 2013 faculty meeting. The elected committees began their work in spring 2013.

At the September 4, 2013 GovCom meeting, the new chair articulated the charge of the committee as follows:

- oversees faculty governance,
- is the (elected) voice of the faculty in conversation with the administration,
- that the committee is empowered to take on a leadership role and be proactive about any issue considered important to faculty, such as: a faculty position on on-line courses; the current faculty governance committee structure; faculty frustration getting new courses approved; how to best communicate with the faculty

The work of the two review committees was ongoing, with a request from the SFGC to present their initial findings to the college faculty in September, and with the stated aim of the PRC to have their recommendations submitted early in the fall. There was concern about the process of establishing electronic voting, when it should be used, and what amendment might be made to the bylaws to allow a period between the approval on e-voting and the faculty vote to ensure wide knowledge of the issue. GovCom also faced examination of two appeals instigated by the Dean’s September 2012 decisions.

In mid-September the SF GC presented its interim findings to the college faculty and shared the document broadly (Appendix 3). The lengthy document included reviews of literature on faculty governance, surveys of peer institutions, comparisons with other faculty governance structures within the University, and summaries of multiple conversations held with a variety of stakeholders. It also articulated a set of guiding principles for creating transparent, effective, and efficient faculty governance, which include:

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

The report made several strong recommendations (Appendix 4):

- 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 GovCom 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 GovCom 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.

In order 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 GovCom.

At their November 13, 2013 meeting, GovCom decided to cancel the November college faculty meeting as the major items for discussion were still in process and not yet ready to be presented. They agreed to examine the current Standing Committee structure (beginning with Curriculum and Educational Policy committees) and problems existing within the current bylaws to determine any required changes. A concern at the November 20, 2013 GovCom meeting focused on the issue of electronic voting by the faculty and the steps needed to make that happen. They also discussed some of the inefficiencies and burdens of the Curriculum and Educational Policy Committees and agreed on the need to “rethink policies, philosophy, and purpose of committees in general and specifically to encourage creativity and innovation and maintain and encourage institutional expertise and memory within committees and committee structure.”

The GovCom meeting of February 5, 2014 involved review and discussion of the findings and recommendations of the SFGC and PRC reports (which were pending at the time of the January 15, 2014 meeting). The PRC report suggested establishing a review process before another reallocation of resources might occur, though it failed to specify when this review would occur. The SFGC final report (Appendix 5) strongly recommended that a representative faculty senate government structure replace the GovCom/Faculty of a whole structure. Discussion pertained to questions about: the structure of a faculty senate system; the nature of general college faculty meetings; the frequency of senate and faculty meetings; the procedures for establishing a senate; the procedures for elections; distinctions from GovCom; and the timeline to establish a new system. The SFGC report offered possible answers to these questions and additionally provided principles about ongoing evaluation and review of departments and programs and recommendations about a process for the closure of departments and programs. The SFGC report provided the basis for the founding of the ECAS faculty senate, with much discussion to follow involving GovCom and the full faculty.

On February 19, 2014 the GovCom committee met to discuss the upcoming agenda for the College faculty meeting of March 5, 2014. The concern was largely about how to move forward in a manner that would get the information to the faculty and allow discussion and input. A hope was articulated that the meeting could be conducted as a “committee as a whole” per Roberts Rules of Order. (It was.) For the March 5, 2014 meeting, GovCom had the Chair lead the meeting but took the unusual step of having all the committee members on stage. A series of questions sparked discussion, including: What does faculty representation mean? What is the current default faculty governance structure? How does the current structure differ from the proposed SFGC faculty senate system? This meeting achieved GovCom’s goal to ensure transparency in the process of making any changes.

On April 2, 2014, GovCom continued its routine governance concerns (e.g., regarding elections, online voting for nominees, and setting the agenda for the April College faculty meeting). Additionally, the
committee discussed feedback from the March 5 faculty meeting. There seemed to be broad support for the senate proposal, but many questions about the details. Representation was a concern, what is an optimal size of a senate, are the representatives from divisions, departments? The goal was to ensure that College faculty remained empowered and have a direct, clear, and transparent voice through their representative. Next steps pertained to how to go about writing a constitution that outlines a senate structure and representation (e.g., allow the Senate to write its own bylaws or use the existing bylaws of the University Senate as a model to begin drafting new bylaws). GovCom members agreed to create a subcommittee tasked with presenting several models of representation by the next meeting.

The final GovCom meeting of the academic year, May 1, 2014, dealt with committee elections, election of GovCom co-chairs for AY 2014-15, and a discussion of next steps in changing faculty governance. The committee commented on the consensus among faculty for a need for a new faculty governance model. The subcommittee presented their findings about different senate models, noting the need to balance time commitments, expertise, departmental representation, and LTF/TTF representation. The question of the standing committees and efficiencies was raised as well. GovCom voted unanimously to develop a constitution for a senate over the summer months based on the SRGC recommendations. The intended document would be concise and to the point. And, when GovCom agreed upon a final draft, it would be brought to each department for discussion prior to a full faculty vote in AY 2014-15.

The August 27, 2014 GovCom meeting focused first on filling vacancies on standing committees and ex-officio GovCom positions and then turned to a discussion of the process of revising the College bylaws and the steps needed to share this document with the faculty. GovCom agreed to discuss the first draft of the revisions in September. (Additional business at the meeting pertained to the upcoming review of the College, the role of GovCom in strategic planning, and other issues pertaining to standing committees.)

