

Report from the

Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Committee Alignment:

A review of the structure, operation, and effectiveness of senate committees and recommendations to improve the fit of the senate committees with the operations and interests of the university.

Table of Contents

Background and Overview	page 3
University Senate Organizing and Standing Committee Descriptions (2021)	pages 4 - 6
Charge to Ad Hoc Committee from Steering Committee	page 7
Process	pages 8 - 9
Overarching Recommendations	pages 10 - 13
Committee Reports	pages 14 - 43

Academic Subcommittee

[Council on Academic Affairs \(CAA\)](#)

[Committee on Academic Misconduct \(COAM\)](#)

[The Council on Enrollment and Student Progress \(CESP\)](#)

[Council on Student Affairs \(CSA\)](#)

[University Research Committee \(URC\)](#)

University Subcommittee

[Athletic Council](#)

[Council on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technology \(DELIT\)](#)

[Diversity Committee](#)

[Committee for Evaluation of Central Administrators \(EOCA\)](#)

[Council on the Physical Environment \(COPE\)](#)

[Steering Committee](#)

Fiscal Subcommittee

[Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee \(FCBC\)](#)

[Fiscal Committee](#)

[Graduate Associate Compensation & Benefits Committee \(GCBC\)](#)

[Committee on Intellectual Property, Patents, and Copyrights \(IPPC\)](#)

Faculty Subcommittee

[Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility \(CAFR\)](#)

[Faculty Hearing committee](#)

[Honorary Degrees Committee](#)

[Rules Committee](#)

Background and Overview

Senate committees are the heart of the work of the university senate. The spirit of shared governance is reflected in the breadth and the inclusivity of committee membership and the topics reviewed and acted upon by its members. As the senate's 'committee on committees' the steering committee has the duty under University Faculty Rule 3335-5-47.1(B)2 to "*Review the structure, operation, and effectiveness of the senate and its committees. It shall receive suggestions, review proposed rule changes, and initiate recommendations for change in the structure and operation of the senate, including structure, duties, and responsibilities of senate committees...*" To fulfil this duty, the steering committee convened an ad hoc committee composed of members representing a broad cross-section of the university community to study current senate committee structure and provide recommendations to improve the workings of the committee system. This report is the product of a comprehensive review conducted during the academic year of 2021-2022.

From a historical perspective, the university senate was the subject of a comprehensive review by a Presidential Commission on University Governance in the year 2000. This group recommended a multitude of changes to committee structure and function, many of which have been implemented in ensuing years. Committees that were 'retired' or merged since the last comprehensive report include the Program Committee, Committee on University Bookstores, Library Committee and Legislative Affairs Committee. New committees created since the last comprehensive review include the Committee for Evaluation of Central Administrators (EOCA), Graduate Associate Compensation & Benefits Committee (GCBC), Council on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technology (DELIT), and the Committee on Intellectual Property, Patents, and Copyrights (IPPC). With time and changing needs of the university, there have been consistent updates to the membership and charges of university committees.

Notably, as recommended by the Presidential Commission, the university senate membership has been broadened to include staff as senators beginning in the 2019-2020 academic year, and staff membership on senate committees has increased in parallel. Another recommendation of the Presidential Commission was that "issues that are primarily faculty oriented should be the responsibility of Faculty Council" and suggested that faculty-oriented committees should be managed by Faculty Council. The present report also makes the same recommendation. Finally, a theme shared by the previous report and the present report is the ever-present desire to enhance communication among university community members (administration, faculty, students, and staff) and to increase the visibility and effectiveness of the important work of senate committees.

The present report begins with a set of *Overarching Recommendations* that emerged out of the work and discussions of the ad hoc committee. In general, these overarching recommendations extend beyond the purview of any individual committee and are intended to strengthen the connections among committees and with the university community. Following the section on *Overarching Recommendations* are the detailed recommendations for each current senate committee (*Committee Reports*). These individual recommendations are organized around four clusters (Academic, University, Fiscal and Faculty) as described in the *Process* section of the report.

University Senate Organizing and Standing Committee Descriptions (2021)

For reference, this section lists the current senate committees (2 organizing committees and 17 standing committees). The brief descriptions listed can be found on the senate website: <https://senate.osu.edu/>.

The full descriptions of committee composition and duties and responsibilities may be found in University Faculty Rules section on Committees: 3335-5-46 to 3335-5-48.

Senate Organizing Committees

Steering Committee: The Steering Committee is the 'committee on committees'. It sets the agenda for all University Senate meetings, and steers proposals to other relevant senate committees. Its membership consists of the elected leaders of the faculty, students, and staff as well as key administrative leaders of the university.

Rules Committee: The Rules Committee is the guardian of the faculty rules. The rules are a part of the Ohio Administrative Code, and proposals to change the rules must be vetted by the rules committee, in collaboration with other committees. Rule changes are proposed to the University Senate for approval. Final approval is made by the university's Board of Trustees.

Senate Standing Committees

Academic Affairs: The Council on Academic Affairs (CAA) is at the heart of the university's mission. It approves all curricula and brings all program changes to the full senate for approval. The committee and its subcommittees meet frequently to keep pace with academic changes across the academy. The university meets the changing needs of our students and society through these programmatic changes.

Academic Freedom and Responsibility: The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR) works to ensure that role of the faculty is kept independent and free from undue influence or restriction. This committee considers faculty grievances about the conditions of faculty employment and serves as a recourse for other faculty concerns.

Academic Misconduct: The Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) is a pool of faculty and students from which small panels are drawn to hear cases of alleged academic misconduct. When a panel determines that academic misconduct has occurred, it decides on the appropriate sanction. The committee considers broader issues of academic misconduct and provides feedback to instructors and departments about best practices and policies.

