

## ***Resolution from the Committee to Review Faculty Governance***

***Whereas*** the Committee to Review Faculty Governance was created by the Faculty Senate in November 2005 to study the state of faculty governance at Cornell and “to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for changes to broaden and strengthen the influence of the university faculty on administrative decision-making at Cornell”; and

***Whereas*** the Committee to Review Faculty Governance has fulfilled its charge and has submitted its final report and recommendations to the Faculty Senate,

***Be it resolved*** that the Senate receives the report with thanks and calls on the Dean of Faculty and the University Faculty Committee to initiate further consideration of the recommendations.

*Committee to Review Faculty Governance*  
*March 7, 2007*

*University Faculty Senate*  
*March 14, 2007*

### **IV. Recommendations**

The recommendations in this report are designed to improve and strengthen faculty governance at Cornell and by so doing, improve the overall quality of the University. The recommendations address the issues and problems identified by the FGC in its work, with a particular focus on openness and meaningful consultation between faculty and the administration and the trustees, toward a goal of consensus as decisions are made.

The success of any changes depends on active faculty participation in university governance, including the UFC, Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate committees and University Assembly. The Dean of Faculty and University Faculty Committee (UFC) should develop a program to educate new members of the Senate and newly hired faculty about governance processes and procedures. Departments should encourage broad and active participation of faculty in the Faculty Senate, giving such representation weight appropriate to the importance of faculty governance at Cornell, relative to other faculty committee and service duties. Faculty Senators should report to and seek input from the faculty they represent on a regular basis.

**1. The role of the Dean of Faculty and UFC shall be expanded to improve communication and consultation between the Administration, the Board of Trustees and the Faculty:**

- **Expanded membership eligibility:** Five members of the UFC shall be current Senate members at the time of their election; four need not be current members of the Senate at the time of their election.
- **Broad consultation:** The President, Provost and Trustees shall use their regular meetings with the Dean of Faculty and the UFC to raise issues for faculty consultation. In addition to meeting regularly with the President and Provost, the Dean of Faculty shall attend the President's weekly meetings with senior administrators. Issues for faculty consultation should cover both academic and non-academic matters that affect faculty and academic life at the university (e.g. capital campaign planning; housing; budget/finance; new construction). These issues shall be raised early enough to provide time for meaningful consideration by appropriate Faculty Senate committees, *ad hoc* faculty committees, or joint faculty/administration committees. In unusual cases where time is of the essence, the President, Provost, or Board of Trustees shall work with the Dean of Faculty and UFC to find ways to act quickly while also providing adequate faculty consultation.
- **Report regularly to the Faculty Senate:** Given the scope and importance of their liaison roles, the Dean of Faculty and UFC shall each make an oral report at every Faculty Senate meeting, with sufficient time for questions. These reports should fully inform the Faculty Senate of the content of the UFC's meetings with the Administration and Trustees. Any restriction of information based on confidentiality shall be defined as narrowly as possible. At least once a semester, the Dean of Faculty and UFC shall report on the progress in implementing specific Senate resolutions. All Dean of Faculty and UFC reports shall be posted on the University Faculty website, in addition to their inclusion in the Faculty Senate meeting minutes.
- **Ensure timely response to and implementation of Faculty Senate resolutions:** The Dean of Faculty and the UFC shall adopt processes to ensure timely response to and implementation of Faculty Senate resolutions, including: encouraging Senate committees to seek responses from the Administration or Deans, where appropriate, to proposals prior to submission to the Faculty Senate; establishing timetables, with the Administration, for the Administration's definitive responses, whether positive or negative, to resolutions adopted by the Faculty Senate<sup>1</sup>; and adopting processes to ensure that Faculty Senate resolutions, when accepted by the administration, are implemented within one to two semesters.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>

The University of Chicago provides an example of a governance process that places primary responsibility on the University President for implementing the decisions of the Council of the Senate, which is a university-wide governing body consisting of 51 faculty members. The University President, who acts as chair of the Council meetings, executes or implements the decisions reached by the Council and reports back to the Council.

