

December 19, 2006

Proposal of Shared Governance Task Force

This is the final proposal of the Shared Governance Task Force. If adopted, it will establish the permanent structure of shared governance at the University of Detroit Mercy and will serve as the ultimate governing authority for shared governance at the university.

The proposal of the Shared Governance Task Force (“Task Force”) is the result of many hours of discussion among different constituencies of the University. The Task Force began its deliberations over two years ago with a draft decision-making matrix which had been proposed by an earlier configuration of this task force and with an extensive set of forums at which all members of the university were invited to express their views and share their ideas. Members of the university community who were not available to attend these forums were invited to submit comments through e-mail, and the Task Force invited e-mail suggestions from all members of the university community throughout the 2004/05 academic year. Following the forums, the members of the Task Force engaged in an intensive series of discussions which frequently involved weekly meetings, some lasting four or five hours each. In fact, through December, January and February, the members of the Task Force participated in a series of mini-retreats lasting on occasion for half a day at which a wide range of issues were discussed and considered.

In March 2005, the Task Force released an initial proposal and held a series of forums to gather reactions to that initial proposal. The Task Force reviewed the comments that were offered both at the forums and through e-mail. Additional meetings were held in March and April with various university constituencies at which further input was received. Throughout the process, input was sought from multiple parties, and a wide range of university constituencies were present through their representatives on the Task Force. This resulted in a pilot proposal which included changes made by the Task Force to reflect various recommendations emerging from those meetings. The pilot proposal was offered by the Task Force in April, 2005 for approval by all affected constituencies in May, 2005.

The pilot proposal was adopted by the following constituencies: The School of Law adopted it unanimously; the Dental School adopted it unanimously; and the McNichols faculty adopted it by a vote of 110 to 12. It was also approved by the administrative heads of the law, dental, and McNichols constituencies, as well as by the President and the Board of Trustees. Accordingly, it entered into effect as of May 15, 2005.

Since that time, the university has been operating under the pilot proposal. Consistent with that proposal, a wide range of new institutional entities were created, including university-wide teams, the McNichols Faculty Assembly (“MFA”), and committees under the MFA. The pilot period was intended to take each of the new institutional entities for a “test-drive” to ascertain whether there was enough “give in the joints” for the framework to work in real life and to discover whether there were any modifications in the structure that should be made prior to its permanent adoption. During this phase,

the Task Force undertook an assessment of the functioning of the framework through surveys as well as discussions with various participants, and the Task Force also oversaw the preparation of the key organizational documents of the MFA and the teams. (The organization of those committees with sole reporting authority to the MFA was left to the MFA to oversee.) While the Task Force has completed its review of the organizational documents for all the Teams, there are still some amendments to the MFA Constitution and Bylaws that remain to be enacted before they receive final Task Force approval. Upon final approval by the Task Force, the MFA Constitution and Bylaws will enter into effect.

During the pilot proposal period a formal communications process was established to try to keep members of the UDM community posted regarding the activities of each of the teams and committees. In addition, there was significant informal communication between the MFA and its leadership and the Academic Vice President/Provost (“AVP”).

As a result of the Task Force’s assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the shared governance framework during the pilot period, the Task Force has proposed a series of modifications to the temporary structure adopted in 2005. Those modifications are included in the text of this proposal which serves as the final proposal of the Task Force.

As such, this proposal serves as both the matrix narrative and the governance structure in fulfillment of the Task Force’s charge under Letter of Agreement #13 of the current UDM/UDMPU contract.

While there has certainly not been unanimity of agreement on all issues discussed by the Task Force, throughout the process the deliberations have occurred within the context of respectful exchange of views, underscored by a shared commitment among all to the university and its mission. No member of the Task Force believes that the proposed structure set forth in this report is perfect; every member of the Task Force agrees that it reflects an important step forward for the university.

The Forums

The Task Force was guided in its deliberations by a set of underlying principles and ideas, some of which were expressed at the forums mentioned above and others of which emerged through discussions among Task Force members. Several points that emerged from the forums in the 2004/05 academic year guided the development of the pilot proposal and continue to serve as the foundation for this final proposal:

1. There is a wide range of differing views across the university regarding the extent to which a shared governance structure for the university is either necessary or desirable. While certain participants at the forums spoke strongly in support of the university’s moving toward implementation of a shared governance structure, others expressed serious concerns about such a development. In particular, there was substantial opposition expressed by the professional schools to any structure that would tamper with or impinge upon in any way the arrangements already existing within those schools.

2. There has also been a wide range of differing views across the university regarding what a shared governance structure should look like or hope to achieve. Some participants in the forums expressed the hope that a new shared governance structure would dramatically change the way the university currently functions. Others offered suggestions for what would be essentially incremental changes. In addition, participants differed widely in terms of the role that shared governance could play. For some, the notion of shared governance offered a panacea for all the ills besetting the university; for others, shared governance was seen as more a part of the problem than a part of the solution. It is clear to members of the Task Force that different constituencies have very different goals and hopes for shared governance.
3. The level of involvement suggested for different constituencies in shared governance also differed dramatically. Some asserted that any shared governance structure should encompass the entire UDM community including faculty, administrators, staff, students, alums, etc. Others proposed a shared governance arrangement that focused more on enhancing faculty involvement in university governance. Even those who agreed on the groups that should be included in shared governance often disagreed on the extent of involvement of those groups. For example, some faculty argued for extensive faculty involvement while other faculty expressed concern over the demands that any shared governance structure would impose on their already busy schedules.
4. Despite the disparities in perspective mentioned above, there was general agreement on several key items:
 - a. There was a general consensus that the level of communication at the university and among university constituencies needed improvement. This applies to communication in all directions, whether moving up, down, or across the different components of the university structure.
 - b. Many participants expressed the hope that shared governance would lead to more effective decision-making at the university. While participants and commentators differed regarding the causes of current weaknesses, there was agreement that the university as a whole has not taken maximum advantage of the wealth of expertise and ideas generated by community members who are not directly in the line of decision-making authority.
 - c. Many parts of the university also expressed a desire for a structure that would enhance the level of interdisciplinary interaction among faculty and that would encourage intellectual exchanges that cut across organizational lines.