Athletic Council: The Athletic Council maintains policies and programs that are designed to improve the academic progress and well-being of student-athletes. The committee also advises the Department of Athletics on decisions about finances and facilities.

Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technology: The Council on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technology (DELIT) has the broad charge of

understanding and overseeing our digital resources for education, communication, and information storage and exchange. The work of DELIT helps define what it means to have a smart campus and provides an important voice in key technological initiatives.

Diversity Committee: The Diversity Committee assesses how well the university promotes and achieves a broad representation of people and ideas in the life of the institution. The committee recognizes, rewards, and supports efforts by individuals or groups that enhance diversity, and looks for ways the university can improve diversity. The committee recommends solutions to the problems that the university faces to best represent society as a whole.

Enrollment and Student Progress: The Council on Enrollment and Student Progress (CESP) monitors the recruitment, admission, retention, degree completion, and graduation of all students. The council advises on policies that affect the characteristics of the student body and that impact timely completion of degrees.

Evaluation of Central Administrators: Each year, the Committee for Evaluation of Central Administrators (EOCA) compiles information about two central administrators through research and interviews. It is an upward evaluation by faculty, students, staff and deans of key administrators. The evaluation is designed to provide feedback to the President and Executive Vice President and Provost on the effectiveness and role of both the office and the individual.

Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee: Each year the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee (FCBC) publishes a report that compares the salary data of Ohio State's faculty to that of faculty at peer institutions in the B1G and AAU. In addition, the committee studies data within the university, looking broadly at diversity across initiatives and colleges. FCBC also monitors any university hiring or budgetary decisions that impact faculty lines. The committee's annual report contains recommendations for addressing compensation and benefits concerns.

Faculty Hearing Committee: The Faculty Hearing Committee is a pool of faculty from which small panels are drawn to make recommendations concerning faculty appeals to administrative decisions that affect conditions of faculty employment including those resulting from allegations of misconduct (Faculty Rule 3335-5-04), or complaints regarding promotion, tenure, or reappointment (Faculty Rule 3335-5-05). The Hearing Committee helps both to protect the integrity of the institution and to preserve academic freedom and responsibility.

Fiscal Committee: The Fiscal Committee and its subcommittees meet frequently throughout the academic year to make recommendations concerning financial matters facing the university. This committee reviews all the sources of funding for the university. It regularly reviews the distribution of funds to colleges and other units and assesses how the budget model is working. The committee makes recommendations to the Chief Financial Officer, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the President concerning budgetary concerns.

Graduate Associate Compensation & Benefits Committee: The Graduate Associate Compensation & Benefits Committee (GCBC) is chaired by a graduate student and

assesses the support of graduate associates at the university. Each year, GCBC issues recommendations concerning the funding of graduate and professional students.

Honorary Degrees Committee: The Honorary Degrees Committee solicits nominations from the university community for distinguished individuals that merit consideration for receiving an honorary degree. The committee reviews internal and external letters of support, applies a standard of distinction, and then makes recommendations to the University Senate for the awarding of honorary degrees.

Intellectual Property, Patents, and Copyrights: The Committee on Intellectual Property, Patents, and Copyrights (IPPC) considers issues relating to the development, dissemination, and commercialization of intellectual property of faculty, students and staff. The committee recently completed a four-year process of socializing, revising and obtaining approval for the Intellectual Property Policy and is now monitoring its implementation.

Physical Environment: The Council on the Physical Environment (COPE) oversees the application of the architectural framework plan for capital development and improvement at the university. The committee advises on policies and programs that affect how people use and move through campuses.

Research Committee: The University Research Committee (URC) evaluates policies and programs affecting scholarly and creative activities at the university. It encourages and facilitates cooperation among all sectors of the university, including centers, to promote disciplinary and transdisciplinary research, and to reduce any barriers to the free and open pursuit of research and creative expression for all faculty, students, and staff.

Student Affairs: The Council on Student Affairs (CSA) takes up issues which affect all aspects of the life of a student at the university, including policies, practices, and the organization of the office of student life. The committee also administers the use of the student activities fee and is responsible for revisions to the Code of Student Conduct. The committee is chaired by one of the student members.

Charge to Ad Hoc Committee from Steering Committee

Ad Hoc Committee on Senate Committee Alignment

Purpose: The charge is to review and suggest improvements to the organization of the university senate standing committees. It may consider the ideal structure, operation, and effectiveness of these committees. It may consider whether the current committee practices are consistent with the duties and responsibilities described in rules and bylaws. It may consider alignment of committees with the priorities and needs of the university and propose new committee structures to enhance shared governance in the university operations.

Data-gathering may include (1) benchmarking of senate committee structures across peer institutions; (2) surveying committee chairs and members about current committee practices and effectiveness; (3) surveying faculty, students, staff, and administrators on the current and ideal role of shared governance through senate committees in setting educational and academic policies and in institutional decision-making; and (4) interviewing campus leaders about current and ideal senate committee structure and function.

The goal is to generate specific recommendations for improving the fit of the senate committees with the operations and interests of the university. The duties and responsibilities of the committees should align with and support the goals of the administrative offices engaged in setting educational and academic policies and making institutional decisions. This ad-hoc committee will meet first on December 9, 2020, then regularly during Spring semester 2021, and present a report with recommendations to the senate steering committee no later than April 15, 2021.

Membership: The committee will have 11 members, with 5 faculty, 3 administrators, 2 students and 1 staff member. The chair will be selected from the members, and all meetings and the final report will be organized by the chair.