<sup>2</sup>

Structural changes may require up to two semesters for implementation. Examples include the suspension policy recommended by the AFPS and approved by the Faculty Senate in September 2006, and the Faculty Senate *ad hoc* Committee on the Status of Nontenure-track Faculty recommendations for emeritus status and professional development opportunities for senior level nontenure-track faculty. See Appendix C. Other types of Senate resolutions should, in general, be implemented more quickly. The emeritus status

and professional development opportunities recommended by the Faculty Senate *Ad Hoc* Committee on the

□ **Authority during breaks:** During the summer and winter breaks, when the Faculty Senate does not meet, the UFC shall have executive authority to consult, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, with the Administration and Board of Trustees when necessary to deal with crises or other important issues that arise. In dealing with such matters, the UFC shall attempt, whenever possible, to find interim solutions until such time as the Faculty Senate is able to meet and consider the matters.

□ **Special consultation:** Prior to accepting the resignation or considering the discharge of the President or Provost, the Board of Trustees or the President, respectively, shall consult with the UFC.

□ **Initiate reviews of deans, vice presidents, and vice provosts, based on significant faculty concerns:** The UFC shall adopt a procedure for receiving substantive complaints about the functioning of deans, vice presidents, and vice provosts. In consultation with the Provost, the UFC will decide if the substance and number of complaints is significant enough to merit a formal review.

**2. President's biannual meeting with the faculty and university faculty fora:** The President shall hold a meeting with the faculty, as a whole, at least once each semester to report on the state of the University and answer questions. In addition, the Dean of Faculty shall hold university faculty fora on crucial issues, as they arise. The agendas of these meetings shall be publicized, with a general discussion following the particular agenda items.

### **3. Effectiveness of Faculty Senate committees:**

□ Faculty Senate committees shall review their committee charges to determine if the charge should be amended to provide mechanisms that add weight to committee recommendations to the CU Administration. Committees that seek to change their charge shall bring a resolution to the Faculty Senate.<sup>3</sup> Each Faculty Senate committee shall establish regular meeting times at the start of each academic year.

□ The Administration shall consult regularly with Faculty Senate standing committees on relevant issues of policy. For example, the Faculty Senate Financial Policies Committee (FPC) should have a more consultative role in university budgetary planning. One means to further this goal could be for the chair of the FPC to participate in the Provost's budget committee or to reinstate the practice by Provosts Nesheim and Randel to include faculty members on the Provost's budget committee.<sup>4</sup> Another example is the

Status of Nontenure-Track Faculty have still not been implemented, more than one year after Senate approval. See Appendix C.

<sup>3</sup>

At the December 2005 Faculty Senate meeting, the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status (AFPS) proposed amending its charge to strengthen the weight of its recommendations to the Administration concerning faculty grievances. The UFC referred the AFPS resolution to the FGC. The AFPS should consider re-submitting its resolution to the UFC for debate by the Faculty Senate.

<sup>4</sup>

The current Provost's budget committee is made up only of administrators. Adding faculty participation has its roots in the history of an analogous budget committee under Provosts Nesheim and Randel, which included two faculty members; one appointed by the Faculty Senate and another appointed by the Provost. Executive Committee of the University Diversity Council, which was created in December 2006. A standing appointment of the chair of the Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee would create an ongoing liaison with the Diversity Council.

**4. Faculty participation in presidential searches:** In recognition of the importance of the position of the University President, the appointment of the President shall be carried out in as open a manner as possible, including broad faculty input and consultation in search processes. Faculty shall compose at least one-half of any search committee for the President.<sup>5</sup> These faculty appointments shall be made through a process of nominations by the Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections Committee, subject to approval by the Faculty Senate. The Nominations and Elections Committee shall adopt procedures that ensure its independent role in nominating the slate of faculty search committee members that it presents for the Faculty Senate's approval.