The Overall Context of Shared Governance

While it is never easy to devise a shared governance structure for a university, the task before us is perhaps even more daunting than is customary. This is so because it is no secret that the university faces a series of immediate challenges (increasing enrollment being the prototypical example) that need to be addressed in very short order and in rather dramatic fashion. Other challenges, from the deterioration of the physical plant to continuing financial and budgetary constraints, have been frequently noted at the highest levels of the university administration. This situation poses a particular challenge in creating a shared governance structure. This is so because on the one hand, the shape of an enduring structure should not be unduly influenced by the problems of any particular moment. On the other hand, the challenges faced by the university are of sufficient severity and magnitude that any shared governance structure that ignores the need to help address them has little chance of success. The Task Force has made an effort to balance both the longer-term structural issues together with a recognition of the challenges that all the constituencies of the university need to face immediately.

The specific challenges faced by the university together with the particular needs and concerns expressed at the forums led the Task Force to conclude that we needed to devise a shared governance structure specifically tailored to the particularities of UDM. Thus, we did not feel that we could use the shared governance structure at any other university as a template. Similarly, we tried to push ourselves to “think-outside-the-box” as any typical university-wide shared governance structure that merely succeeded in adding a level of bureaucracy and slowing down the decision-making process would represent a step backwards rather than progress. In short, the Task Force recognizes that the university faces a critical moment in its history, and the shared governance process needs to help the university surmount its current challenges in an expeditious manner.

Having written this, it must be recognized that shared governance alone will not solve the critical current challenges faced by the university. Our goal is for shared governance to be a part of the solution.

Underlying Principles

Given the above realities, the Task Force enumerated a set of principles upon which to base the proposed shared governance structure. While the Task Force does not believe that it has achieved all of these principles perfectly (in fact, some of them are in tension with each other), we hope that we have at least captured some of their essentials and reflected them in the shared governance structure described in more detail below. These core principles are described briefly:

1. Thinking outside the box - As noted above, we have tried to create a structure that addresses the most pressing concerns faced by UDM, and as will become clear in the details described later in this document, we have created very

much of a hybrid structure. We hope that what is lost in uniformity will be more than compensated for in effectiveness.

2. Common commitment to teaching and learning - University constituencies frequently speak in terms of mission, and the entire Task Force embraces the special mission which lies at the heart of UDM. At the same time, we feel a need to make explicit a point which is often left unsaid in terms of mission, and that is at its core, everyone at the university shares a common mission related to both teaching and learning. The creation of a shared governance structure provides a tremendous opportunity to identify and bring to life new approaches that can further that common mission.
3. A new more stimulating environment as part of a new culture - Related to our common commitment to teaching and learning is our desire for a more stimulating intellectual environment at the university. The entire university community should be part of a common culture that “crackles” with intellectual excitement and exploration. Our required focus on immediate needs and challenges should not obscure the broader need for what would indeed be a significant cultural change at the university. This cultural change goes beyond the desire for greater intellectual stimulation to also encompass more sharing of information, as well as a recognition by all relevant players that honest disagreements can - and will - occur among people acting in good faith. We recognize that there is no structure which can single-handedly shape a culture - indeed the causation often runs the other way. The members of the Task Force hope, however, that the shared governance process can serve as a building block in introducing a new culture of participation.
4. Mission as a Catholic urban university - All university constituencies agree that we also share a common mission as a Catholic urban university. While as a university we have done much to make us proud in fulfilling this mission, the shared governance process needs to incorporate this essential element in its very structure. As will be described in more detail below, this led the Task Force to contemplate some ways to move forward rather dramatically in furthering this mission. We do not believe for one moment that we have a monopoly on ideas for furthering the mission, but we do want the shared governance structure from its inception to reflect that mission in its very framework.
5. Autonomy/don't fix what ain't broke - A key principle behind our proposal is recognition that different parts of the university need to have substantial freedom and autonomy. There is no purpose in uniformity or centralization for its own sake. This principle came into play most obviously with regard to the treatment of the law and dental schools. Both schools already have their own well-functioning shared governance processes; and no constituency at either school expressed any desire for change. Especially given the enormity of the challenges facing the university, there is no rationale, and it would be counterproductive, to meddle with processes that are working well. The Task

Force also recognizes that various undergraduate and graduate entities also have their own internal processes, and no effort is made to change those. Rather, what we have done is to identify the areas in which we need to come together on a more comprehensive university level to address problems and challenges that cut across individual organizational lines.

6. Communication is key - As noted above, there was general agreement that serious improvements are needed in the transmission of information among constituencies at the university. We recognize the steps that have been made recently by the university administration to improve the sharing of information, and we intend for the shared governance structure to expand on that foundation. At the same time, we recognize that an important part of that improved communication must be a level of transparency and availability of information sufficient for each part of the shared governance structure to be able to do its job.
7. Encouragement of entrepreneurship - Both good practice and the current challenges facing the university require a level of entrepreneurship that has been lacking. Many constituencies feel that there is no way for them to either suggest or develop entrepreneurial ideas that could both enhance enrollment and promote educational excellence. There needs to be a mechanism by which new ideas can be developed, vetted, and either adopted or rejected expeditiously. While this proposal does not mandate a detailed mechanism for doing so, it is implicit in the work of a number of entities, including the MFA itself and the Strategic Planning team. It is also expected that the developing relationship between the MFA and the AVP will provide the basis for more expeditious vetting of issues “bubbling up” from the faculty.
8. Assessment and accountability - Hand in hand with the encouragement of entrepreneurship needs to go a commitment to continuous assessment and enhanced accountability. There need to be measures to determine successes and failures, with the opportunity to rectify weaknesses and the wisdom to abandon approaches that are not working. In order for assessment to have teeth, there need to be ways to hold accountable for poor performance those who have or share decision-making authority.
9. Rights and responsibilities - As will become clear below, involvement in a shared governance structure is more than the recognition of rights, it also involves the imposing of responsibility. In order for shared governance to work, there needs to be a general recognition of this duality. Without the commitment of time and energy needed from every member of the university community, this or any other shared governance structure will fail.
10. Taking advantage of expertise - Related to the notion of rights and responsibilities is the recognition that there are many people with different areas of expertise throughout the university. As an institution, especially one facing the challenges currently confronting us, we need to take greater

advantage of the breadth of expertise available. We want to achieve an environment in which we can get “all pistons firing” as we move forward as a university.