Members

Maddie Carson, Undergraduate Student Government, Chair of the Undergraduate Caucus

Meg Daly, Professor of EEOB, and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education

Terry Esper, Associate Professor of Logistics

Gates Garrity-Rokous, Vice-President for University Compliance and Integrity

Tom Gessells, Health Plan, University Senate Staff Senator

Jennifer Higginbotham, Associate Professor of English

Kari Hoyt, Professor of Pharmaceutics and Pharmacology (Ad Hoc Committee Chair)

Nick Messenger, Council of Graduate Students, Chief of Staff

Jan Neiger, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Human Resources

Randy Smith, Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Brian Turner, Professor of Sports Management

Non-voting members

Megan Ferguson, Senate Recording Secretary

Ben Givens, Senate Secretary

Process

All meetings were held in a virtual format due to COVID-19 pandemic restrictions on in-person meetings.

An introductory meeting was held in December of 2020 to acquaint committee members with each other and the goals of the committee. To organize committee efforts, a chair was selected at this meeting. The committee had biweekly hour-long meetings during the months of January, February and March of 2021 for planning and discussion of findings and recommendations. The final report is due to be discussed at the April steering committee meeting.

Timeline of Committee Activities and Progress:

January 2021: A subcommittee (Ferguson, Givens, Higginbotham, Hoyt, and Messenger) worked as a writing group to create questions for two surveys that were designed (1) to assess the structure and function of each of the 19 committees and (2) to get a global sense of the need for new committees and to solicit suggestions for consolidation or removal of committees. The first survey was sent to current and former members of each committee and the questions were focused on the formal duties and responsibilities of the committee, its composition, and its communication with administration, senate and the campus community. The second survey consisted of more open-ended questions on general committee structure and function and was distributed to senators and select groups of students and staff as recommended by ad hoc committee members representing these constituencies. Biweekly ad hoc committee meetings focused on the interpreting the results of these surveys and the creation of a plan to organize the process of generating specific recommendations. During January, Jessica Eveland, Secretary of Board of Trustees was invited to the group to increase communication with the Board of Trustees. A summary of committee structures at peer institutions for reference was also created.

February 2021: To facilitate the reviews of each senate committee, the ad hoc committee categorized each of the 19 senate committees into 1 of 4 categories listed below. Subcommittees were formed and members analyzed survey input, the charges and composition of the committees and committee annual reports, and other resources. All materials were shared, organized, and updated in an ad hoc committee Teams folder. Progress reports were presented at the biweekly ad hoc committee meetings. Discussion of overarching recommendations were also on the agenda of the biweekly ad hoc meetings. Preliminary reports were generated by the end of February and made available for committee feedback.

Subcommittee Clusters

Academic: Academic Affairs (CAA), Student Affairs (CSA), Enrollment and Student Progress (CESP), Academic Misconduct (COAM), Research (URC).

Members: Meg Daly, Jennifer Higginbotham, Randy Smith

University: Athletic Council, Physical Environment (COPE), Diversity Committee, Distance Education, Libraries and Information Technology (DELIT), Steering Committee, Evaluation of Central Administrators (EOCA).

Members: Maddie Carson, Gates Garrity-Rokous, Tom Gessells, Ben Givens

Fiscal: Fiscal, Faculty Compensation and Benefits (FCBC), Graduate Associate Compensation and Benefits (GCBC), Intellectual Property, Patents and Copyrights (IPPC).

Members: Megan Ferguson, Nick Messenger, Brian Turner

Faculty: Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR), Faculty Hearing, Honorary Degrees, Rules Committee.

Members: Terry Esper, Kari Hoyt, Jan Neiger

March 2021: The preliminary reports on each committee were distributed to the current senate committees for discussion and feedback. An update of the work of the ad hoc committee was presented for additional feedback at the March 5 Faculty Cabinet meeting. Biweekly ad hoc meetings were devoted to discussion of final recommendations from each sub-committee. Additionally, Gil Latz, and Fernando Unzueta of the Office of International Affairs met with the ad hoc committee on March 19 to explore the idea of a new senate committee on International Affairs (this discussion led to *overarching recommendation 6*). At our final meeting on March 26, the committee focused on converting the preliminary recommendations into final recommendations after consideration of collected feedback. We also discussed the format, writing, and timing of the final report. The final recommendations will be presented to the steering committee in April 2021 as outlined in the charge to the committee.

Overarching Recommendations

This section summarizes the major findings and recommendations of the ad hoc committee. Detailed assessments and specific recommendations for each committee are found in the following *Committee Reports* section of this report. Overall, the ad hoc committee concluded that, with very few exceptions, each senate committee is fulfilling the duties and responsibilities outlined in the University Faculty Rules. Additionally, committee composition, in most cases, is optimal for efficient committee operation. The senate committees provide outstanding leadership and service to the campus community. The recommendations outlined here are intended to re-align work with the evolving nature of the university's goals, to balance workload, and to increase communication among the committees and with the campus community.

Overarching Recommendation 1: Removal of distinction between organizing committees and standing senate committees.

As currently described in the University Faculty Rules, the steering committee and the rules committee are 'organizing committees' while the remaining 17 committees are 'standing committees'. To streamline the University Faculty Rules and to remove redundancies in the sections of the rule pertaining to the various types of committees (rule 3335-5-46, 3335-5-47 and 3335-5-48) we recommend eliminating the concept of organizing committees. Each of the nineteen committees will be standing committees each with their own membership qualifications.

Overarching Recommendation 2: Create thematic clusters of senate committees with related charges and constituencies, to foster cross-committee collaboration and to enhance visibility of committee work.

