

## **Agenda with Attachments**

### **Meeting of the Rules Committee October 29, 2010, 2:00 p.m. Room 104 Melson**

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 22, 2010 meeting. (The draft minutes are posted on the Rules Committee website.)
2. A conversation with President Sethna on the meaning of the “consultative” role of the faculty in shared governance..
3. Old Business:
  - A. Further consideration of the proposed clarification to the meaning of the “consultative” role of the faculty in shared governance. (Appendix 1)
  - B. Further consideration of a proposal to recommend that Senate leaders serve on the major administrative councils. (Appendix 2)
  - C. Further consideration of a proposal for a budget to provide part-time instructors to allow for re-assigned time for the members of the Senate’s executive committee. (Appendix 3)
  - D. Further consideration of the proposal to re-apportion senators. (Appendix 4)
  - E. Further consideration of the proposal to revise the Senate’s standing committees. (Appen. 5)
  - F. Further consideration of a proposed clarification of the definition of the status of “ex officio” members of Senate committees, with specific implications for voting eligibility. (Append. 6)
  - G. Further consideration of a proposal to combine the positions of Secretary to the general faculty and Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate. (Appendix 7)
  - H. Further consideration of the proposal to revise the definition of a “quorum” for general faculty meetings. (Appendix 8)
  - I. Further consideration of changes to the *By-Laws* that will be needed to bring them into conformity with changes made last year to the *Policies and Procedures* manual. (Append. 9)
  - J. Further consideration of a mission statement for the Rules Committee. (Appendix 10)
4. New Business:
  - A. Initial consideration of a proposal to increase the number of senators. (Appendix 11)
  - B. Initial consideration of representation of faculty not affiliated with a college. (Appendix 12)

## APPENDIX 1

### **Proposal to specify the Meaning of “Consultation” in the Faculty’s Shared Governance Role as Consultative**

#### **Proposal**

To clarify and improve the consultative role of the faculty in the shared governance of the university, it is recommended that:

Consultation of administration with faculty shall be made for the major administrative decisions affecting the academic mission of the university; that consultation shall be obtained within the 6 months prior to the decision being made; and that the faculty body to be consulted shall be the Faculty Senate. Personnel decisions are specifically not included in this policy. In general, this policy aims to improve the consultative collaboration of administration and faculty at the level of major decision-making, and it is not meant to imply any micro-managing of the ordinary administrative tasks of managing the university. Whenever there shall be ambiguity as to whether a decision should fall within the range of this policy, it is expected that it would be reasonable to follow the principle of being more consultative in preference to less. The President should seek the advice of the Chair of the Senate in those cases where it is uncertain.

#### **Rationale**

To clarify a significant ambiguity in the consultative role of faculty in important administrative decisions. For example, currently a group of faculty appointed by the administration two years before a decision is made, and who recommend not making that decision, may nevertheless be counted as having fulfilled the administrator’s duty to “consult” with faculty.

#### **The Current Situation**

The Board of Regents *Policy Manual* for the USG specifies that university presidents have the authority to “*develop the organizational structure*” of their universities (specified in Policy 2.7). The opportunity and role of faculty consultation in this process is left unspecified at that point, but in general is regarded as a crucial aspect of such decision-making. For example, the UWG *Policies and Procedures* specify the following:

“The President, in consultation with representatives of the University community, shall determine the divisional organizational structure necessary for the orderly, effective, and efficient administration of the University’s affairs.” (Article I, Section 1, subsection F)

Note that this precise phrase is repeated four times in the *Policies and Procedures*, each time a section of the first three articles identifies how it can be modified. It appears as

Subsection F of Section 1 (Administrative Organization) of Article I (The University)

Subsection D of Section 1 (The President) of Article II (Officers of the Administration)

Subsection F of Section 1 (General officers of administration) of Article III (Officers of the Ad)

Subsection D of Section 2 (Other Officers of the Admin) of Article III (Officers of the Admin)

In contrast, Articles IV (Faculties) and V (General Policies of the Faculties) specify that they can only be revised by a vote of the general faculty.