11. Involvement of all elements of the community - While much of the discussion below focuses on the sharing of governance with and among faculty and administrators, it is important to recognize that staff, students, alums and others have important roles to play in governance as well. In fact, the proposed membership of many of the entities proposed below reflects this commitment.

In addition to the principles outlined above, the Task Force was guided by the agreements that have already been entered into between the university and the UDMPU, (including the agreement to extend the deadline for the vote on this final proposal until January 2007). In particular, Letter of Agreement 13 (attached as Appendix A) outlines a vision of shared governance which guided and shaped the Task Force’s approach. Finally, the very compact time frame within which the Task Force was required to make a broad range of important decisions reflected the common desire to implement a workable shared governance structure prior to the upcoming North Central accreditation review in 2007.

General Conceptual Structure

The Task Force has endeavored to create a structure that reflects the principles enumerated above. We have devised a set of university-wide teams to address issues where the entire university community needs to be included; a McNichols Faculty Assembly (MFA) to address issues that cut across the individual McNichols units; and McNichols committees to address specific identified cross-cutting McNichols concerns. These are described in more detail in the narrative below, but the framework within which they operate is based on the following:

First, based on the concerns regarding autonomy and not fixing things that aren’t broken, the existing law and dental school governance processes would continue as they currently exist. In order to provide greater faculty involvement in the fundamental academic decisions that cut across the undergraduate and graduate entities, a new shared governance process would be established that would include a set of committees (described more below) and a broader MFA. While the narrative below identifies in more detail those areas of MFA responsibility, in general, the more a fundamental academic issue cuts across different college/school or organizational lines (and, therefore, is not amenable to resolution within a particular entity), the more likely that it would be appropriately referred to consideration by the MFA. For purposes of this document, McNichols faculty includes full-time faculty in the schools and colleges on the McNichols campus as well as librarians reporting to the Dean of Libraries.

The MFA would serve as a representative body of the McNichols faculty in shared governance. As stated in the “Joint Policy Statement on a Faculty Rights and

Responsibilities Framework” adopted by the university’s Board of Trustees and the UDMPU “The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status (everything except hiring and firing decisions), promotion and tenure process, and academic/program standards, and with shared responsibility for supporting those procedures for admission of students and other aspects of university life that relate to the educational process.” It is through the MFA that the McNichols faculty will exercise its primary responsibility for these academic matters through its own deliberations and those of its committees.

MFA determinations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility would be communicated to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (AVP) (or, in certain instances indicated below, another Vice President) for consideration. If the AVP decides to take a course of action different from that recommended by the MFA or one of its committees, the AVP would be required first to make herself available to explain the reason for the contrary decision to the MFA or its appropriate committee, providing an opportunity for discussion so that the MFA or such committee could raise additional issues that the AVP may not have considered. As shared governance matures and there is meaningful consultation throughout the process, such instances are expected to become the exception rather than the norm.

In addition, the MFA would also make recommendations to the AVP and the President regarding academic issues of concern to the McNichols faculty as a whole, including issues related to the protection of academic freedom as well as major reorganizations that cut across multiple schools or colleges on the McNichols campus. The MFA would also have the authority to review proposals associated with the units that are represented in the MFA for new degree programs or new majors or new minors (or for revisions to degree programs, majors or minors that are so substantial that the AVP and MFA conclude jointly such review is required) with the MFA recommendation to the AVP to be made according to a stringent timeline that requires expeditious review. While the MFA would be required to have the committees described below, it would also be able to establish additional committees or task forces of McNichols faculty members to advise the MFA on various issues or to develop ideas for the MFA. While the Tenure and Promotion Committee would not report to the MFA, the MFA would have the authority to explore and make recommendations regarding broader academic issues regarding tenure, such as common baseline criteria, investigation of tenure and promotion systems at other universities, etc. The MFA would also participate in a 360-degree evaluation system to be overseen by the Task Force in conjunction with the university administration for review of non-academic programs.

Second, as indicated above, a series of McNichols faculty committees will be created to address important crosscutting undergraduate and graduate academic concerns. As a general matter, these committees will report to the broader MFA regarding their deliberations. They will also be able to make recommendations directly to administrators where appropriate.

Third, a series of university-wide teams would be created to provide meaningful input and advice into administrative decisions (such as strategic planning, budgeting, etc.) as they impact university-wide academic concerns. In order to take advantage of the expertise available, these teams will include representation from all the university's campuses. These teams would also provide a mechanism for the sharing of information in these areas with the university community as a whole. This structure will encourage the sharing of information in manifold directions without hampering the need to make important decisions in an expeditious fashion. While university administrators may receive a wide range of formal and informal advice from these teams, if an administrator acts contrary to a formal recommendation of a team, the administrator will make him/herself available to explain to the team the reason for the contrary action.

In certain circumstances, some of these teams will also be responsible for actual implementation as well as involvement in policymaking. For example, a team would focus on identifying and implementing dramatic improvements in the university's role as a leading urban institution with a commitment to social justice.

Fourth, on occasion, task forces would be created to help the university address specific pressing problems. The initial such task force would focus on development of an undergraduate core curriculum.

In summary, teams operate on a university-wide level; committees operate on the McNichols campus; and task forces deal with short-term specific issues.

In structuring these governance bodies, we have operated under the principle that the representatives of different faculties will be determined through elections among the affected faculty members. Similarly, students will vote for student representatives. It should be noted that, except where otherwise stated, each group is free to elect as representatives any one that group chooses, whether the representative be a member of that group or not. It should also be noted that the structure of each body is based on the current university structure. We recognize that all universities occasionally add or subtract pieces as they grow and develop. The Shared Governance Task Force will be responsible on an ongoing basis for making changes in teams and committee memberships that might need to be made to conform with changes in the university's organizational structure over time.

Narrative

A description of each of the bodies proposed to be established as part of the new shared governance process follows. As a general matter, under the shared governance structure, initial terms for elected members will be either one or two years so as to create staggered terms. Elected representatives on any body will be limited to two consecutive terms, except as noted below.