Six concerns regarding the College bylaws draft arose that the September 24, 2014 GovCom meeting:

- The ramifications of closing the ILA on faculty and how to account for faculty in programs in representation.
- An amendment that established guidelines for development, review, and reorganization of programs.
- The specificity of the bylaws in response to recent past events as opposed to general principles, framing bylaws in such a way so as to provide some direction and establishing procedures without hampering Senate operation.
- Membership and representation and LTF.
- How to allot representation, by number of faculty/departments with a division or by number of majors or by enrollments.
- Clarifying language and wording around the bylaws.

The meeting concluded with an agreed upon focus for the next GovCom meeting and a set of several questions: Should a presentation be made on October 15 to full faculty? Is there any real power in a senate? What exactly is its relationship to the faculty?

The October 1, 2014 GovCom meeting involved a line by line discussion of the revised College bylaws draft to address clarity as well as policies around standing committee representation in a senate, ex-officio roles, and the time line for Senate review of the Senate. Unresolved was the issue about
participation of faculty in voting. The committee articulated reasons for moving toward a senate model that included the advantages of: broadening faculty representation; creating an empowered faculty and engaged government; becoming nimble in responding to changing environments; and allowing better participation in strategic planning. Although GovCom recognized risks in moving forward, they relied on the endorsement of the College faculty of the idea of a Senate when they approved the recommendations of the SFGC. GovCom planned to present their report to the college faculty at the October 15, 2014 meeting and present the full proposal at the November 12, 2014 meeting.

GovCom offered a power-point presentation of the report, illuminating: changes in faculty, student, and budget numbers over the years; charts showing satisfaction with current faculty governance structures across the university; detailed highlights from SFGC and PRC reports; articulated concerns regarding the current faculty governance structure; laid out the overall work of GovCom since the March 5, 2014 College faculty meeting; an overview of the new senate power and duties; and an explanation of the goals for representation. Specified were next steps including holding the November 12, 2014 faculty meeting as a committee of the whole to discuss the proposal. The time-frame involved using November and December to make further revisions, with the December 3, 2014 faculty meeting for airing the GovCom report in anticipation of finalizing the proposal. Meetings with departments would unfold in January and February, with the aim of having the first official consideration of the proposal held at the February 11, 2015 college faculty meeting.

At the October 22, 2014 meeting, GovCom agreed to prepare a final draft of the bylaws to be sent to the faculty prior to the November 2014 meeting. Members discussed particular articles of the bylaws, including the size of a quorum for faculty meetings and the relationship among the standing committees to the proposed senate. The meeting concluded by agreeing to finish up discussion of bylaws through email in order to be ready for the following GovCom meeting. The chair of the committee pointed out that owing to his role as the primary author of bylaws, he should not chair the meeting. Instead, GovCom agreed to have the Dean chair the meeting and include a selected parliamentarian.

The October 29, 2014 GovCom meeting saw discussion of several amendments, with the adoption of some and a further discussion of the appeal process bylaws. The chair outlined the process of electronically sharing the draft bylaws with all faculty for review. Additionally, GovCom learned about the College external review. Its role in the process would include a meeting with the external review committee and the opportunity to review and comment on the reviewers’ report.

On November 12, 2014 the college faculty met to consider the revised College bylaws that GovCom had developed over the semester and had shared with the faculty in advance of the meeting. A motion was made and passed to move to a committee of the whole to allow for discussion of the bylaws. As the principle drafter of the bylaws, the chair appointed another member of GovCom to lead the discussion. Several issues received robust discussion:

- The size of the quorum required for voting at faculty meetings;
- The length and language of the paragraph detailing the powers of the Senate, especially with respect to reorganization or elimination of programs;
- The specific model to be used for achieving proportional representation to the Senate;
- The optimal size of the Senate and the number of at-large members;
- The process for including student representation on standing committees;
- The rationale for a new standing committee on Assessment;
- The reporting responsibilities of the Grievance Committee;
• The preferred time between the institution of a Senate and its self-review and report to the faculty.

The motion “The faculty expresses support for the principle of a Senate model and recommends that GovCom continue working on the revision of the draft bylaw” was approved by all but two of the faculty at the meeting.

When the GovCom reconvened January 14, 2015, discussion centered around the changes still needed to be made to the proposed bylaws for the senate. Chief among these were issues about the makeup of standing committees and voting procedures and provisos regarding the transition process. The chair of the committee reviewed the timeline of events to bring the revisions of the bylaws to a vote. GovCom agreed to cancel the January 21 College faculty meeting to provide time to make minor changes to the bylaws and provide faculty enough time to review them.

At the full College faculty meeting of February 18, 2015, GovCom presented the fully revised bylaws of Emory College Faculty, which included Article VI, detailing the jurisdiction, composition, and functioning of the Senate. By a vote of the quorum present, the faculty approved these bylaws. Subsequently, the newly elected Senate approved its specific bylaws on August 25, 2015 (Appendix 6).

April 1, 2015 was the final meeting of GovCom. Discussion focused first on nominations and elections for the Senate members and the College Standing committees owing to the insufficient number of nominations in some areas and how to redress the issue. Then discussion shifted to the transition from GovCom to the Faculty Senate. Seven members of GovCom would serve on the Senate to ensure institutional memory. Recommendations included the hiring of a parliamentarian to assist in finalizing the bylaws and a half time administrative staff person to assist in organization. GovCom deemed it critical to develop a more robust website that allowed faculty access to all proceedings. In addition, the question of where a body as large as the new Senate could regularly meet was considered, and the Jones Room in the library identified as a possible venue. The meeting concluded with a series of well-earned thanks and acknowledgements of the number of individuals (including GovCom chairs, committee members, Deans, and chairs of SFGC and PRC) who contributed thoughtfulness, time, and considerable energy that made this governance transition possible:

**SENATE ACTIVITIES 2015-2018**

In spring 2018, then Faculty Senate President compiled all the motions passed by the Senate since its inception (Appendix 7). Analysis of this document allows assessment of the extent to which the Senate is carrying out the functions described in the bylaws.