## APPENDIX 2

### Proposal for Faculty and Administrative Collaboration

#### The Proposal

It is recommended that leaders of the Faculty Senate shall be included as members of the following administrative councils:

1. The President's Advisory Committee shall include the Chair of the Senate
2. The Administrative Council shall include the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee
3. The Planning Council shall include the Chair of the Business and Finance Committee
4. The Technology Coordination Council shall include the Chair of the Information Technology Committee

#### Rationale

Precisely because both the faculty and the administration understand the value of the key administrators having seats at Faculty Senate, the value of this two-way communication would be improved by enhancing the specifically "two-way" nature of it, by having the complementary structure of Faculty Senate leaders having seats on the major administrative councils.

##### 1. The President's Advisory Council

This body, chaired by the President, is arguably the most important arena for consultation at UWG. The *Policies and Procedures*, Article I, Section 1,E,1 defines this body as follows:

"The President's Advisory Committee shall be the immediate advisory body to the President. The President shall appoint persons to this committee with whom he or she will consult on a regular basis to advise him or her on the administration of the University. This Committee shall consist of: a. Persons in administrative positions reporting directly to the President; and b. Such other persons as the President believes will provide advice for the orderly, effective, and efficient administration of the Committee's affairs. Appointments shall be annual at the beginning of the fiscal year..."

The elected Chair of the Senate shall be accorded a seat at this Council.

##### 2. The Administrative Council

This body, chaired by the Provost, is the most important administrative body for the specifically academic operations of UWG. The *Policies and Procedures*, Article I, Section 1,E,2 defines this body as follows:

"The Administrative Council shall be the chief advisory body for administrative activities in the academic operations of the University. It shall consist of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (chair), Vice President and Dean of Students, Deans of the Graduate School, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, the School of Nursing and Honors College; the Executive Director of Institutional Research & Planning; Directors of Continuing Education/Public Services, Information Technology Services and the Library; the chair of the Institutional Studies and Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate; and the President of the Student Government Association."

Note that this passage indicates that the Chair of the Senate's ISP Committee shall have a seat at this council. I don't know whether that is practiced or not – we should find out. But I do not think that is the most valuable Senate leader we could place on that council. It seems to me that either the Chair of the Senate or the Chair of the Undergraduate Academic Programs Committee would be more so. And, if we revise the Senate's committee structure, then I would suggest that the Chair of the Senate's proposed Academic Affairs Committee should have this seat.

### 3. The Planning Council

This body is advisory to the President. The *Policies and Procedures*, Article I, Section 1,E,3 defines this body as follows:

“The Planning Council shall be an advisory body to the President on long-range development of the University. It shall be expected to oversee the creation of a variety of plans extending three or more years into the future. Members of the Council shall be appointed by the President from the administration, faculty, students, alumni and the community. It shall have no policy-making powers.”

I also think, for the same reasons, that a key leader of the Senate should have a seat at this body. Who that should be depends on whether we revise the Senate's committee structure. If we do adopt the proposal I have for that, then I would suggest that the Chair of the Senate's proposed Business and Finance Committee should have this seat.

### 4. The Technology Coordination Council

The *Policies and Procedures*, Article I, Section 1,E,3 defines this body as follows:

“The Technology Coordination Council shall create, assess, and coordinate technical standards, procedures and processes that implement UWG's information technology strategic policies; to coordinate the activities of UWG's information technology groups to foster the best use of information technology across campus; to perform periodic evaluations of UWG's IT resources; to make cooperative purchasing decisions among the information technology groups; to ensure that the information technology groups communicate with each other and with the University administration; and to advise the Technology Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate and the administration on technical issues. The Technology Coordination Council will meet jointly once each semester with the Technology Planning Committee to promote communication and cooperation.

Membership: The University Technology Officer (chair) and the director or senior staff member of each campus IT staff (including 1 representative each from Information Technology Services, the Learning Resources Center, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Richards College of Business, the College of Education, the Nursing School, Ingram Library, the Department of Computer Science, Business Information Technology Services, Student Affairs, and Distance Education). The chair of the Technology Planning Committee of the Faculty Senate, or a designee selected by the chair, and the University's Information Security Officer will serve *ex officio*.”

As stated above, the Chair of the Senate's Technology Planning Committee should already have a seat at this body. (Again, we should check to see if this is current practice.) I think that designation is the appropriate one.

### APPENDIX 3

## Proposal for Re-assigned Time for Senators

### Proposal

It is recommended that the members of the Senate's Executive Committee should be granted reassigned time to provide them sufficient time to effectively carry out their duties in a timely way. The Chair, the Past Chair and the Executive Secretary shall have a one course reassigned time each semester and the Chairs of the Senate committees shall have a one course reassigned time per year. The senator's home department shall be compensated by an amount sufficient to hire a part-time instructor to fill the gap left by the course release.