University-wide Teams

1. Mission/Urban/Social Justice Team – Central to all of the above is the university’s broader mission as an urban Catholic university with a passion for service and social justice. Shared governance needs to include a mechanism for faculty to participate actively in developing and implementing that commitment in an interdisciplinary fashion. And to fulfill our potential as a mission-driven university, we need a dedicated team of faculty, administrators, staff, students, and alums who work together to foster our Jesuit and Mercy traditions. This team would develop ongoing education and promotion of mission fulfillment; they would coordinate awards to recognize those who foster the mission; and they would constantly seek out ideas from other similarly situated universities to promote even further the development of mission at UDM. In addition, this team would explore, advocate for, and implement interdisciplinary efforts to nurture and expand the university’s role in service and social justice in an urban context. This could include items such as coordinating a faculty effort to publish an interdisciplinary journal regarding urban issues; establishment of a student-run non-profit that would give our students hands-on experience managing a non-profit that serves the community; development of opportunities for university-supported community projects, volunteer opportunities, and the like. These are just examples of things for the team to think about. We have every confidence that it will develop a far more exciting and innovative plan – and, once approved by the appropriate authorities, then coordinate its implementation. This team will report to the AVP and through that office to other bodies as appropriate. Membership on this team would include one Law School representative; one Dental School representative; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; two elected representatives of the McNichols faculty; three administrative representatives (at least two of which should be representative of two of the following: the University Ministry, the Office of Mission and Identity, and the Leadership Development Institute), one staff representative, one alum, and two students.
2. Strategic Planning Team – There would be significant value from a strategic planning team that enables different university constituencies to gather ideas to be shared with key administrators, and to think through different strategic options. This group would be available for consultation with the administrative leadership of the university, especially regarding strategic planning necessary to address academic issues. When the university next undertakes a formal strategic planning process, this team would function as a university-wide strategic planning team to provide input into a SWOT analysis of the university, provide input into long range planning processes, and suggest ideas for how college/school or unit strategic plans could be more consistent with those of the university. The team would also be available to provide input into strategic issues such as adjustments to become more competitive in the marketplace and more flexible in delivering instruction. During the time period that a strategic planning process is not underway, this group would assess trends at other schools and suggest innovations that could be introduced at UDM. This team would also participate

- in meetings with the administrative leadership of the university at which major strategic issues facing the university would be discussed. This team will report to the President of the University (or designee). Membership in this team will include one representative of the Law School; one representative of the Dental School; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; one elected representative of the McNichols faculty; four administrative representatives, one staff member; one alum; and one student. While the other bodies created under this shared governance structure will have initial terms of either one or two years (so as to create staggered terms), the initial terms for this team will be either two or three years (with future terms expiring at two year intervals thereafter).
3. **Budget Team** - The budget team will provide advice to the President regarding budget priorities and concerns as they relate to core academic issues. Members will also work with university constituencies to seek out and develop potential revenue-raising opportunities. As part of the annual budget process, this group would be expected to serve in an advisory capacity as needed for the President regarding issues such as budgeting assumptions, capital spending plans, and tuition and fee increases. This group is not intended to advocate regarding the amount of funds for individual units, but rather to provide expertise and input on broader budgetary issues that impact core academic concerns. Membership in this team would include one Law School representative; one Dental School representative; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; one elected representative of the McNichols faculty; and five administrative representatives.
 4. **Information Technology Team** - This team will provide recommendations to the AVP and the Vice President for Business and Finance (and through him to the information technology staff of the university) about planning for academic technology needs; technology needs regarding the possible development of online courses/programs and courseware; recommendations regarding software; web standards; planning for IT infrastructure, and strategic IT planning for the university. The activities of the existing Knowledge Support Group and the Web Supervisory Committee would be assumed by this team. The membership will be comprised of one Law School representative; one Dental School representative; one library representative; one IDS representative; two students; two administrative or staff representatives; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; and two elected representatives of the McNichols faculty. Two representatives of the university IT staff will be ex officio members of the team..
 5. **Facilities Planning, Standards, and Safety Team** - Given the challenges facing the university in these areas, a process for greater input by affected constituencies is needed. This team will make recommendations to the Vice President for Business and Finance regarding: ways to prioritize among needed renovation/repairs as well as new projects; compliance with ADA in facilities; ideas for improving campus aesthetics; ideas for improving campus safety and OSHA compliance;

and development of the university's emergency response plan. The team would have particular responsibility for advising the Vice President for Business and Finance regarding the academic implications and concerns stemming from various facilities plans. This team will assume the responsibilities of the existing Emergency Response Planning Committee and will work to integrate its activities with the existing Facilities Planning and Standards Committee. This team will be comprised of four administrative or staff representatives; one Law School representative; one Dental School representative; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; one elected representative of the McNichols faculty; and two students.

6. Faculty Development Team - In order to create the exciting intellectual environment in which we all want to work, there is clearly a need for greater faculty involvement and participation in learning together. Accordingly, a special university-wide team involving faculty from all parts of the university would be created to coordinate and oversee a wide range of initiatives. This team would have responsibility for coordinating a broad range of interdisciplinary discussions among faculty at all the schools. Regarding orientation and mentoring of new faculty, this team would share best practices among the schools and, if any school fails to establish processes for orientation and mentoring, this team would establish and coordinate as needed such processes. This team will also be responsible for the development and designation of faculty awards as well as making recommendations to the appropriate administrators regarding, and where appropriate, implementing steps that can be taken to further faculty professional development. It should be noted that the fact that a university-wide faculty development team exists does not mean that individual schools or disciplines would not continue to enjoy the autonomy to develop programs more tailored to the needs of their particular units. This team, which will replace the existing Faculty Development Committee and the Faculty Excellence Committee, will report to the AVP and through that office to other bodies as appropriate. Membership on this team would include one representative of the Dental School faculty; one representative of the Law School faculty; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; four elected representatives of the McNichols faculty; and two administrative representatives.
7. Staff/Administrator Development Team – In order to create an exciting learning environment for staff and administrators who continually work with the students and faculty as well as to provide for the administrative functions of the university, opportunities for professional development must also be provided. This team would make recommendations to the Department of Human Resources regarding orientation for new employees; make proposals regarding professional development opportunities for staff; and develop training programs for employees. This team would also have responsibility for the development and designation of a staff award. This team will report to the Associate Vice President for Human Resources for the university; its membership will include three staff and four administrative representatives.