The number of senate committees is large, and the topics covered by the committees is diverse and broad. The ad hoc committee is not recommending the elimination or merger of any current committees since each was found to be productive and serving an important role in shared governance, but rather, that the steering committee consider creating four clusters of committees. This will facilitate promotion of the work of the committee, foster work among related committees and simplify the presentation of the committees on the senate website. It can be challenging for a newcomer to navigate the senate committee structure and creating clusters to organize the structure will help the campus community understand how the senate committees fit into the larger university structure. The organization of these clusters can also better facilitate the Senate's work in supporting the ongoing mission of the university, by better orienting clusters of committees towards specific strategic objectives or initiatives in alignment as suggested in *overarching recommendation 9*.

The work of the ad hoc committee was organized according to clusters and this was felt to help facilitate discussions and generation of recommendations. The clusters used by the ad hoc committee were Academic, University, Fiscal, and Faculty as described in the *Process* section of this report, and these could serve as a starting point for discussion. We recommend that the Steering committee discuss creating cluster groups and the assignment of senate committees within a particular cluster.

The ad hoc committee also recommends that the steering committee explores ways to encourage cross-committee communication. Specific recommendations are detailed in the individual committee recommendations in the *Committee Reports* section of this report. In general, one way to accomplish this is through subcommittees with cross-committee membership that collaborate on projects that extend beyond the charges of a given committee. Faculty Cabinet and the Steering Committee could be used to facilitate this goal.

A recurring theme during ad hoc committee discussions was a need for broader dissemination of the results of committee work. While each committee chair presents updates to the steering committee and submits an annual committee report, it was felt that there would be benefit in making the work of the committees more widely known at the senate (and community) level. One way to accomplish this would be to highlight the work of committees at senate meetings with reports of notable accomplishments from committee chairs and through other methods of more routine and consistent communications.

Overarching Recommendation 3: Create an orientation for committee chairs and recommend that committee chairs reserve a portion of the first committee meeting for orientation of new members. Committees should create a chair transition plan to ensure the uninterrupted and efficient work of the committee.

While many committees have a robust plan for onboarding new members and the transition of committee leadership is smooth, the ad hoc committee recommends that the steering committee considers creating a more deliberate, formal program of orientation. For many committees, the learning curve can be fairly steep and a plan to get members and new chairs up to speed quickly would increase the efficiency of the committee and reduce any confusion on the part of new members. The new chair orientation could take the form of a retreat prior to the start of each autumn semester. The orientation of new members during, or prior to, the first meeting could be codified in the general committee operating procedures (rule 3335-5-46).

Overarching Recommendation 4: Create a more direct link between faculty-focused committees and Faculty Council.

As originally recommended in the 2000 Presidential Commission on University Governance, the ad hoc committee concurs that the Hearing committee, Honorary Degrees committee, CAFR, and FCBC should form a stronger connection to Faculty Council. The ad hoc committee specifically recommends that these 4 committees make their reports to Faculty Council. This new structure would accomplish several goals that were identified by the ad hoc committee. While other recommendations are predicted to increase the responsibilities of the steering committee, enactment of this recommendation would help balance this increase. Reporting of these committees directly to Faculty Council would increase the visibility of the work of the committees to the faculty. Finally, the ad hoc committee received feedback that the work of Hearing and CAFR in particular should be more broadly communicated, and even take on a more proactive educative role for faculty. Faculty Council would be a logical venue for this expanded role.

Overarching Recommendation 5: Use the annual committee report process to ask committees to actively consider and ultimately document contributions of the committee to topics of urgent and critical importance to the university community.

The ad hoc committee received feedback encouraging the strengthening of the role of senate in promoting many ongoing and emerging topics of critical importance to the university community. Specific suggestions included the areas of health, safety and wellness, and diversity, equity, and inclusion. These areas cross many existing senate committees, university-level task forces and administrative offices, and it can be difficult for faculty, students, and staff to identify the groups actively working on any given topic.

Instead of creating new senate committees charged with these cross-cutting critical issues, we recommend that the steering committee promotes deliberate and active engagement of senate committees with these and other emerging concerns via the proposed chair orientation program (to educate chairs on ways their committee could help) and, in parallel, specific guidance to chairs on documentation of progress in these defined areas in their written committee annual report. These annual reports would help the steering committee follow progress in these defined areas, and identify needs going forward.

As part of this recommendation, the ad hoc committee recommends that a template be established for annual committee reports that contain the basic elements of the work of each committee.

Overarching Recommendation 6: Facilitate engagement of the University Senate with the Office of International Affairs.

The ad hoc committee discussed the possibility of creating a new senate committee on International Affairs. The ad hoc committee met with Office of International Affairs (OIA) leadership to explore possible composition and charges to such a committee. At this point, the establishment of a separate senate committee dedicated to International Affairs is not believed to be the most efficient way of enabling collaboration with OIA. As such, it would make more sense to address the issues being raised through coordination of existing committees. CSA, which brings together student life with academics, serves international students as one of its constituencies, and CESP likewise has an interest in the success of international students. In addition to student research at the undergraduate and graduate level, URC has a stake in facilitating collaborations that take place across national borders, global intellectual property rights, etc. Academic Affairs oversees curricular agreements between non-US educational institutions and OSU.

The ad hoc committee recommends holding a preliminary meeting with the chairs of CSA, CESP, CAA, and URC (and any other chairs of committees deemed relevant) with OIA leadership to identify issues that need Senate engagement and devise a mechanism to facilitate involvement from those existing committees.