We categorized each of the 54 motions (one a duplicate) considered in terms of its function (Appendix 8). **Symbolic motions** are those that express an opinion of or support by the senate to another entity inside or outside of Emory. **Position statements** reflect the senate’s position on an issue. **Procedural motions** are changes to Senate procedures and includes changes to Senate and ECAS bylaws. **Content-oriented motions** address activities that include creation of working groups or task forces by the Senate to address specific issues, and that produce a report for the approval of the senate. In addition to motions, the Senate engaged in 28 formal discussions of topics requiring no specific action, but which may stimulate a motion proposed later to the senate.
We attempted to trace the effects of content-oriented motions in terms of creation of working groups, changes in policy, recommendations to chairs, and the like. Because of the way records have been kept by the Senate, we could often not fully determine the consequences of the content-oriented motions beyond the creation of WG and the preparation of reports. To date, no documentation of actual policy changes was evident or easily traceable, which constitutes a weakness of the Senate as currently implemented. Thus, it is not possible to accurately assess how effective the Senate has been in carrying out its functions. It is clear, though, that the senate has been active, having passed 18 position statements, 21 procedural motions, 1 both position and procedural, 11 content-oriented motions (all for the creation of working groups), and 2 symbolic motions. These actions include 5 changes to the College and Senate bylaws.

We think it likely that the Senate has been more effective than we can document in view of the lack of complaints or concerns from faculty that the Senate is not following through on its commitments. (Results from the survey, presented in the next section, lend credence to this assessment of effectiveness but also note concern about the visibility of Senate accomplishments.)

Two specific actions of the senate are worth highlighting. Motion 37-2017 was to amend the bylaws so that the Senate could call for an electronic vote on any issue. This arose because the previous College bylaws required a vote of the full faculty to authorize an electronic vote. With the Senate in place, the two annual full faculty meetings rarely garner the quorum necessary to authorize an electronic vote. The full faculty passed Motion 37-2017 to allow the Senate to call for an electronic vote at its November 1, 2017 meeting, the last time we succeeded in getting a quorum to a full faculty meeting.

The Senate authorization for an electronic vote was to allow the Senate to propose College bylaws changes and then have faculty vote on these electronically. This was necessitated by a failure to nominate a President-elect in Spring 2017. Thus, in AY 2017-18 the senate had a President, but no President-elect, which created the possibility that there would be no President in the following year. The Senate proposed motion 47-2017 to change the bylaws to allow direct voting for the President if the office of President-elect was vacant. This change in the bylaws was passed by an electronic vote.

The conditions that resulted in the President-elect vacancy remain and reflect that only six senators are eligible to be nominated for President-elect. Thus, it is possible that the Senate will fail in the future to have a viable nominee for President-elect.

**FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF AND CONCERNS ABOUT THE SENATE**

**Data Collection**

To assess faculty perceptions and concerns about the Senate, we invited all Emory College faculty members to participate in “listening sessions” and a survey. Listening sessions were held October 24 (during the regularly scheduled Emory College faculty meeting), November 14, and November 19. About 50 faculty members attended the first session; the other two sessions had a significantly lower turnout (N=4 and 1, respectively). The goal of the sessions was to allow faculty members to comment on whether expectations for the Senate had been met, share observations of its effectiveness, discuss potential changes, and identify future issues. Open-ended questions on the survey also tapped into the latter three concerns as well as on views pertaining to the composition of the Senate.
The WG invited all Emory College faculty members to participate in an on-line survey assessing the Senate, which was available from November 19 to December 5. Multiple reminders were sent to faculty members to complete the survey. In addition to the open-ended questions, close-ended items addressed: individuals’ familiarity with and involvement in faculty governance; general views about the functioning of the Senate; comparison to previous structure of governance; representativeness of the Senate; awareness of and perceived effectiveness of Senate activities; and demographic characteristics (e.g., rank, years at Emory, division) of respondents.

Survey Participants

The response rate for the survey was approximately 45%, with 255 of 564 ECAS faculty participating. Not all respondents, however, answered every question and thus the numbers reported in subsequent analyses vary.

Of those responding to the survey, 53% (N=136) were tenured (compared to 59% for all faculty), 14.5% (N=37) were tenure-track (15.2% for all faculty), and 30.2% (N=77) were from the lecture track (24.6% for all faculty). Additionally, 2% (N=5) of respondents represented visiting appointments. Thus, survey participants slightly underrepresent tenured faculty and slightly overrepresent lecture track faculty. Respondents came from all divisions of the college, with 41.2% (N=93) from the Humanities, 26.1% (N=59) from Natural Sciences/Mathematics/Computer Science, and 32.7% (N=74) from the Social Sciences. These percentages are largely on par with the distribution of the entire faculty by division (41.8%, 25%, and 32.4% respectively). Of those indicating their years of service to Emory, 42.2% indicated over 15 years (compared to 47.7% for all faculty), with the remaining percentages varying from 13.3 to 15.6 (10.3 to 16.3 % for all faculty) for categories of 1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, and 11 to 15 years.

About 20% of respondents had served on the ECAS Faculty Senate. Similarly, nearly 20% had served on a Senate working group. In addition, 34.8% of respondents reported serving on a standing committee of the Senate in the last five years.