8. Assessment Team - The university needs to insure that assessment is occurring throughout its academic programs. Accordingly, a university-wide team will be established with membership from units across the university. This team will replace the current Educational Outcomes Assessment Committee. This team will share best practices around the university regarding assessment, review the assessment methodologies being used by each school, and will identify those schools in which assessment activities require improvement. The Assessment Team reports to the AVP, and its membership will be comprised of one representative of the Law School; one representative of the Dental School; one representative from each of the colleges/schools (selected by the college/school); one representative from the library; one faculty member selected by the MFA from its members; and two administrative representatives.

McNichols Faculty Assembly

The McNichols faculty need an organized structure through which members can exercise meaningful decision-making responsibility on fundamental academic issues, develop innovative faculty ideas, and engage in discussion regarding areas of common concern. The MFA will be comprised of elected representatives from the relevant schools/colleges/library. Each of the six units (School of Architecture, College of Business Administration, College of Engineering and Science, College of Health Professions and McAuley School of Nursing, College of Liberal Arts and Education, and Library) will have at least two representatives; in addition, those units with more than 20 full-time faculty will receive one additional representative for every additional 10 such faculty or part thereof. For example, a school with 1-20 full-time faculty would receive two elected representatives; a school with 21-30 full-time faculty would receive three elected representatives; a school with 31-40 full-time faculty would receive four elected representatives, etc. Given the current sizes of the existing units, there will initially be approximately 27 members of the MFA. All representatives would be elected by votes of the full-time faculty within their respective school/college/library. For these purposes, full-time faculty include faculty on phased retirement who are considered full-time. In addition, there would be two additional Adjunct Faculty representatives who would be elected by the McNichols adjunct faculty. In order to be eligible to vote or serve in this capacity, the individual must have served as an adjunct for four or more terms over the last five years.

While the MFA will be responsible for proposing its own internal organizational structure, it is anticipated that the MFA would select from among its members five officers: President, Vice President, Secretary, Parliamentarian, and Communications Officer. The officers will function collectively as an Executive Committee and a liaison on behalf of the MFA to the university administration.

In order to assure communication among teams and committees, elected MFA representatives (except the five officers) will also serve as a faculty representative on either a committee or a team (as indicated in the membership discussion regarding each such group). The MFA will be responsible for coordinating the election of McNichols

faculty members to fill other McNichols faculty seats on the teams and committees. Given its unique circumstances, members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will continue to be separately elected by the McNichols faculty within their respective schools/colleges/library.

Stringent timelines will be established both for committee and MFA processes and actions.

Determinations by the MFA in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility would be communicated to the AVP (or, in certain instances indicated below, another Vice-President) for consideration. If the AVP decides to take a course of action different from that recommended by the MFA or one of its committees, the AVP would be required first to make herself available to explain the reason for the contrary decision to the MFA or its appropriate committee, providing an opportunity for discussion so that the MFA or such committee could raise additional issues that the AVP may not have considered. As shared governance matures and there is meaningful consultation throughout the process, such instances are expected to become the exception rather than the norm. For purposes of this paragraph, amendments to the MFA constitution or its by-laws are considered to be determinations by the MFA in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility.

McNichols Committees

1. Core Curriculum Committee – Once the Core Curriculum Task Force (described in more detail below) has completed its work and an undergraduate core curriculum is in place, this committee will be formed. Since it is unclear at this point what that core curriculum will look like, it is not possible at this time to determine the appropriate structure for this Committee. At the appropriate time, the number and composition of faculty members on this team will be determined by the MFA. Its members will be elected by the McNichols faculty; the AVP will appoint administrative representatives. It will have the responsibilities described in more detail under the discussion regarding the Core Curriculum Task Force, and will report to the MFA and, through the MFA to the AVP.
2. Tenure and Promotion - The tenure and promotion process as it currently exists for McNichols faculty (including research leaves) would be essentially retained. The committee would also be charged with considering self-evaluation and other processes to enhance faculty performance in future years. The Dental School and Law School tenure and promotion processes would continue to operate as currently structured.
3. Undergraduate Standards Committee - The basic academic standards for the undergraduate programs need to reflect the wisdom and judgment of the faculty exercising their primary academic responsibility. Accordingly, an undergraduate standards committee would be created to make determinations regarding

- minimum cross-cutting admissions-related standards; undergraduate grading policy; minimum graduation requirements; and the determination of standards that apply for study abroad and the transfer of credits. The committee would also be tasked with developing a set of guidelines/checklist of standards that need to be met by non-accredited undergraduate certificate programs. The committee would report to the MFA, and the MFA determinations would be communicated to the AVP and, with regard to any change to minimum admissions standards, to the Vice President for University Advancement and Enrollment Management as well. Membership on this committee would include two administrative non-voting representatives designated by the AVP; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; and four elected representatives of the McNichols faculty.
4. Undergraduate Retention Committee - In order to enable the university to address the serious challenges of undergraduate student retention, a committee would be established to make recommendations to the appropriate administrators regarding, among other items, student life issues, ways to improve student-faculty interaction, and ways to more effectively welcome students to the McNichols campus. This committee would also be able to make recommendations to the MFA on issues of common concern. This committee should consider whether to propose for consideration by both the MFA and the AVP a restructuring of academic advising procedures. This Committee and the Graduate Standards and Retention Committee will replace the current Retention Committee. Membership of this committee would be three administrative and one staff representatives designated by the AVP; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; four elected representatives of the McNichols faculty; one librarian representative, and two students.
 5. Graduate Standards and Retention Committee - In order to address the specific academic concerns of graduate programs, a separate committee would be established. This committee would have essentially the same responsibilities as it relates to graduate programs as the Undergraduate Standards Committee and the Undergraduate Retention Committee. The committee would also be responsible for providing recommendations regarding common recruitment efforts. This committee would be comprised of two administrative non-voting representatives designated by the AVP; one faculty member selected by the MFA from among its members; and four elected representatives of the McNichols faculty. All five of the MFA and McNichols faculty representatives must be from departments with graduate programs. This committee reports to the MFA and through the MFA to the AVP.
 6. Program Review Committees - The university needs a more coordinated and broadly participatory system for reviewing academic programs. This presents particular challenges for several reasons. First, there exists a wide range of academic programs, each of which is already subject to different types of review. The most obvious distinction in this regard is between those academic programs that are reviewed as part of an outside accreditation process and those that are not.