### Rationale

Given:

that it is beneficial to attract the best people to serve as leaders in the Senate; and

that Senate service takes a large commitment of one's time; and

that the members of the Senate's Executive Committee in particular bear both a large share of the responsibility and time commitments of optimal Senate functioning;

it is reasonable to provide a structure to facilitate such optimal functioning with the use of reassigned time. This practice is common at other universities in the USG.

If we were to follow that line, then the budget required for this proposal would be something like \$3200 x the number of reassigned courses. Currently, that would be 19, but with the proposed changes to the Senate's committee structure, it would be 11. Perhaps the budget line could be placed annually under the authority of the Chair of the Senate.

## APPENDIX 4

### *Ideas toward a Proposal to Revise the Allocation of Senators*

#### *Questions under Consideration*

1. Should every department, regardless of its size, be guaranteed to have a representative on Senate?
2. Should large departments be guaranteed of a larger proportion of representation?
3. Should the current ambiguity in the question of the locus of representative responsibility be resolved?
4. Should holding departmental elections prior to the college elections will allow for those not elected to the Senate to run for non-senator seats on Senate committees, without the current problem of having to simultaneously run for twp positions, only one of which can be held (requiring numerous subsequent complicated adjustments, including the possibility of special elections)?
5. Should programs (rather than departments) be considered the locus of representation?

#### *Variants under Consideration*

1. Each academic department, the School of Nursing, and the Library elects senators, according to this formula: 1-10 full-time faculty = 1 Senator, 11-20 full-time faculty = 2 Senators, 21 or more full-time faculty = 3 Senators
2. Each academic department, the School of Nursing, and the Library elects senators, according to this formula: 1-15 full-time faculty = 1 Senator, 16-25 full-time faculty = 2 Senators, 26 or more full-time faculty = 3 Senators
3. Each college, the School of Nursing and the Library is allotted the number of senators equal to 10% of their full-time faculty, the distribution of which among their departments will be determined every few years as proportionally as possible. The departments will then each elect the number of senators they have been allotted.
4. Each college, the School of Nursing and the Library receives the number of senators equal to 10% of their full-time faculty, to be allotted such that each department elects one senator, and the remaining senators are elected at-large by the college.
5. Each college, the School of Nursing and the Library receives the number of senators equal to 10% of their full time faculty, to be elected at large by that unit, with the proviso that each department within that unit shall have at least one senator from that department.
6. Every academic department, the School of Nursing, and the Library shall be allocated one senator, the remaining number of senator positions shall be allocated among those units as proportionally as possible to match their number of full-time faculty. The units shall elect their senators one month prior to the colleges' elections of non-senator members of the Senate's committees.

## APPENDIX 5

### A Proposal to Revise the Structure of the Senate's Standing Committees

#### A. The Proposed Committee Structure

The Senate shall include six standing committees. Four of these are each aligned with one of the four administrative divisions of the university, and each of these shall also include standing subcommittees. The fifth committee, the Rules Committee, shall be devoted to the governance structure itself. The sixth committee shall be the Senate's Executive Committee. All senators will be assigned to one of the first five committees by the outgoing Executive Committee, taking into account their preference. These committees and their subcommittees shall be:

#### 1. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Purpose: The Academic Affairs Committee shall work in close coordination with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, to recommend policy regarding the university's academic programs and policies.

Composition: 19 Senators will constitute the Academic Affairs Committee. They will vote to elect one among them to serve as Chair. The committee will then allocate the other 18 to serve on its six subcommittees (3 on each), as much as possible allowing for individual preference of subcommittee assignment, but with the Chair having the authority to decide any disagreement.

Subcommittees: There shall be six standing subcommittees of the Academic Affairs Committee, named and charged with the following areas of policy:

##### a. Undergraduate Academic Programs Subcommittee

Purpose: to recommend policy and formulate procedures concerning undergraduate degrees and academic programs (including majors, concentration and minors, core curriculum, and individual undergraduate courses; to approve all undergraduate course additions or deletions from the curriculum and any reorientation of existing programs, including extended degree programs and international programs.