Analyses of Data

We approached analysis of the survey data in three ways. First, we offer univariate analyses in the form of frequencies of response categories for all close-ended items on the survey (Appendix 9), reporting general trends in the text. Second, we conduct bivariate analyses (cross-tabulations) to examine the impact of faculty characteristics (track, division, years of experience) and knowledge (which is moderately correlated with Senate experience .57) on: comparative assessments of the Senate and the previous GovCom/Faculty Meeting structure; perceived adequacy of Senate composition; awareness of Senate activities, and perceived effectiveness of the Senate overall in the last three years. Such analysis allows us to assess whether some sectors of the faculty more (or less) favorably assess the Senate than do others.

We analyzed comments arising from the listening sessions (Appendix 10) and from the open-ended questions on the survey. Our reading categorizes the responses offered regarding: reasons for believing that the Senate is worse or better than the previous governance structure; reasons for assessing the Senate composition as less than fully adequate; and the nature of changes proposed by those who recommend them. Appendices 11 and 12 provide the wide array of closing comments and identification of pressing issues for the Senate to address in future years.
Familiarity and Interest in Shared Governance

We asked faculty how familiar they were with the functions and responsibilities of the Senate, its representatives and officers, and its website. Respondents are most familiar with Senate functions and responsibilities, with 37% indicating that they are “mostly” or “fully” familiar; almost 32% noted that they were somewhat familiar but the remainder (31.1%) responded “not at all” or “a little.” Regarding familiarity with Senators and Senate officers, the percentage indicating little familiarity grows to 44.3% and only 30% report that they are “mostly” or “fully” familiar. Many respondents (29.3%) did not know that there was a website and 45% reported that they were “not at all” or only “a little” familiar with it. Those who were “somewhat” or “mostly” familiar with the website were in the minority (25.2%). Thus, we conclude that, regarding knowledge about the functioning of and membership in the Senate, faculty are generally at least “somewhat” familiar, though that familiarity drops off significantly regarding the website.

We combined the first two familiarity items to create an additive “knowledge” scale (standardized by the number of items in the scale to maintain the original scale structure of 1 [not at all] to 5 [fully]). The correlation between familiarity with the functions of the Senate and its members is .79. We use this scale in bivariate analyses as a factor that may shape other evaluations.

The moderate level of familiarity with the Senate and low level of familiarity with its website seems to correspond with reports about attending the biannual faculty meetings. About 46% report “never” or only “occasionally” attending compared to 36.3% indicating that they “usually” or “always” attend. Although 26.4% of respondents agree that the biannual meetings of College faculty serve no real function, 54.8% disagree with that statement. This pattern suggests that while people do not attend the meetings regularly, they seem to see some merit to them.

The pattern of perceptions about faculty engagement parallels the pattern for attendance at faculty meetings. Most either “don’t know” or believe that faculty are “not at all” or just “a little” engaged in shared faculty governance. Thirty-four percent report that faculty are somewhat engaged but an incredibly small number (4.7%) suggest that faculty are “mostly” or “fully” engaged.

Perhaps more important than actual attendance or perceptions of the engagement of faculty in governance in general are faculty views on how much they would like to be involved in faculty governance. Most people report that they would “somewhat” like to be involved (38.8%), but over a quarter (26.4%) indicate that they are “not at all” or just “a little” interested in such involvement. The remaining third (34.7%) indicate that they would “mostly” or “fully” like to be involved in faculty governance. The combination of those somewhat or more extensively willing to be involved is consistent with the overwhelming agreement (74.7%) that individuals are confident that they could get more involved in Senate issues and activities if an issue about which they were passionate arose. Indeed, faculty largely “somewhat” or “strongly” agree that the existing Senate structure offers opportunities for them to provide input to College issues (53.5%, with 29.8% neither agreeing or disagreeing) and that they understand the process of providing input to college issues (52.7%, with 15% neither agreeing or disagreeing). That 32.3%, however, seem not to understand the process of how to express opinions about Senate activities is notable.
Taken together, reports of faculty’s involvement in governance or understanding of how to be involved suggest that many are not that interested in participating but that they do largely understand how to provide input and know how to get involved when interested.

**Awareness of Senate Activities**

Even though faculty respondents may only be moderately familiar with Senate functions and membership, they seem aware of its activities. Over 50% of respondents indicated that they were “mostly” or “fully” aware of: establishment of working groups (58.2%); providing a forum for discussing issues brought by the Dean (61.0%); providing a forum for discussing issues facing faculty (60%); overseeing standing committees (53.2%); having Senators liaise with departments (52.6%); and representing College faculty views to the administration (57.6%). About a quarter of respondents, however, demonstrated lack of awareness (“not at all” or “a little”) on each activity, with awareness of the oversight of standing committees (26.0%) and of the activities of liaisons (29.4%) garnering the least awareness. Importantly, with the inclusion of respondents who indicate that they are “somewhat” aware, it seems that there is a moderately high level of awareness of Senate activities among the faculty.

We created an additive scale from the six awareness items (standardized by the number of items in the scale to maintain the original scale structure of 1 [not at all] to 5 [fully]). These items go together well (alpha scale reliability of .93). In a subsequent section, we examine how characteristics of faculty and their knowledge shape awareness.

**Perceived Effectiveness of the Senate**

Eleven items assessed faculty members’ perceptions about the effectiveness of the Senate in a variety of areas. One question specifically asked each respondent to rate the overall effectiveness of the Senate in the last three years. (Owing to glitch detected early in data collection, the eleven items did not appear for the first 40 faculty members to take the survey. Everyone who participated, however, had the opportunity to assess “overall effectiveness.”)