Second, the review of academic programs encompasses a series of criteria, not all of which are academic. For example, academic programs need to be reviewed not only in terms of quality (clearly a fundamental academic matter), but also in terms of cost, marketability, and mission. Third, while it is desirable to review academic programs on a regularized basis, given the financial challenges faced by the university, there is also a need to establish a system in which programs facing special challenges can be identified, reviewed, assessed, and decisions made regarding steps to address current weaknesses, or, alternatively, a decision to close the program. Finally, it needs to be remembered that program review is an extremely time- and labor-intensive process, for the reviewers and administrators, as well as for everyone involved within the program being reviewed. These provide daunting challenges given staffing and other constraints. Accordingly, the Task Force proposes the following system:

All academic programs will be reviewed internally within the university on a five to seven year cycle. The initial cycle for review and subsequent changes to the cycle for review will be determined jointly by the AVP and the relevant program review committee. For programs subject to outside accreditation review, the cycle will be established to coincide with the accreditation cycle already in place.

In addition to the regular cycle, the AVP will be able to identify programs (after consultation with either the Strategic Planning Team or the Budget Team) that face special challenges and therefore should receive an out-of-cycle review during the year. In identifying these programs, the AVP will, in consultation with the MFA, make clear the reasons why such an out-of-cycle review is necessary, e.g., persistent declining enrollment, rising expenses, sudden personnel changes, unusual emergency occurrences, significant trends in the discipline that raise serious questions about the program, significant changes in underlying factors related to the program's feasibility or marketability, new market opportunities that require expeditious changes, etc. Such an out-of-cycle review may require an expeditious timeline.

It should be noted that the goal of academic program review is not to establish added bureaucracy or work for programs that are functioning well. If a program is subject to a stringent outside accreditation review, the process should be essentially painless, with a review of the documents prepared for accreditation aided by a cover letter by the Dean addressing mission or other items not considered as part of the accreditation process. Of course, even a finding of strong academic quality does not prejudice issues of mission, cost, marketability, and continued feasibility of the program.

- a. Undergraduate Program Review Committee - Undergraduate academic programs will be reviewed as follows: an Undergraduate Program Review Committee will be established with the following membership: one librarian, one faculty member elected by each of the five colleges/schools with undergraduate degrees, and one faculty member selected by the MFA

from among its members. This committee will have access to a wide range of information regarding the program, its academics, marketability, relationship to mission, costs, etc. This committee will be required to make judgments regarding the academic quality of the program, and may also make judgments regarding other aspects of the program. It should be noted that in cases in which a program has already been subject to a stringent outside accreditation process, the academic quality portion of the review will rely largely on the materials prepared through that process, and great weight will be given to the conclusions of that process. The AVP and the committee will, in consultation with the Dean, jointly decide if an outside accreditation process meets the necessary standard of stringency. The committee will issue a report determining whether the program meets university standards together with suggestions for improvements where necessary. The report will be shared with the Dean, the program and with the MFA. The report will be deemed automatically approved by the MFA (and, thereby, forwarded to the AVP) unless it is sent back to the committee within 60 calendar days of its issuance by a 2/3 vote of the members of the MFA.

The AVP may also request advice on any program under review from other sources, including, for example, the Strategic Planning Team, the Budget Team, and the Mission/Urban/Social Justice Team. Each program will also have an opportunity to respond to the AVP regarding conclusions or recommendations made by various teams regarding that program. Should the AVP be inclined to make a decision contrary to the determination of the MFA the AVP will make herself available to meet with the MFA or its representatives to share with them the basis for a different decision. The AVP will issue a final decision regarding the program's academic quality, as well as a final decision (in consultation with the President of the University) regarding the program's feasibility, cost, marketability, and commitment to mission.

- b. Graduate Program Review Committee - Reviews for graduate programs will proceed as follows: Graduate academic programs will be reviewed by a Graduate Program Review Committee which will be established with the following membership: one librarian, one faculty member elected by each of the five colleges/schools with graduate degrees, and one faculty member selected from among its members by the MFA. The remainder of the process will be essentially the same as for undergraduate program review, with recommendations going to the MFA and then to the AVP.

While the Undergraduate and the Graduate Program Review Committees are entities distinct from each other, in order to insure both efficiency and consistency, they should operate in joint session when considering proposals and reviews of programs that are both undergraduate and graduate.

While they are not part of the McNichols Program Review process, it should be noted that dental and law programs will be reviewed by a committee of their respective faculty (as part of their own internal preparation processes for outside accreditation) which will make recommendations for approval by their respective faculty as a whole (rather than the MFA). A conclusion by either the Dental or the Law faculty that a program meets or fails to meet the required university standard for academic quality will be treated as having similar authority as a recommendation for or against an individual's tenure by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Conclusions regarding non-academic issues, such as cost, mission, marketability and feasibility will be considered advisory. With regard to these programs, the AVP will be able to request recommendations regarding cost, marketability, feasibility, and mission from other university-wide teams.

Adjunct Committee – In recognition of the important role that adjuncts play in the educational process, it is appropriate to establish a forum for adjunct faculty to participate in shared governance and to raise issues of concern to adjuncts. This committee, which will report to the MFA, will be comprised of one adjunct member of the MFA selected by the MFA and four adjunct faculty elected by the McNichols adjunct faculty. Only adjunct faculty who have taught at least four academic terms over the past five years will be eligible to be elected to either this committee or the MFA as a whole.