##### b. Graduate Academic Programs Subcommittee

Purpose: to recommend policy and formulate procedures concerning graduate admissions, transfers, admission to candidacy, eligibility for graduation, petitions, appeals, and graduate faculty membership; to recommend proposals for graduate degree programs and other graduate curricula matters.

##### c. Honors Programs Subcommittee

Purpose: to recommend policy and formulate procedures concerning Honors College admission and retention criteria, Honors College advising and curriculum matters, petitions and appeals, and the annual Honors Convocation; to recommend proposals for recognizing Honors College student achievements through the University Commencement program and other appropriate means; and to recommend means to attract prospective Honors College students, and to provide

Honors College students amenities and advantages consistent with national patterns of excellence; and to make recommendations concerning honorary degrees.

**d. Academic Policies and Procedures Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy concerning intellectual property, advising, undergraduate admissions and retention, registration, University calendar, class scheduling, final examinations and examination scheduling, advisement, testing, advanced placement, commencement, and catalogs (including catalog content); to hear undergraduate student petitions for exceptions to academic policy, including graduation requirements.

**e. Teaching Support Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy, make procedural, organizational and developmental recommendations for: SACS and specialized accreditations, QEP implementation, pedagogy for distance and classroom learning, and for the library, computer center, and Learning Support & Testing.

**f. Faculty and Administrative Staff Personnel Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy concerning appointments, promotions, tenure, salaries, benefits, grievances, discipline and dismissals; to hear and make recommendations in grievance, discipline, post tenure review appeals and dismissal cases; to make recommendations for the composition of university search committees; to recommend policy with respect to the offices of Ombuds, University General Counsel, Office of Institutional Diversity.

**g. Faculty Research Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy and procedural, organizational and developmental recommendations for Sponsored Operations, faculty and institutional research; and to determine the allocation of UWG funded grant support.

-----

**2. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Purpose: The Student Affairs Committee shall work in close coordination with the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, to recommend policy regarding the university's educational services, developmental programs, and student activities designed to enrich the student's university life.

Composition: 7 Senators will constitute the Student Affairs Committee. They will vote to elect one among them to serve as Chair. The committee will then allocate the other 5 to serve on its two subcommittees (3 on each), as much as possible allowing for individual preference of subcommittee assignment, but with the Chair having the authority to decide any disagreement.

Subcommittees: There shall be two standing subcommittees of the Student Affairs Committee, named and charged with the following areas of policy:



**a. Student Life Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy and procedures concerning financial aid, housing, health and food services, counseling services, student security and safety, student discipline, student publications, student organizations, and other student matters referred to the committee, to recommend policies and procedures with respect to the Campus Center, Career Services, EXCEL Center, Financial Aid, First Year Experience, Health Services, Residence Life, Intramurals and Recreational Services, Multicultural Achievement Program, Student Judicial Programs, Student Development, Registrar

**b. Enrollment Management Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy and procedures concerning admission, retention, and progression to graduation in liaison with the offices of Enrollment Management and Admissions.

-----  
**3. BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

Purpose: The Business and Finance Committee shall work in close coordination with the Division of Business and Finance, to recommend policy regarding the financial operations of the university and the physical property and services of the university.

Composition: 13 Senators will constitute the Business and Finance Committee. They will vote to elect one among them to serve as Chair. The committee will then allocate the other 12 to serve on its four subcommittees (3 on each), as much as possible allowing for individual preference of subcommittee assignment, but with the Chair having the authority to decide any disagreement.

Subcommittees: There shall be four standing subcommittees of the Business and finance Committee, named and charged with the following areas of policy:

**a. Information Technology Subcommittee**

Purpose: To assess and recommend policy and procedures that contribute to the fulfillment of UWG's technology vision. That vision is "... to integrate information technology into West Georgia's academic and administrative mission to ensure that students, faculty, staff, and the community are well prepared for life in a knowledge-based and technologically dynamic society." The Technology Planning Committee will produce a Yearly Evaluation of Campus IT as a summation of the state of information technology at UWG over the previous academic year. This subcommittee will serve as the liaison with the Office of Information Technology.

**b. University Facilities and Services Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy and procedures for public relations, convocations, campus security and safety, telephone services, mail services, parking and traffic control, physical plant problems, environmental issues, etc.; to recommend policies and procedures with respect to the offices of: Campus Planning & Facilities, University Police, Business & Auxiliary Services.