The effectiveness items elicited somewhat high rates of “don’t know,” which may not be surprising insofar as the work of the Senate is evolving. Nearly 38% responded “don’t know” to assessments of the effectiveness of the Senate in forwarding the teaching mission of Emory College and in using its website to communicate with faculty members. About 35% indicated that they did not know how effective the Senate has been in representing faculty interests, providing a voice in strategic planning, and developing decision-making procedures for addressing College issues. The “don’t know” responses ranged from about 25-30% for effectiveness regarding: addressing policies about tenure and promotion; acting as a forum for discussion of issues; partnering with College administration in shared governance; using working groups to create recommendations for College endeavors; providing updates on Senate activities via periodic newsletters and emails; and consulting with the faculty in general or on working group endeavors.

For those who did judge the effectiveness of the Senate on these activities, most faculty members judged the Senate as either “somewhat” or “mostly” effective on nearly all the activities. In only three (of eleven) instances do percentages viewing the Senate as “fully” effective on an activity exceed 10%; those “fully” effective judgments contribute to the ranking described next. The main exception to Senate effectiveness is its use of the website to communicate.
Faculty members see the Senate as most effective (based on the total percent responding “somewhat,” “mostly,” or “fully”) regarding: acting as a forum for discussion of issues (62.4%); using working groups to create recommendations for College endeavors (61%); and providing updates on Senate activities via biannual newsletters and periodic emails (57%). The perceived effectiveness of the Senate with regard to other activities varies as follows: partnering with the College administration in shared governance (55.6%); addressing policies regarding tenure and promotion (54.9%); representing faculty interests (52.5%); consulting with faculty in general or with regard to working group endeavors (50%); providing a voice in strategic planning (48.3%); developing decision-making procedures for addressing College concerns (47.2%); forwarding the teaching mission of Emory College (45.9%); and using its website to communicate with faculty members (35.6%).

The scale for the overall effectiveness question included, in addition to “don’t know,” the following potential responses: “very ineffective,” “somewhat ineffective,” “neither effective nor ineffective,” “somewhat effective,” and “very effective.” About 25% indicated “don’t know” for this question. Only 13.2% suggested that the Senate was “ineffective” at any level and another 10% rated the Senate as “neither effective or ineffective.” What is promising is that a majority of respondents (43.4%) judged the Senate overall as “somewhat effective,” with another 8.8% claiming that it was “very effective.”

Thus, **in three years, the Senate has clearly achieved some level of effectiveness**, as judged by more than half (52.2%) of survey respondents. It appears that the Senate has made the greatest inroads in being seen by faculty members as a forum for discussion issues and creating working groups to investigate issues and propose recommendations, as it was intended. Perceptions vary more in the extent to which the Senate is providing a voice for particular concerns.

Communication via newsletters and periodic emails seems clearly more effective than doing so via the Senate website. One other survey item addresses the issue of communication. We asked faculty how much they disagreed or agreed with the statement “I would like more active dissemination of information about the Senate and its activities.” Most respondents (41.5%) “neither agree or disagree,” which along with the 16.5% who disagree, could suggest that the amount of communication may be sufficient for most faculty. Yet, with 41.9% agreeing with the statement, the Senate should work to ensure that all faculty perceive that the body is adequately communicating.

Another survey item provides a little depth on how faculty members see the partnership between the Senate and the College administration. About 24% of respondents agree that the Senate largely functions to serve the College administration, which may imply that the Senate is merely a tool of the administration and not an independent body. That 47.5% disagree with that assessment, and another 28.5% neither agree or disagree, suggests otherwise, however. As set forth in the bylaws, the ECAS Faculty Senate is charged with working with the administration in shared governance, an activity judged by more than half of the respondents as being (at least somewhat) effectively achieved.
Quantitative Bivariate Analyses: Impact of Respondent Characteristics on Assessments

The bivariate analyses examine how, if at all, any faculty characteristics (track, division, years of experience) and knowledge impacts assessments of the Senate and its perceived overall effectiveness. Although, as noted previously, “don’t know” was a potential response used by a number of faculty regarding their assessments of the Senate compared to GovCom, its current composition, and overall effectiveness, the analyses reported excludes faculty members who used that response. (Patterns of results excluding and including “don’t knows” were largely the same; exceptions noted in the text.)

The patterns of results involving track (tenured, tenure-track, lecture track), years of experience (1-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11-15, over 15), and division (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences/math/computer science) generally indicate that none of these faculty characteristics affect perceptions of whether the Senate compares favorably to GovCom, whether its composition is adequately representative, and its overall effectiveness. (With the inclusion of “don’t knows,” years of experience affect the comparison to GovCom and adequacy of composition, but the large number of cells with no respondents may affect the calculations of statistical significance.) And, while track has no impact on awareness of Senate activities (as captured by the scale of all awareness items), other characteristics do. Respondents with more years of experience (p < .05) and those from the Social Science or Natural Science divisions (p < .05) report greater awareness of Senate activities (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1. Effect of “Years at Emory” on Awareness of Senate Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>1-3 Yrs</th>
<th>4-6 Yrs</th>
<th>7-10 Yrs</th>
<th>10-15 Yrs</th>
<th>15+ Yrs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how aware are you of the Senate activities? (composite)</td>
<td>no, not aware</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat aware</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes, aware</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=177; Pearson Chi-Square (df=8) 15.54, p = .049

Table 2. Effect of “Division” on Awareness of Senate Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Natural Sciences/Math/CS</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how aware are you of the Senate activities? (composite)</td>
<td>no, not aware</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat aware</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes, aware</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=221; Pearson Chi-Square (df=4) 12.45, p = .014

Knowledge about the Senate consistently and strongly affects most evaluations (Tables 3, 4, and 5; all p < .01). Those with more knowledge indicate: greater awareness of Senate activities; see the Senate as better than the previous form of governance; and rate the Senate overall as effective. Knowledge, however, does not positively affect the assessment that the composition of the Senate is adequately
representative (except with the inclusion of “don’t know” responses, which suggests that faculty with more knowledge are likely to see the Senate as adequately representative).