Core Curriculum Task Force

Core Curriculum Task Force (“CCTF”) - The development of a coherent core curriculum for the undergraduate programs is clearly overdue. Under the shared governance structure, a CCTF of thirteen members would be elected by the undergraduate faculty and charged with (a) exploring best practices in terms of the structuring of core curricula at other comparable institutions, and (b) developing, in conjunction with the AVP, a core undergraduate curriculum for UDM. This CCTF would include faculty representation from each of the following units: one representative each from education, library, business, architecture, engineering, health professions/nursing, dental hygiene, math, and science, and four from liberal arts. Each unit would be responsible for nominating at least two times the number of candidates to fill its slots; and the entire McNichols faculty would vote among those nominated representatives. It would also include two non-voting administrative representatives (designated by the AVP). The CCTF would report on its deliberations to the MFA and would, by majority vote of its members, make a specific recommendation to the MFA. As an initial matter, the core curriculum would be adopted by a majority of the MFA and the AVP. If the MFA cannot garner majority support for a proposal, the AVP can propose a modified structure for adoption by a majority of the entire McNichols faculty. Following the adoption of a new core curriculum, this CCTF would be replaced by a Core Curriculum Committee, with elected McNichols faculty representatives and with non-voting administrative representatives appointed by the AVP. This new committee would be responsible together with the AVP for continuing oversight and assessment of the core curriculum, tracking of developments in core curricula in other educational institutions, consideration and proposing of any

amendments to the core curriculum, as well as recommending when a new core curriculum development process might be needed.

Further Details

While the above outlines the general shared governance structure, several additional organizational items must be understood:

1. The Shared Governance Task Force will serve as a steering committee to oversee the operations of shared governance on an ongoing basis. As such, the Task Force bears the ultimate responsibility for overseeing implementation of the shared governance framework. In addition to the responsibilities inherent in the task force's role as steering committee, among the task force's responsibilities are the following: coordinating a continuing assessment process among the different entities of shared governance; insuring that the shared governance structure operates in a manner consistent with this proposal; serving as an "umpire" regarding the structural relationships and the distribution of authority outlined in this proposal; and serving as an "umpire" regarding issues that arise dealing with the general operations of the shared governance framework (including dealing with issues related to changes in underlying organizational documents). The Task Force will also serve as a resource for entities that have questions about their relative powers and responsibilities under this framework. In addition, the Task Force will oversee, in conjunction with the university administration, a process for implementation of the requirement that there be a "360 degree evaluation of non-academic program." It will also be responsible for establishing a clearinghouse for better communication among teams, for directing which shared governance entities should review specific proposals, and for the allocation of responsibilities among the different shared governance entities (including the establishment of entrepreneurial workshops which will provide opportunities for members of the university community to brainstorm and propose ideas for consideration by shared governance and other university entities). This responsibility includes the authority to require proposals approved by one team to be considered by other teams or committees. The Task Force may delegate its responsibilities in the prior three sentences to other participants in the shared governance process as it deems fit. The Task Force will also be responsible for proposing, as needed, modifications to the shared governance framework, which modifications may only be adopted through the vote of all the constituencies which adopt this proposal. Position(s) on the task force will become vacant when a member of the task force steps down. That person will be replaced by the same entity and in the same way as the person stepping down was originally named to the Task Force.

No organizational document of any entity created by this proposal shall enter into

effect if it has not been approved by the Task Force.

Notwithstanding the limits in #2 below, the Task Force will remain in its current form and with its current membership through 2010. The Task Force will have the authority to determine whether it needs to continue after 2010 and, if so, in what form. (No further vote or approval of the university constituencies adopting this proposal will be required to implement a Task Force decision either to discontinue the Task Force after 2010 or to continue the Task Force with powers and responsibilities substantially similar to (or including only a portion of) those that it has under this proposal.) Should the Task Force continue after 2010, it must impose term limits on its members such that no member at the time of the adoption of this proposal can serve for more than five consecutive years after this proposal enters into force.

So long as the Task Force remains in existence in any capacity, its membership must always include representatives from the administration, the law school, the dental school, and the McNichol's faculty.

2. Members of all teams, committees, etc., except for those who serve ex officio, will be limited to serving two consecutive two-year terms on any given team or committee, except that the Shared Governance Task Force, in order to establish staggered terms, may extend or abbreviate the initial terms as deemed appropriate. No voting member of a team or committee may serve on more than three of the shared governance bodies (which includes teams, committees, and the MFA) simultaneously. For these purposes, the Executive Committee of the MFA counts as a committee. The terms of administrative representatives appointed based on their administrative position will not be term-limited. In addition, time served during the pilot period "counts" for purposes of term-limits and also for purposes of establishing staggered terms.
- 3 The MFA is responsible for establishing procedures for when and how committee members should be removed for systematic non-participation. The Vice President or other administrator to whom an individual team reports is responsible for initiating the replacement of any systematically non-participating member of a team. However, the replacement for such a member must be appointed or elected by the entity that was the original appointing or electing authority for that member. (If that original appointing authority chooses to reappoint the non-participating team member, then that ends the matter.) This removal procedure should be used sparingly and is only applicable for cases of pervasive and continuous absence and non-participation, and must be preceded by sufficient warnings of removal to provide an opportunity for reform.
- 4 If teams are not functioning appropriately (e.g., not meeting as needed, dysfunctional, etc.), it is the responsibility of the Vice President or other administrator to whom the team reports to rectify the situation. If a team feels that the problem lies with the administrator to whom it reports, the team should request intervention by the Task Force.

- 5 Teams and committees are free to consult other teams and committees as appropriate for their task. In order to establish improved communication among teams, the AVP (working together with the Task Force) has the authority to call a meeting once per semester of team leaders together with executive officers of the MFA to clarify responsibilities for handling various issues and to share information.
- 6 In order to insure informed voting, the Task Force may establish special election procedures for certain positions, such as, for example, a requirement that the ballot include a statement from each candidate explaining his or her underlying interests and policy positions.
- 7 Given the importance of enabling the university to move forward expeditiously, there will be clear time limits placed on teams, committees, and the MFA for action on various items, which should be included in the organizational documents. If they fail to act within the time limits provided, then the administration will retain the authority to move forward based on its own best judgment. If the MFA fails to act in a timely fashion, it is expected that the AVP would make clear the necessity for action and try to work toward a common solution. If such a solution is not forthcoming, then the AVP may seek the concurrence of either the relevant MFA committee or the MFA Executive Committee to a common solution. If such a solution is still not forthcoming, then the AVP may decide.
- 8 The fact that the AVP may have appointed non-voting representatives to a committee does not diminish the AVP's ability to engage in further consultations or her authority to make decisions.
- 9 The minutes of all team and committee meetings must be submitted promptly to the University Archives. These minutes will be posted on the shared governance web site unless the team or committee involved also submit summary minutes for that purpose at the same time. The MFA is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date list of its members and the members of its committees, which list shall be submitted to the Task Force at least annually (with updates as needed). The AVP is responsible for submitting such a list regarding members of teams to the Task Force at least annually (with updates as needed).
- 10 Maintenance of the shared governance website will be as follows: The MFA will be responsible for designating an individual to update MFA and committee information. The IDS representation on the Information Technology team will be responsible for updating team information. The Dean of Libraries will be responsible for maintenance of the more general information on the website.