**5. Faculty participation in searches for the Provost:** While recognizing that the President has the prerogative to appoint the Provost, faculty shall participate actively in the search process for Provost, including consultation by the President with the University Faculty Committee and the Nominations and Elections Committee.

**6. Faculty participation in searches for college deans:** The Provost's process for selecting faculty membership on Deans' search committees should be amended to clarify the role of the Nominations and Elections Committee. The Provost's current policy for Deans' searches includes the following provisions: After receiving nominations from the faculty of the particular college, "[t]he Provost submits a list of possible search committee members to the Nominations and Elections committee, the members of which suggest revisions to the list or additional names. The Provost makes final decisions about the membership after determining individuals' willingness or ability to serve."<sup>6</sup> This procedure should be amended in the following ways: The Provost shall consult actively with the Nominations and Elections Committee throughout the process of appointing Deans' search committees. The Nominations and Elections Committee shall have access to the list of faculty who were nominated from the college to serve on the search committee. This information shall include any supporting statements on behalf of the faculty nominees. After receiving the Nominations and Elections Committee's suggested revisions to her/his initial list, the Provost shall submit the final faculty list to the Nominations and Elections Committee for their review prior to inviting faculty to serve on the search

<sup>5</sup>

Examples of faculty representation on presidential search committees at other universities include: University of Wisconsin-Madison (faculty make up a majority of the search committee for Chancellor); University of Chicago (The search committee is made up of the 49 Board of Trustees members, 7 faculty members elected by the faculty, and student representatives. A faculty advisory committee, consisting of one faculty member and one trustee from the search committee, consults extensively with the deans);

California Institute of Technology (In its last three searches for president, a trustee selection committee made an offer to a candidate from a short list generated by an all-faculty search committee.)

<sup>6</sup>

“Policy Statement – Provost Bidy Martin: Deans’ Searches, Reappointments, Mid-term Review,” available at, <http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/announce/ProvostStatement021002.html> committee. If any faculty decline to serve, the Provost shall consult with the Nominations and Elections Committee about the names of additional faculty to add to the list.<sup>7</sup>

**7. Faculty participation in searches for senior-level administrators:** Appointments of senior level administrators shall be carried out in as open a manner as possible, including broad faculty input and consultation in search processes. In searches for the Dean of the Graduate School and Dean of Students, the Administration shall follow the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty (OPUF), which describes the process for Senate nominations of faculty to serve on search committees appointed by the Administration. Section XIII.B of OPUF states: “The central administration will be expected to select about one-half of the faculty membership on each such committee from names presented by the Senate. The Senate will present as many names as are requested, but in no case more than twice the number to be selected.”<sup>8</sup> These faculty nominations shall be made by the Faculty Senate Nominations and Elections Committee, subject to approval by the Faculty Senate.

**8. Reviews of the offices of the President and Provost:** The offices of the President and Provost shall be reviewed periodically, and at least once every five years. The Dean of Faculty and the UFC should be actively involved in scheduling the reviews and developing the review procedures. The Nominations and Elections Committee should be involved in nominating faculty to serve on review committees. Such reviews would provide a systematic faculty evaluation of the offices’ structure and performance and the opportunity for recommended improvements.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup>

The recommended changes in recommendation #6 do not strictly follow the Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, described in recommendation #7. The FGC interviewed current and past chairs of the Nominations and Elections Committee, current and past Deans of Faculty, and the Provost about the process of appointing faculty to dean search committees. The changes recommended here are based on the view that the current process is generally adequate, but could be improved by enhancing the Nominations and Elections Committee’s participation and access to information.

<sup>8</sup>

<http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/gov/OPUF.html>

<sup>9</sup>

An example of procedures for periodic reviews of central administration offices is found in the University of Iowa policies. See University of Iowa Operations Manual, Chapter 28.4, available at, <http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/ii/28.htm#284>