The specific form of the network to address international affairs within the senate should be determined by the stakeholders and should be iterative to allow the model to be refined based on what works best and what is needed. We do not, however, recommend that representatives from OIA be asked to serve ex-officio on each of these committees

because that seems like an unmanageable workload. A better model might be to have representatives from the committees serve on the various working groups that OIA has established in the process of developing their current Strategic Plan as OIA transitions the working groups into more permanent advisory committees. Alternatively, OIA could plan to visit each committee once to present on relevant issues to each constituency to foster conversation.

Overarching Recommendation 7: Create an Ad Hoc committee to explore consolidating and strengthening the senate committee structure to support the graduate student experience.

A common theme in the feedback the ad hoc committee received was the need for a clearer and more centralized place for supporting the concerns of graduate students. CGS, CSA, GCBC and Graduate Council all handle different aspects of the graduate student experience and this wide distribution of responsibilities can be challenging to navigate. In response to these concerns, we recommend creating a new Ad Hoc committee charged to make a more comprehensive study of the needs of graduate students relative to the current committee structure and to make specific recommendations to improve the senate committee structure to better support graduate students.

Overarching Recommendation 8: Split the Council on Distance Education, Libraries and Information Technology (DELIT) into two new committees, (1) a Libraries Committee and (2) a Technology Committee.

The ad hoc committee is recommending only one major structural change to the senate committee framework, the splitting of DELIT into two new committees. This recommendation is based on feedback from current and former members of DELIT and discussions of the ad hoc committee. Briefly, the expansion in online teaching and learning along with increasing issues surrounding the use of technology warrant creation of a new committee dedicated to these topics. There would be a stand-alone Libraries Committee and a new Technology Committee with 2 subcommittees (A) Teaching and Online Education and (B) Technology Implementation. This re-organization is intended to allow more time for in depth consideration of these important topics. Additionally, re-focusing the committees will help with recruitment of new members and increase engagement in general.

Overarching Recommendation 9: Strengthen channels of communication between the senate and the President and the Board of Trustees. Add representation from the President's office and the Board of Trustees to the Steering committee and strengthen the advisory role on matters of rank, reputation, and shared values.

We encourage the Steering Committee to consider adding representation from the President's office and Board of Trustees to the Steering Committee to facilitate communication and development of shared goals. This recommendation is in line with its charge (University Faculty Rule 3335-5-47.1(B)3) to serve as a channel of communication and advisory role to these offices. In addition, we suggest that Steering reflects regularly on the mission, vision and shared values of the university and initiates discussions with university leadership on focused initiatives that could enhance the reputation of the university and the well-being and success of its community. A subcommittee of Steering could be committed to this effort.

Committee Reports

Academic Subcommittee: Meg Daly, Jennifer Higginbotham, Randy Smith

[Council on Academic Affairs \(CAA\)](#)

[Committee on Academic Misconduct \(COAM\)](#)

[The Council on Enrollment and Student Progress \(CESP\)](#)

[Council on Student Affairs \(CSA\)](#)

[University Research Committee \(URC\)](#)

University Subcommittee: Maddie Carson, Gates Garrity-Rokous, Tom Gessells, Ben Givens

[Athletic Council](#)

[Council on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technology \(DELIT\)](#)

[Diversity Committee](#)

[Committee for Evaluation of Central Administrators \(EOCA\)](#)

[Council on the Physical Environment \(COPE\)](#)

[Steering Committee](#)

Fiscal Subcommittee: Megan Ferguson, Nick Messenger, Brian Turner

[Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee \(FCBC\)](#)

[Fiscal Committee](#)

[Graduate Associate Compensation & Benefits Committee \(GCBC\)](#)

[Committee on Intellectual Property, Patents, and Copyrights \(IPPC\)](#)

Faculty Subcommittee: Terry Esper, Kari Hoyt, Jan Neiger

[Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility \(CAFR\)](#)

[Faculty Hearing committee](#)

[Honorary Degrees Committee](#)

[Rules Committee](#)

Council on Academic Affairs (CAA)

Review of CAA Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

CAA is highly effective in its duties centered around the development of the academic curriculum in coordination with colleges, schools, and units, with around 80% of survey respondents identifying the performance of these tasks as being done 'Very Well'. Among these duties are timely review of curricular changes at the undergraduate and graduate level and presenting proposed changes to the university senate. CAA also provides timely review of proposed structural changes, such as the establishment and abolition of degrees. In addition to reviewing academic changes, CAA is also particularly effective in establishing and communicating procedures for making curricular changes. The effective use of subcommittees allows for rigorous reviews but efficient use of meeting time. An additional strength of CAA is its strong communication with the stakeholders who implement curricular policy.

CAA is charged with reviewing the academic organization of the university at five-year intervals to make certain it is kept as closely attuned as possible to changing needs, however there is no record of performance of such a review. It is not clear what kinds of organizational changes CAA would be authorized to initiate, given that the organization of academic units into colleges and schools has such wide-ranging financial implications. There was also identification of a need for clarity about CAA's duty to review the administration's proposals of a state of financial exigency as provided under rule 3335-5-02.1 of the Administrative Code. This is a duty that is initiated when a state of financial exigency has been declared and CAA receives proposals from the Executive Vice President and Provost for the curtailment of academic programs. It is an important role, but not one that CAA performs routinely. CAA has not addressed this recently because no proposals to curtail academic programs due to financial exigency have been made.

The administrative focus and intense workload of the committee leaves little time for cultivating vision, and some members of the committee expressed a desire for being more proactive at the level of initiating curricular changes and reviewing policies as well as having more intensive debates about proposals at the full CAA meetings. Feedback also indicated that there is a steep learning curve to the work of the committee and that new members would benefit from a comprehensive onboarding process.