- 11 Each entity created under this shared governance process is responsible for sharing (where appropriate) information with the constituencies that it represents and decisions with the broader university community.
- 12 No entity participating in shared governance may alter its structure or powers in a way that contradicts the distribution of authority and/or underlying structural relationships established by this proposal. Neither the AVP, the President, nor any other university administrator to whom a team, committee, or the MFA reports, has the authority to amend, or to approve or ratify an amendment or amendments to, the underlying documents of the entities reporting to them, if such amendment(s) is, or if such amendment(s) causes any governing or other documents to be, inconsistent with this proposal. Such amendment(s) shall be null and void unless they are adopted through formal amendment of this proposal.

Any provision of the constitution, by-laws or other underlying documents of any entity established by this proposal shall be null and void if it is inconsistent with this proposal or with the distribution of authority and/or underlying structural relationships established by this proposal.
- 13 Nothing in this proposal shall be interpreted to limit the authority or the flexibility of the university administration to structure or restructure administrative areas or entities.
- 14 Once approved, this shared governance structure may only be amended by the affirmative vote of each of the constituencies (the Board of Trustees, the university administration, a majority of each of the three separate faculties [McNichols, Dental and Law] as well as by their administrative leadership) that adopted it.
- 15 For those entities for which relevant issues related to areas of responsibility may arise for decision during the summer months, each entity will be asked to establish in its organizational documents a mechanism to enable it to continue to operate, so that it does not abdicate its right to participate in decision-making.
- 16 The items mentioned to describe the existing (and continuing) shared governance structure at the Law and Dental schools are meant to be illustrative only of the way that those schools have to date structured their own governance. They are not meant to fully describe the authority of any of the players in those schools' existing shared governance structures, and it is understood that those structures may evolve over time as determined jointly by the faculty and administration of each school, consistent with the traditional practices at each school.
- 17 This proposed plan is not intended to limit the continued operation or functioning of other structures currently existing at the university, except where their function is explicitly incorporated into a new team or committee. For example, the Institutional Review Board, the Athletic Board, externally mandated committees, and other such entities will continue to operate. The President or the AVP can

establish ad hoc teams as needed to address particular needs as they arise. Such teams must be structured with the types of mixed representation (i.e., both administrative and elected faculty representatives) and to operate with the same kinds of procedures as other shared governance teams. In addition, the administration retains its ability to establish ad hoc entities that are not under the shared governance rubric.

- 18 It is understood that no matter how stringent the timelines established, emergency situations may arise in which administrative decision-making and action is required in a timeframe that does not permit a full and complete vetting of the issue and that may impact core academic concerns. In such circumstances, the administrative leadership of the university has the authority to galvanize any part of the shared governance structure and initiate a truncated process of consultation with affected constituencies to insure timely action and the maximum amount of early, careful and meaningful consultation with faculty feasible under the circumstances.

As noted at the outset, there is no perfect structure for shared governance. We want to encourage greater faculty involvement, input, and shared decision-making in appropriate academic areas, but we also need to recognize that it is the President and the Board of Trustees who ultimately have the fiduciary responsibility to decide key issues for the university. The goal here has been to provide greater input by multiple constituencies in decision-making for many important issues, while making clear those areas where the McNichols faculty has primary responsibility that would enable it to play a more active role in decision-making than it has to date. These processes are also designed to increase communication flow in all directions. However, at a certain point a decision needs to be made and implemented, and this proposal recognizes the continuing authority of the university administration to do so.

Attachments

Attachment A is Letter of Agreement 13. Attachment B is a chart regarding committee memberships. Attachment C is a chart regarding team memberships. Where there is any apparent conflict between this document and the interpretation of the charts, this document is intended to prevail. That is, the charts are meant to be merely illustrative and a source of easy reference. They are not intended as a grant of authority.

What Happens Next

1. In order for the shared governance framework to begin on schedule by January 2007, this proposal needs to be accepted by the university administration as well as the Board of Trustees. It also needs to be accepted by a majority of the votes cast by each of the three separate faculties (McNichols, Dental and Law), as well as by their administrative leadership.

2. For the McNichols faculty, acceptance requires the affirmative vote of a simple majority of the votes cast by the full-time faculty (including those on phased retirement considered full-time). For the Dental and Law faculties, acceptance will be according to their normal decision-making processes already in place.
3. We leave it to the administrative leadership of the university and each of the schools/colleges to determine the appropriate way to receive and consider input from staff and administration in making their own determinations regarding approval.
4. What will these constituencies be voting on? They will be voting whether to accept the structure outlined in this final proposal as the permanent framework for shared governance.
5. The MFA will arrange for the voting procedures for faculty on the McNichols campus. Law and dental faculty will vote according to their existing procedures at faculty meetings.
6. If the McNichols faculty votes to accept this proposal and the proposal is accepted by the McNichols administrative leadership, the university leadership, and the Board of Trustees, then the MFA portion of this proposal will be considered accepted even though the other university-wide portions of this proposal may not have been accepted.

If the McNichols faculty fails to accept this proposal and the proposal is accepted by the law and dental faculty, the law and dental administrative leadership, the university leadership, and the Board of Trustees, then the university-wide teams will be considered accepted. In such an event, the university administration will be responsible for determining how the McNichols constituencies will be represented on the university-wide teams.

Dean Mark Gordon, School of Law, Chair
Dean Margaret Auer, Libraries/Instructional Design Studio
Dr. Vivian Dicks, College of Liberal Arts and Education
Prof. Michael Dosch, College of Health Professions
Dr. Mary Higby, College of Business Administration
Associate Dean, George Libbey, Libraries/Instructional Design Studio, Recorder
Dean Suzanne Mellon, College of Health Professions/McAuley School of Nursing
Dr. Gail Molinari, School of Dentistry
Dr. Carol Weisfeld, College of Liberal Arts and Education

FINAL