Table 3. Effect of “Knowledge” of Senate Functions and Membership on Awareness of Senate Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how aware are you of the Senate activities? (composite)</td>
<td>no, not aware</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat aware</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes, aware</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=248; Pearson Chi-Square (df=8) 151.93, p < .000

Table 4. Effect of “Knowledge” of Senate Functions and Membership on Assessment of Senate Compared to Previous Governance Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much worse or better is the ECAS Faculty Senate compared to the former form of governance in Emory College?</td>
<td>Much worse than previous</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat worse than previous</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither worse nor better</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat better</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=152; Pearson Chi-Square (df=16) 51.28, p < .000

Table 5. Effect of “Knowledge” of Senate Functions and Membership on Overall Effectiveness of Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how ineffective or effective has the Senate been in the past 3 years?</td>
<td>Very ineffective</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat ineffective</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither effective nor ineffective</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 188; Pearson Chi-Square (df=16) 36.12, p = .003
In what follows, we attempt to find common themes arising from the listening sessions and responses to the open-ended questions on the survey. Although we focus largely on the latter, we note when themes also emerged during the free-flowing listening sessions.

The first three open-ended questions on the survey specifically addressed evaluations of the Senate compared to the previous governing structure, the adequacy of the composition of the Senate as it is currently structured, and recommended changes to the Senate. Responses to these questions were readily categorized through a coding system devised by Senate Review WG members. Doing so allows quantification of emergent themes. The remaining two open-ended questions asked generally about additional thoughts about faculty governance and about future issues for the Senate to address. As those questions elicited quite a variety of responses and given the limited time frame for completing this report, we note what seem to be common themes, but recognize that those data await further rigorous analyses.

**Reasons for Assessing Senate as Worse or Better than Previous Structure**

To complement respondents’ quantitative evaluations of how worse or better the ECAS Faculty Senate is compared to the former form of governance, we specifically asked: “What are your reasons for believing that the ECAS Faculty Senate is worse or better than the previous governing structure?” The quantitative data indicated that 33.9% “don’t know,” 7% think that it is much or somewhat worse, 13% indicate that it is “neither worse or better,” and 46.1% see it as somewhat or much better.

As Table 6 shows, those who responded to the open-ended question emphasize its structure, greater representativeness, and what might be considered its transparency (i.e., more open and deliberative). Such themes also emerged at the listening sessions. Some also note greater engagement in general, and specifically with the College administration. The following captures these positive elements of the Senate as a structure of shared governance:

*The faculty making decisions are now more representative, more engaged, and better educated about the issues than before. Before, discussions and decisions were dominated by the few people that showed up at the poorly attended faculty meetings. Many looked at those attendees as people who had nothing better to do. The senators now cover each division, which is more fair [sic]. The senators have read up on the issues. The senators are also the ones carrying out the working group activities.*
Table 6. Reasons Senate is better or worse than previous governing structure (N=90 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>better structure</td>
<td>organization is more defined, more efficient, independent of quorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>more representative</td>
<td>represents faculty and faculty issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>more open</td>
<td>better communication, more transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>more deliberative</td>
<td>more decisive, more informed discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>less engaged</td>
<td>the whole faculty have disengaged from the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>more engaged</td>
<td>the whole faculty are more connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>better connection to administration</td>
<td>clarified, required mechanism for the administration to report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>passive/powerless</td>
<td>follows administration directions, do-nothings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>not responsive</td>
<td>ignored issues faculty brought up, not working on important issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>outreach is insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the largely favorable assessments, some respondents noted that with the Senate structure, faculty in general are less engaged. Lack of such engagement also emerged in listening session discussions, with some noting that a crisis tends to enhance engagement. Others highlighted the possibility that the Senate is largely a tool of the administration (which dovetails with the quantitative assessment showing that 24% of respondents agree that the Senate functions to serve the administration) and is passive or powerless.

Detailed comments from the minority who see the Senate as worse than the previous form of governance raise concerns like: “being governed by people who are not really driving the university forward from a research perspective - puts power in the hands of a disgruntled minority;” “the Senate today seems still to focus on nonsense, rather than real issues that affect the quality of faculty life;” and “reports that colleagues attended meetings to raise issues and were shut down.” Such comments call attention to the need for the Senate to ensure that its body is representative and open to tackling difficulty issues, raised by the faculty.

One respondent explicitly compared the two systems of governance, suggesting:

...the great value of inertia in the previous system was that very few ideas destructive of basic liberal arts values and educational practice could force their way to a majority in two successive general faculty meetings. The potential for disaster in the current system is vastly greater, and the introduction of internet voting for proposals many will not even bother to read increases the danger even more.

While this assessment may exaggerate the potential for disaster, it reiterates the need for clear communication from the Senate, openness of the Senate to the concerns of its diverse constituents, and
critical thinking to weigh proposals to ensure that destructive ideas do not become practice.