Recommendations for CAA Duties and Responsibilities

- Remove or clarify the procedure for conducting reviews of the university's academic organization every five years
- Add online documents and guidelines to supplement traditional in-person orientation session
- Foster pro-active engagement through open discussions of academic issues of concern to council members

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of CAA

CAA works very closely with OAA in the fulfillment of its duties and responsibilities, and this strong relationship is key to the success of the committee. Inclusion of an advisor along with the undergraduate, graduate, and professional student representatives ensures that student

concerns are voiced while evaluating proposals. Participation by administrative offices, particularly from ODEE, the Graduate School, and the Registrar, ensures that curricular changes are implemented in a timely fashion. Proactive consultation with these stakeholders ensures that issues with implementation have been addressed before proposals are presented for approval.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of CAA

- Continue to remain aware of the distribution of representatives from across colleges and schools when appointing members.
- Consider a formal liaison from a regional campus
- Inform members in the orientation process that the chair collaborates in the creation of agendas

Review of Communication and Alignment of CAA with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The strong relationship with OAA, including support for scheduling meetings and communicating with various college offices and arranging for reports is recognized as a strength. CAA meetings have regular attendance from appropriate administrative offices. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs proactively keeps the members aware of academic developments behind the scenes and outside the immediate scope of the committee.

CAA works closely with many university committees, including the curriculum committees of all colleges and schools. CAA has a standing combined subcommittee with Graduate Council. The committee oversees and receives updates from the SEI Oversight Committee and ULAC-GE. The committee also receives reports from the Academy/College Credit Plus program.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of CAA with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Continue to work closely with OAA and other administrative offices.
- Explore ways to address emerging questions about online education.

Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM)

Review of COAM Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

COAM executes its duties very effectively. The fair process for investigating charges of student misconduct with impartial hearings provided for all involved parties was highlighted as a particular strength. The committee excels in its core roles in investigating cases of student misconduct, deciding upon disciplinary action following cases, and reporting findings of examination cases to the Executive Vice President and Provost for review. Clearly, this is a productive committee that does important work for the university, and committee members experience participation in many positive ways.

While COAM is not formally charged with active prevention of misconduct, an activity that would be difficult to add to the current workload with the current number of members, this was a main area identified for improvement. Feedback indicated that COAM could help educate faculty on designing assessment methods in digital environments and informing them of the way current technologies facilitate patterns of cheating.

Recommendations for COAM Duties and Responsibilities

- Use technology to streamline workload distribution.
- Collaborate with the Office of Distance Education and eLearning (ODEE) as well as the Committee on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technologies (DELIT).

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of COAM

Overall, COAM has an excellent mix of faculty and students from across the university and the structure and composition of the committee is appropriate. Feedback also indicated that timeliness of hearings can be impeded due to the committee's workload and availability of members to hear cases. A need for more diverse representation on the committee; that diversity referred to underrepresented members of the student and faculty population rather than adding administrators or staff was also expressed.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of COAM

- Expand number of members to facilitate timeliness of hearings and better distribute workload.
- Consider whether composition of current panels could be streamlined while remaining diverse and representative.

Review of Communication and Alignment of COAM with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

COAM's decisions are reported to the Executive Vice President and Provost. It was noted that COAM does not work directly with the Office of Distance Education and eLearning or with the Office of International Affairs. The former plays a key role in informing the community about best practices for online teaching, and the latter would enable international students to be better informed about ways to avoid misconduct. It was noted that international students could benefit from more education about academic norms in US culture and support navigating the hearing process in a second language.

Connections of COAM with CAA and CESP were found to be strong. As previously mentioned, feedback indicates that members would like to develop ways to better communicate with the community regarding prevention, but the committee does not have ongoing communication with the Committee on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technologies (DELIT), which would share concerns over the role of technology in academic misconduct.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of COAM with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Collaborate with ODEE.
- Collaborate with OIA to help address concerns about international student equity.
- Work closely with the new Coordinator of Academic Misconduct.
- Collaborate with DELIT.
- Collaborate with CSA to help address concerns about international student equity.

The Council on Enrollment and Student Progress (CESP)

Review of CESP Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

CESP executes its duties very well, especially with respect to the “Student Progress” aspect of the charge. There is informed, respectful discussion of issues, and excellent engagement with COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges was notable.

CESP was noted to have less focus on graduate student issues and is relatively less engaged with its Enrollment duties than with Student Progress duties. Committee members expressed a desire to explore ways that they could be more directly engaged in making recommendations or decisions. Committee workload is relatively large.

Recommendations for CESP Duties and Responsibilities

- Refine the charge and organization of this committee. Suggestions include:
 - Split the Enrollment and Student Progress functions into subcommittees or separate committees
 - Add subcommittees on Undergraduate and Graduate student issues
 - Transfer some functions to other, related committees
- Identify ways in which committee(s) can be used in goal setting and decision-making.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of CESP

Overall, there is strong participation and engagement by members. The committee has been particularly effective and responsive in times of crisis. A need for expertise from academic support staff was identified, which is currently given on a voluntary/ad hoc basis. Voting membership from someone in this role might be a valuable addition. This committee deals with issues that are highly technical with a steep learning curve, and this is a barrier, especially for students. The breadth of participation through ad hoc or ex officio membership is a strength, but this may limit the real or perceived independence of the group. Focus on the technicalities and minutiae of policies is necessary but may inhibit the committee from exploring broader perspectives.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of CESP

- Expand the onboarding process.
- Have committee members set independent, official goals.
- Add a member of academic support staff.