**c. Institutional Studies and, Planning Subcommittee**

Purpose: to recommend policy concerning University purposes and goals (and to evaluate their degree of suitability and attainment), academic planning and growth, and campus development and to monitor the implementation of the campus strategic plan, in liaison with the Office of Institutional Research & Planning.

**d. Budget Subcommittee**

Purpose: to review the budget of the University and to make recommendations regarding prioritization, distribution, and implementation to the President and the Vice Presidents of the University.; to recommend policies and procedures with respect to the offices of Budget Services & Asset Management, Controller, Human Resources, Internal Audit.

-----

**4. UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE**

Purpose: The University Advancement Committee shall work in close coordination with the Division of University Advancement, to recommend policy regarding the university's goals to: foster relationships with and serve the university community (including alumni, prospective students, the local community, the larger community, the legislature, and the media), expand the public's awareness of the university, implement special events held on campus, and develop its programs in intercollegiate athletics.

Composition: 7 Senators will constitute the University Advancement Committee. They will vote to elect one among them to serve as Chair. The committee will then allocate the other 6 to serve on its two subcommittees (3 on each), as much as possible allowing for individual preference of subcommittee assignment, but with the Chair having the authority to decide any disagreement.

Subcommittees: There shall be two standing subcommittees of the Student Affairs Committee, named and charged with the following areas of policy:

**a. Intercollegiate Athletics Subcommittee**

Purpose: To recommend policy and procedures concerning athletic admission standards, athletic budgets, program expansion or reduction, and membership in associations; and to oversee the enforcement of conference, association, and accreditation rules and regulations; to recommend policies and procedures with respect to the office of Intercollegiate Athletics

**b. University Relations Subcommittee**

Purpose: To recommend policy and procedures with respect to the offices of Development and Alumni Relations, University Communications and Marketing, University Events, Publications & Printing, Public Relations, Continuing Education.

-----

## **5. RULES COMMITTEE**

Purpose: to review and make recommendations regarding the structures, composition and organizational aspects of the Faculty Senate, its committees, and the rules under which they operate; to resolve disputes between Senate committees; to develop and recommend rules for faculty participation in shared university governance; to hear appeals for cases of alleged violations to the rules; and to coordinate revisions and updates to the *Statutes, Faculty Handbook, Policies and Procedures* and *By-Laws* and any operational protocols the Senate establishes.

Composition: The Rules Committee does not have subcommittees, but will function as a committee of the whole. It will include 3 senators, 7 faculty (1 from each college, 1 Nursing, 1 Library) and 1 ex officio non-voting from Administration (the university general counsel).

---

## **6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Purpose: The Executive Committee of the Senate shall: assign senators to Senate standing Committees; create ad hoc Senate committees and assign senators; serve as the Senate's elections committee, receiving nominations from the Senate for Chair, establishing election procedures, monitoring compliance, and certifying the results; and, in consultation with the Chair of the Senate, recommend the agenda and facilitate the flow of business for each Senate meeting.

Composition: The Executive Committee shall be composed of the chairs of the other five standing committees, plus the Chair of the Senate, the Past Chair of the Senate, Executive Secretary of the Senate, the President of the University, the Provost of the University, and the President of the University's AAUP chapter.

### **B. Non-senator Composition of the Subcommittees**

Each of the four Senate committees that are comprised of subcommittees will have for their membership only the senators assigned to those committees, plus the ex officio representative from the Provost's office. The working subcommittees, on the other hand, will include non-senate members as well. Each of those 14 standing subcommittees will include:

three senators

the Chair of that Senate committee (serving as ex officio on all of its subcommittees)

an ex officio representative from the Provost's office (*NOTE: might we want to consider eliminating the 'ex officio' rep from the VPAA office? Replace it with a voting member appointed by the relevant VP for each committee?*)

and also:

1. Seven elected faculty members, one from each of the following academic units: the five colleges (COSM, COSS, COAH, RCOB, COE), the School of Nursing, and the Library.
2. One member from the administration, appointed by the Vice-President whose division aligns with the Senate committee over that subcommittee.
3. One student representative, in each case to be elected by SGA except for the Graduate Academic Programs Subcommittee, whose student rep will be appointed by the Dean of the

- Graduate School (with the exceptions of the Faculty and Administrative Staff Personnel and the Faculty Research subcommittees, the subcommittees, which will not include student reps).
4. In addition, each subcommittee may choose to include *ex officio* members to its committee as it deems fit, such *ex officio* appointments to be non-voting and made on an annual basis.