Comments regarding Extent to Which Senate Adequately Represents Faculty

As previously described, 60.5% of respondents reported that the composition of the Senate “mostly or “fully” represents the views of the College faculty. Only 8.2% believe that it does not do so at all or only a little (16.3% “don’t know”). Thus, the survey asked, “If you indicated that the current composition of the Senate is less than fully adequate, what recommendations would you make for changes?”

As illustrated in Table 7, respondents often had contradictory suggestions for how to increase the adequacy of representation. On the one hand, 19% of respondents recommend more tenure-track Senators, but on the other hand, 13% encourage more lecture track representation. As currently written, the bylaws allow for up to 11 lecture track members to serve (of 23). In the first years of the Senate, the proportion of Senators from the lecture track was higher than the proportion (24.6%) of faculty in that track; for 2018-19, the lecture track Senators make up about 25% of the Senate. Many of the comments continue debates that arose at the time the Senate was conceptualized (as noted in the previous narrative about the founding of the Senate).

Table 7. Suggestions for increasing the adequacy of the representation of the Senate (N=67 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>more tenure track or less lecture track representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>more lecture track representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>proportional representation (of LTF/TTF #s, or division #s, of departmental #s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>more senior faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>increase the value of service, enhance participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>disproportionate divisional representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>more leadership, less politics and service work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>increase the size of the senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>add representation of adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>increase male participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>disproportionate divisional representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>disproportionate minority representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>decrease at-large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>decrease the size of the senate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent captured the difficulty in achieving full representation (in terms of gender and rank composition):

_The by-laws are adequate, but the culture of service has led to an imbalance of the senate. Right now, the Senate is largely female. Right now, the Senate contains a high percentage of LTFs. These are two communities who place greater emphasis or feel greater pressure to perform a large service load. This is an indicator of the lack of_
emphasis on service to all faculty, creating a discriminatory system. This imbalance is due to failure of the Dean and chairs to appreciate such work.

The issue of service emerges in other comments as well. For example, “[the Senate] needs to be composed of faculty leaders. Not of faculty merely willing to serve.” Another faculty member suggests that the structure should “restrict faculty from serving on more than one standing committee on the senate concurrently.” Such a restriction might encourage a greater number of faculty to be involved in aspects of shared governance and thus ameliorate the concern voiced by one respondent that “…the same group - and sorts- of people seem to be continuing to be in faculty governing bodies.”

Two comments focus on LTFs, noting that as the precariat, they may be less inclined to voice their views but that the Senate should “encourage them to speak more.”

**Changes Recommended for ECAS Faculty Senate**

The Senate Review survey also requested faculty to think pro-actively about the Senate. One close-ended question asked respondents how strongly they recommended changes to the ECAS Faculty Senate. Although 31% preferred not to answer that questions, among those who did answer, 39% did not feel strongly about recommending changes, 18.1% felt somewhat strongly, and only 11.9% felt “mostly” or “fully” strongly about offering suggestions for changes. The open-ended follow-up question asked: “If you recommend changes to the ECAS Faculty Senate, please describe the changes you would like.” Table 8 offers a list of those recommended changes.

Table 8. Recommended changes to the ECAS Faculty Senate (N=58 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Improve communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Change representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Enhance faculty power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Engage more faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Value service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Follow-up on Senate work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Release time for Senate service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Change quorum rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Do major work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Drop Robert’s rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Elect by age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Encourage senior faculty participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Invite administration to only some meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>More leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Penalize poor attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Revert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Term limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Videotape/livestream proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Work more at university level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recommendation to “improve communication” is a theme that also emerged in the quantitative results (especially regarding the Senate website). To increase faculty familiarity with the Senate, one faculty member proposed:

*It might sound old-fashioned and less than eco-friendly, but maybe send faculty an actual ‘flyer’ once a year with pictures of who the Senators are (not sure if that would be allowed) and just a bullet point reminder listing of the responsibilities and goals of the Senate? Something like that might make both the Senate itself and the investment of its members seem more tangible.*

Similarly, issues with representation remains a point of difference among faculty. One respondent suggested specifically that “*The Senate should be expanded to at least 50 members -- and it should be representative of the number of faculty rather than balanced by division.*” Another stressed the need for a representative faculty “*who are compensated for their time.*”

Clearly, faculty would like to see the Senate engage more faculty and to use the Senate to enhance faculty power – to do major work and to follow-up on the work that it does. At listening sessions, faculty likewise emphasized the strength of the Senate in governance of the college, wondering whether it has the clout to stand up to the Dean, should the need arise. The issue of communicating what the Senate has done and following-up on their work emerged in the survey and listening sessions. One suggestion seems to offer a pathway that will both enhance communication and reveal the consequences of the Senate’s work:

*Chairs of Working Groups should continue in their capacity after the report is submitted, should schedule a meeting with the Dean after the report, and should submit a retrospective report to the Senate one year afterward to report any actions or inaction that has taken place.*

Discontent with the use of Robert’s Rules of Orders emerged in this section of the survey and at listening sessions. Use of such parliamentary procedures, however, was deigned prior to the creation of the Senate and is in common use in a wide variety of (governing) groups. And, as the historical narrative of the emergence of the Senate notes, failure to use the rules can create confusion.

**Additional Thoughts Provided by Survey Respondents and in Listening Sessions**

Many (N=70) respondents took advantage of our request for additional thoughts about faculty governance in Emory College that they thought were important for the Senate Review Working Group to know. Appendix 11 details those comments, which varied extensively. A few themes dovetail with concerns elicited through the quantitative results and responses to other open-ended questions.