Review of Communication and Alignment of CESP with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

Administrative alignment and support is good, especially since Dean of the Graduate School has been added. Professional school perspective is less represented than undergraduate or graduate school perspectives. Input and expertise from the various administrative units may

reduce the independence of the committee. The Office of Diversity and Inclusion should be an integral part of discussions but has not played this role. Good connections with senate committees DELIT, Rules, and CAA, with some interaction with CSA and with COAM were noted. There is good visibility and connections for the work CESP has been doing recently on grading. Recent efforts in CESP highlight some effective strategies for communication and alignment of their work via Faculty Cabinet and various administrative bodies (APAC, Council of Deans).

Not mentioned explicitly but embodied in some of the feedback is the less-than-clear translation of the work of CESP to college-level administration, where much of the work of student progress takes place. The reactive nature of this work, mentioned above, is a missed opportunity that probably has its roots in the way communication and decision making happens. Communication and engagement of students could be stronger—the student representatives do a good job and are well engaged, but they are limited in their representation.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of CESP with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Maintain and enhance that connection with the administration as part of the pattern of work.
- Support student participation through onboarding process.

Council on Student Affairs (CSA)

Review of CSA Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

CSA was noted to do a very good job with managing and revising the Code of Student Conduct and is strong in its role supporting student organizations. Feedback indicated much of the work of the committee is devoted to supporting student groups and with less time for their charge to address student experience outside of student organizations. Some members expressed a missed opportunity for proactive, in-depth study on issues of student life. Faculty engagement is lower than desired, likely reflecting disinterest in the more administrative functions related to student activity fee disbursement as well as the frequency/timing of meetings.

Recommendations for CSA Duties and Responsibilities

- Refine structure of the committee so that the student organization funding piece is handled more fully by subcommittee
- Build in more time at general meetings for the Issues subcommittee.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of CSA

Overall makeup of CESP is good with strong student and administrative participation. Inclusion of more regional campus representation is in the works. Student representation is through student government and so not as representative of the student body as might be desirable. International student perspectives are not seen as well represented. As mentioned above, faculty engagement is lower than desired, though it has improved recently as a result of meetings being held virtually (via Zoom).

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of CSA

- Solicit international student members and non-USG members.
- Add representatives from regional campuses.
- Add further orientation for new members.
- Continue to use virtual platforms (e.g. Zoom) as an option for meeting attendance.

Review of Communication and Alignment of CSA with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

Strong administrative connection to Student Life, which provides data, reports, and support staff. Connections with other stakeholders need development: Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI), Office of International Affairs, First Year Experience (FYE) are called out specifically in the survey. Has working relationships with Diversity and CESP. The relationships are not sustained or focused on particular initiatives or efforts. There is low visibility for this committee in strategic planning and decision making for student issues as a result.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of CSA with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Make explicit connection to ODI
- Supplement current engagement with Student Life with more coordination on the academic side (OAA, Graduate School, CESP)
- Intentionally coordinate through steering, faculty council, or faculty cabinet on a set of key issues
- Investigate establishing a subcommittee to address concerns of international students and coordinate with OIA and other committees that serve that community

University Research Committee (URC)

Review of URC Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

URC fulfills most of its main duties/responsibilities very well. It advises the Office of Research by reviewing policies and practices and their potential impact on the research community and helps encourage and stimulate scholarly research and creative activity. It brings together colleagues with cross-disciplinary perspectives, engages in transparent discussion, and works closely with the Office of Research. Some members expressed uncertainty about the committee's role in center reviews and in reviewing the Office of Research budget, which UCR has never done and does not see as an appropriate part of its duties. Members would like clearer precision about the "powers" of the committee. It has "review" capabilities, but how does it move from opinion/judgment to impact? Often the committee is able to provide input only after the fact, rather than early on in the review process. While the committee sees setting research agendas as the purview of faculty, students, and post-doctoral researchers, they feel they could play a larger and more proactive role in assessing success of research directions.

Recommendations for URC Duties and Responsibilities

- Remove "review of the budget of the of Office of Research" from list of official charges.
- Work with Council on Academic Affairs on approval and review of University-level centers/institutes.
- Give UCR a greater role in reviewing impact of specific strategies (metrics, deliverables, successes).

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of URC

While the size and composition of the URC is viewed as appropriate, a greater diversity of representation is needed. A more vocal presence for undergraduates may be needed for the committee to be able to achieve the proper balance of attention to undergraduate, graduate, and faculty research. It is also not clear if URC has enough representation from across the colleges.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of URC

- Work with the University Senate and ODI to improve diversity of representation.
- Look at the full spectrum of translational research (and have appropriate committee representation), as well as consider commercialization and other ways to disseminate research activity.

Review of Communication and Alignment of URC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The committee is well aligned with the Office of Research – it provides data and reports on a regular basis, includes the committee in communications, and seeks advice on decision-making. Committee members mentioned that the committee does not always have the technical expertise to oversee or advise on all centers/institute approvals and reviews. While, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School is a non-voting member, a formal role for the Provost's office may be desirable. The committee engages with Office of Research broadly, and

as needed, with offices such as the Office of Research Compliance, the Office of the CIO, and the Council on Academic Affairs for center reviews.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of URC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Solicit the Office of Research for specific tasks each year.
- Communicate more broadly where committee actions/reports/summaries of the committee have impacted university policy.
- Evaluate the various research committees that work with the Office of Research and address coordination issues.
- Coordinate with the Office of International Affairs to address research issues with an international context.
- Work with the University Senate to improve diversity of representation.
- Engage in more routine interactions with Senate Fiscal Committee, Intellectual Property, University Compliance (including Export Control, Foreign Influence etc.) and the Council of Graduate Students.