### **C. The Proposed Committee Operation**

#### **Functioning**

Each subcommittee would write legislation for Senate consideration. Proposals passed by a subcommittee go directly to the Senate. All committees shall also be empowered to establish ad hoc subcommittees as they deem appropriate.

#### **Committee Chairs**

In the case of those committees comprised of subcommittees, the members would first elect a chair of the committee, then all be assigned to a subcommittee, and each subcommittee would elect its own chair.

Each of the four “divisional” committee chairs would be the one to interface directly with the Vice-President for that administrative unit (and the VP would know where to go for faculty consultation).

The four “divisional” committee chairs would also interface with each of the subcommittees under that committee, closely coordinating, facilitating and expediting action on their proposals.

### **D. Some Notes on the Changes Proposed:**

First, it is vital that we consider these changes in conjunction with others. For example:

1. This set of changes presupposes a Senate of 49 members – which is something I would like to propose anyway. Given the current number of full-time faculty (487) a 49 member Senate is precisely equal to the 10% ratio we had gone with at the last revision, and which was put in place with the beginning of the Senate.
2. These changes should also be seen as key to the set of proposals provided to improve faculty involvement in governance by having key Senate leaders sit on administrative councils (see Appendix 2).
3. These changes should also be seen in conjunction with the proposal concerning the meaning of “ex officio” (see Appendix 6). (***NOTE: might we want to consider eliminating the ‘ex officio’ rep fro the VPAA office? Replace it with a voting member appointed by the relevant VP for each committee?***)

Second, we should be sure to take note that these changes include the following (which may not be immediately apparent):

1. Move oversight of Admissions moved from APP to new subcommittee under the Student Affairs Committee
2. Move oversight of Continuing Education from the UAPC to a new subcommittee under the University Advancement Committee

3. Change the title of General University Matters Committee to the University Facilities and Services subcommittee, and the addition of “environmental issues” as part of its charge
4. Include shifting the work of three committees that are not Senate committees (they are currently housed under the VPAA’s office) to the purview of Senate subcommittees:
  - a. placing Honorary Degrees under Honors Programs Subcommittee
  - b. placing Intellectual Property under the Academic Policies and Procedures Subcommittee
  - c. placing post tenure review appeals under the Faculty Development SubcommitteeWith respect to moving the work of non-Senate committees into Senate committee, I would like to also suggest that we consider folding TEAC into the UAP subcommittee, though that is not specified here.
5. Change the title of the Technology Planning Committee to the Information Technology Subcommittee
6. Include additional purposes for the Faculty and Administrative Staff Personnel Subcommittee.
7. Add a new Faculty Research Subcommittee and gave it charge to award internal UWG grants (now done by the Learning Resources Committee). I would also like to see if we could insure that this committee has an annual budget assigned to it for this purpose (of 1% of UWG’s operating budget would be a real commitment to faculty research).
8. Revise the old LRC committee to a more robust committee on “Teaching Support” – see the new mission for it (should accreditation go there?) but minus the grants which go to the new Faculty Research Subcommittee
9. While all committees’ compositions will be effected, the composition of the Graduate Academic Programs Subcommittee will be affected the most. (Also note the slightly changed name.)
10. Put the AAUP chapter president on the Senate’s Executive Committee. I strongly feel that enhancing coordination between the two elective bodies that represent faculty would be a good thing to do, but am not certain this is the optimal way to achieve that.
11. Several subcommittees’ statements of purpose were slightly tweaked, either to add functions from the division of UWG with which they interface or to remove extraneous verbiage, such as “to the Senate through the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.”

Third, we should also consider whether the smaller units (Library, School of Nursing) may be unduly burdened by having to supply non-Senate reps to every standing committee – that is not the current policy. Perhaps we should specify their non-Senate reps only to certain selected committees? Which ones, if so?

Fourth, I would also like to note that some of these changes concern internal Senate functioning (such as how senators are assigned to committees and subcommittees) and so do not need to be inserted in the *Policies and Procedures*, but can be included in a new document, a “Protocols of the Senate” that we could write and recommend for adoption, and that then can be revised by the Senate without need of general faculty approval.