First, to ensure trust in representation governance requires effective communication to keep faculty informed. Some respondents offered ways to enhance communication, such as: providing easy to digest “bites;” distributing informative reports from committees; more proactive engagement from division representatives; better support for the department liaison function; periodic Senate mixers or social events at which people could speak with Senators informally; and an old-fashion (paper) newsletter.

Second, there seems to be a sense that the Senate accomplishes little, avoids important issues, and has no power. Some contend that the power is centrally located in the hands of the administration. One
respondent noted that the “administration by and large succeeds in ignoring issues or proposals with which it does not agree.” Others stressed the failure of discussions on very important topics to lead to anything or the absence of actions or implemented changes based on findings from working groups.

Third, faculty emphasize that given other demands, they have little time for service. There was a sense of weariness given teaching and research demands. Some lament lack of faculty engagement but few offer solutions. Some suggest that they should be provided with credit or compensation for their service. Others would like to see more mentoring to help them get through and to help navigate service obligations. A few mentioned the need to provide new hires with a primer on faculty governance.

Fourth, although not a common theme in responses to the survey, the role of the Nominations Committee emerged at one listening session. Attendees stressed both concern over the power of the committee to set the slate as well as the need for greater support of the committee in terms of helping them to sort nominations. They also raised issues about opening opportunities for junior faculty.

And, finally, some remarks indicated gratitude to the Senate for taking on the task of governance. Indeed, one person commented: “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.”

**Pressing Issues for the Senate to Address in the Future**

As Appendix 12 demonstrates, about 93 faculty identified a wide array for future issues for the Senate to address (once it finishes this review!) and thus this section offers only a superficial summary. Many comments demonstrated a deep concern for the research and teaching mission of the College, including worry about its current direction as well as strategies to ensure its future.

A repeated theme involved resources for faculty, including competitive salaries, addressing pay inequities, leaves, benefits, and the like. Others called attention to hiring practices and job security, with differing views on the nature of the hiring level. Many, however, emphasized the need for diversity in hiring. Concerns with promotion guidelines and practices, regardless of track, also emerged.

Some respondents stressed issues regarding faculty engagement, in the community, in service, and in faculty governance. One particular concern, noted in other sections of this report, involved the extent to which the Senate follows-up on its activities.

Many comments pertained to students and their experience, especially regarding curricular matters as embodied in the general education requirements. Additionally, some emphasis rested on the academic pursuits of students, with questions raised about pre-professionalism.

Concern with finances of the College was evident. This issue took many forms, from the desire to be more involved with financial decisions, to worry over the effects of the next financial crisis and the long-term sustainability of the current financial approach (especially in view of growing costs of financial aid).

Finally, many voiced what might be called “anti-administration” or administrative overreach concerns. Some focused on the College whereas others were directed to upper administration.
CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATION

This report offers a look back at how the ECAS Faculty Senate came to be established, a review of the work it has accomplished in its first three years, and a description of faculty members’ assessments of the functioning and composition of the Senate since its inception. It also provides a glance at faculty concerns and issues that the Senate may pursue in the future.

The establishment of the Senate, based on conscientious and thorough work of the SFGC and GovCom, emerged through a deliberate process. Faculty members had multiple opportunities to express concerns and debate changes to the College bylaws necessary to establish the Senate.

The procedures of the Senate require that the body handle issues through motions. Doing so involves the use of Robert’s Rules of Order, which are necessary but may be cumbersome. Nonetheless, the Senate has passed a wide array of motions, symbolic, procedural, positional, and content-oriented. The most consequential motions tend to involve the creation of Working Groups. Yet, the translation of the recommendations of such groups into action is not consistently apparent, in part owing to lack of documentation. Thus, what the Senate has accomplished remains less visible than it should.

Perhaps because of the lack of visibility of the Senate’s work, faculty members report their knowledge about the Senate’s functioning and membership to be low to moderate. Their awareness of Senate activities, however, is a bit more extensive and certainly shaped by their level of knowledge. While reported levels of involvement are low to moderate, faculty members clearly seem to know how to get involved should they wish to do so.

Generally, faculty judge the Senate favorably compared to the former system involving GovCom and the faculty of the whole, though comments suggest that, ironically, the structure might cultivate lower levels of faculty engagement. Such evaluations, however, are affected positively by knowledge about the Senate. Likewise, most deem Senate representation to be adequate, with comments reiterating debates regarding its composition since its inception.

Even though the work of the Senate needs to be communicated better and more visible (especially as indicated by the high percentage of “don’t know” responses), most faculty who felt able to assess the Senate’s effectiveness in various capacities judged it as somewhat to mostly effective. Knowledge of the Senate enhances views of its effectiveness. Ensuring that the work is consequential for faculty in general, and regarding the teaching mission of the College, may be one way for the Senate to demonstrate its strength.

The review process has illustrated the need for improved record keeping, including a systematic means of archiving materials relevant to shared governance (e.g., reports of working committees, actions based on their recommendations) and allowing ready access to those materials. Concomitant with such record keeping is the need for an enhanced “presence” of the Senate via the website and other forms of communication, which may boost faculty knowledge about the Senate.

The Senate Review Working Group recommends that the Senate and whole faculty review this report with attention to potential changes to the report to ensure clarity, advice for the President of the Senate with regard to the motion to be offered in the spring to the full faculty regarding continuation of the Senate in its current form, and recommendations for possible alterations in the bylaws governing the Senate, the procedures it undertakes, and the issues it tackles.