## APPENDIX 6

### Proposal to specify “ex officio”

#### The Proposal

To recommend that the phrase “non-voting” be inserted prior to the phrase “ex officio” in *Policies and Procedures*, Article III, Section 1,A,3: “The Provost... shall be... an ex officio member of all standing committees of the Senate”

#### Rationale

To clarify an ambiguity in the meaning of “ex officio” status on Senate committees, and to bring the *Policies and Procedures* into conformity with what has been the prevailing practice in fact. Actually, the current situation contains two levels of ambiguity.

1. On whether administrative positions on Senate committees are ex officio or not
2. On whether ex officio position are voting or not

Compounding this ambiguity is the frequent discrepancy between what is stated in the *Policies and Procedures* for various committees and what is stated on those committees’ web sites (which in most cases specifies that the administrative slots are “ex officio non-voting”).

Committees 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,11,12 list administrative slots not designated as ex officio

Committees 1,8,9,10,12,13 list administrative slots that are designated as “ex officio, non-voting” (Note that Committees 8,12 include both types of slots)

Furthermore, all committees are mandated to include an administrative ex officio slot (for the VPAA) that is not specified as to whether it is voting or not. (*Policies and Procedures*, Article III, Section 1,A,3: “The Provost... shall be... an ex officio member of all standing committees of the Senate”)

1. Concerning first the issue of whether the administrative positions not designated as “ex officio” should be considered to be voting members of those committees, this proposal recommends that they should be so considered. While it might be confusing to have some administrative slots designated as “ex officio” while others are not, this distinction is worth maintaining, as long as it is clear. The intention to have administrators on some Senate committees as full voting members is not in itself a necessarily ambiguous position.
2. Concerning the second issue, the question is whether or not the slots designated as “ex officio” but not “non-voting” (by the *Policies and Procedures* manual (not by the committee web sites, which should be brought into conformity with the manual, not vice versa) should be considered to be “non-voting.” In this matter, it is only the slot set aside on every committee for the Provost that is so designated. Given that every other “ex officio” slot is specified as “non-voting” it seems that this was the intended meaning of “ex officio” to apply in this case as well, and it has also been the typical practice in fact.

*An alternative we may want to consider would be to eliminate the clause for ex officio representation by the VPAA on all standing committees, perhaps replacing it with a codification of the appointment (by the various VPs) of voting members to each subcommittee under their region?*

## **APPENDIX 7**

### **Proposal to Combine Secretary of Faculty and Executive Secretary of Senate**

#### **The Problem**

There is an odd doubling of “executive secretary” functions between the general faculty and the Faculty Senate. Article 1.a. of the *Bylaws of the Policies and Procedures* specifies a “Secretary” for the Faculty officers, to be elected by the faculty. Article 1.b. specifies that the Secretary be elected to a 3 year term. In addition to this “Secretary” to the faculty, there is an “Executive Secretary” to the Senate (elected to a two-year term), as specified in *Policies and Procedures*, Article IV, Section 2,D. Having myself served simultaneously in both these roles, I can definitively say that there is a real advantage in optimal functioning to combining them, and I’d like us to consider doing so.

#### **Possible Solutions**

We could combine these positions in either of two ways:

1. have the Executive Secretary of the Senate serve as the Secretary to the general faculty
2. have the Secretary to the general faculty serve as the Executive Secretary of the Senate.

#### **Proposed Solution**

Because the general faculty as a whole elect the “Secretary” of the general faculty, whereas the Executive Secretary of the Senate is chosen only by the members of the Senate, I propose that we combine these positions in a way that fosters greater participation and democracy, by choosing option #2 above. However, if we do opt to recommend that change, then I think we also ought to recommend that their role as the Executive Secretary of the Senate be clearly specified to be a three-year term since, at this point, it is a two-year term.

**APPENDIX 8**

**Ideas toward a Proposal to Clarify the Definition of a Quorum  
for Meetings of the General Faculty**

electronic balloting up to 72 hours in advance of the physical meeting to be included in the quorum of that meeting

these ballots should be presented and recorded at the physical meeting

any debate prior to the physical meeting should take place on an electronic bulletin board set up for that purpose rather than the ALL-FACULTY listserve



## APPENDIX 9

### **Proposed Changes to By-Laws in the Policies and Procedures**

There may be others, and the changes we propose may make more others, but I did notice one statement in the current By-Laws that was not changed when, last year, the *Policies and Procedures* were changed in this regard. It is:

Currently, Article III D of the *By-Laws* states

*Each Senate committee, except the Committee on Graduate Studies and the Honors College Committee, shall annually elect one (1) faculty member of the Senate as chair.,,, The newly elected chair shall take office at the beginning of the summer semester. The Dean of the Graduate School shall serve as Chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies; and the Dean of the Honors College shall serve as chair of the Honors College Committee.*

Given that chairs of these committees are now elected, this needs to be changed. Note, however, that if we revise the committee structure itself this year (i.e., see Appendix 9), making this change to the *By-Laws* should await that one, which may, for example, further tweak the names of those committees.

While we are proposing changes to the By-Laws, we might also want to consider taking a whack at this one as well:

Currently Article III.C of the *By-Laws* Article III.C. states:

*The official file of the minutes of each committee meeting shall be kept in the Registrar's Office. Official copies of committee minutes shall be made available to the University community from the web page of the VPAA. One paper copy shall be retained in the Archives at the University Library.*

Given that, as far as I know, this is not now followed, and further, given that we live now in an electronic age, shall we change it? On the other hand, there is something quaintly wondrous about it, but if we recommend it be kept, should we then not also recommend it be followed?

APPENDIX 10

**DRAFT      MISSION STATEMENT      DRAFT**

**of the Rules Committee  
a standing committee of the Faculty Senate**

**MISSION**

To support the optimal functioning of the University of West Georgia by developing rules to enhance clear, transparent, efficient and effective modalities for faculty participation in the shared governance of the university.

**GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

**GOAL 1: *To develop clear rules of faculty participation in university governance***

Objective 1: To insure that the relevant guiding documents, the *Faculty Handbook, Policies and Procedures Manual*, the *By-Laws* and *Statutes*, are written in the most articulate, clear, unambiguous and readable manner possible.

Objective 2: To insure that these documents do not contain any internal contradictions.

Objective 3: To insure that any contradictions of any rules with established practices are eliminated either through rules changes or changes to the practices.

**GOAL 2: *To develop transparent rules of faculty participation in university governance***

Objective 4: To insure that all rules regarding university governance are readily available, easily accessible, and understandable to all relevant participants.

Objective 5: To insure that all governance bodies provide timely access to their reports of their meetings, including agendas, minutes, policies and decisions.

**GOAL 3: *To develop efficient rules of faculty participation in university governance***

Objective 6: To insure the widest range of opportunities for broad-based, representative faculty participation in university governance

Objective 7: To insure that governance modalities function in as an efficient a manner as possible.

Objective 8: To insure that all participants in governance are duly recognized and compensated for having contributed their service to the well-being of the university.

**GOAL 4: *To develop effective rules of faculty participation in university governance***

Objective 9: To insure that the role of faculty in governance works in an effective collaboration with administrative roles, through the close alignment of those efforts.

Objective 10: To insure that the faculty's consultative role with administrative policy is codified in such a way that its consultation is timely, representational, and well-known.

Objective 11: To insure that the faculty, through its elected bodies, particularly the Faculty Senate, have the opportunities for debating and determining its recommendations for the key policies regarding the academic mission of the university.

## **APPENDIX 11**

### **Proposal to Increase the Number of Senators**

#### **The Proposal**

The total number of senators shall be equal to 10% of the full-time faculty, a total to be revised by the Rules Committee whenever it shall revisit the allocation of senators, but at least every five years. In light of this policy, the Rules Committee recommends that the current total number of senators be adjusted to 49 with the Spring 2011 election cycle. The terms of some of these newly elected senators shall be adjusted to stagger the election cycles as evenly as possible.

#### **Rationale for this Change**

1. The Senate's workload is growing and is already too large for current number
2. Additional senators will be needed to staff proposed new committees
3. Greater participation provides greater chance of perspectival diversity and participatory democracy
4. The UWG Senate is considerably smaller than that of comparable universities in the USG (i.e., Valdosta State, Georgia Southern, Kennesaw State)

## **APPENDIX 12**

### **On the Question of Representation of Non-College Affiliated Administrators Who Are by Statute Members of the General Faculty**

The *Statutes* mandate that there are some administrators (such as “the Registrar” and “the chief financial officer”) who are to be included in the General Faculty. Given that they do not hold faculty rank in any college, the question arises as to how to allocate their representation on Senate.