Athletic Council

Review of Athletic Council Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

Athletic Council is a solid, productive committee with three highly functional sub-committees (finance and facilities, student-athlete well-being and academic progress and eligibility). The committee serves as oversight/reporting process for working groups within Athletics. The committee has a good connection with FAR, a critical role under NCAA rules. The committee also does a good job of discussing national intercollegiate trends and showcasing both the academic and non-academic work of the student athletes. Feedback indicated that council bylaws and rules are out of sync.

Recommendations for Athletic Council Duties and Responsibilities

- Align athletic council bylaws and rules.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Athletic Council

The committee is composed of a good mix of faculty, student, alumni, administration, and staff. There is a large representation of athletic staff members involved with this committee. Restricting the chair of the committee to one of two fourth-year faculty was deemed as limiting.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Athletic Council

- The chair could be opened, at a minimum, to either a third- or fourth-year faculty member. This would need to be addressed in the athletic council bylaws.
- Supporting processes (e.g., Institutional Control committee, athletic culture committee) could be better mapped to clarify Athletic Council's role.
- Director of SASSO should be added as a member of the AP&E committee.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Athletic Council with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The Athletic Director is actively involved and key university partners (e.g., Student Financial Aid, OHR, OIE, OUCI) likewise regularly attend when needed. The president meets annually with the Athletic Council. Communication from the department of athletics to the committee on issues of importance frequently occur very late, or not at all. However, for major high reputational decisions, leadership of Athletic Council has been involved in decisions in past and is considered a strength. The work of Athletic Council is as not well known or understood by the larger campus community as would be desirable. This includes the awards that Athletic Council gives, as well as issues being discussed, and activities around mitigating risk. The Athletic Council, especially its AP&E committee, could increase its connection to the Council on Enrollment and Student Progress (CESP).

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Athletic Council with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Advanced notice to Council on major decisions could be improved so that the Council could have its intended role of oversight and advice to the President significantly improved through involvement before major decisions.
- The Athletic Council chair, FAR and AD could report annually to the Senate.

- The AP&E and CESP committees chairs could share agendas for their respective meetings in order to be aware of the issues of common interest around which they could seek additional information, alignment or guidance.

Additional recommendations not covered above:

Feedback reflected the possibility of committee moving on occasion into executive session, given the large number of non-voting attendees and the possible need for candid, open discussion on various topics; this could be considered by Athletic Council under its own bylaws.

Council on Distance Education, Libraries, and Information Technology (DELIT)

Review of DELIT Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

DELIT considers a broad range of concerns, policies, and technologies of importance to the university population. Feedback from the committee expressed a need to re-focus the committee. One member noted "Understanding and execution of technology in Teaching and Learning is one of the most important issues facing the university, and this committee is not equipped to focus on this area." To address the expansion in concerns related to advancing technology, and after consultation with the current DELIT committee, the ad hoc committee makes the following recommendation:

Recommendations for DELIT Duties and Responsibilities

- Create two committees with separate duties and responsibilities: (1) a Libraries Committee and (2) a Technology Committee. The technology committee would have two subcommittees A) Teaching and Online Education and B) Technology Implementation. The first subcommittee to focus on classroom technology and online learning and the second subcommittee would focus on areas of data privacy, new and existing platforms, research computing, data security, and technology policies

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of DELIT

DELIT has good representation from faculty, student, administration, and staff. Concerns about on-boarding, engagement, transition, learning curve and contributions were expressed by some members. With the recommendation to split this committee, sound composition and operation of new committee will need to be carefully considered.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of DELIT

- The new committees recommended above would have faculty, students, and staff. For administrative members, the Library Committee would have the Dean of Libraries, and the Technology Committee would include the CIO, the executive vice-president of Research, Innovation and Knowledge Enterprise, the director of the Drake Institute and the vice-president for Distance Education.
- This refocus of the committee should increase engagement.

Review of Communication and Alignment of DELIT with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

CIO and Head of Libraries attend committee meetings. Pressure will continue to grow between funding needs for broad-based technological needs for all faculty and services; and for secure and/or specialized research. DELIT is not currently designed to contribute to resolving these issues going forward. The Carmen Common Sense initiative was well received by the campus community, and the data privacy issue that DELIT has worked on was highlighted at a senate meeting. The new Technology Committee will need to align with the President's new initiatives.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of DELIT with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- In addition to the current four administrators (the CIO, the Dean of the Libraries, the Dean of the Graduate School and the Associate Vice President for Distance Education), the Executive Vice President of Research, Innovation, and Knowledge Enterprise and the Director of the Drake Institute should be added.

- There should be coordination with the University Research Committee.

Diversity Committee

Review of Diversity Committee Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

This is a strong committee that does an excellent job of capturing many pressing issues that are essential to students, faculty, and staff. The committee has open and productive discussions about community concerns. It operates independently and there is an opportunity to bring more issues/decisions for full senate discussion. An inadequate connection with OIE (esp. EEO/AA and ADA as well as TIX) and OHR was noted in the feedback.

Recommendations for Diversity Committee Duties and Responsibilities

- Broaden the charge of the committee to include Equity and consider renaming it the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. Committee will need to continue to integrate with other key university initiatives, e.g., Racial Justice Task Force, and be involved in coordination of offices (ODI, OIE).

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Diversity Committee

Overall, the composition of committee is appropriate. A role for the past-president gives some additional continuity to work of the committee. Issues focus primarily reflects the interests of active members within the committee. It was noted that the Office of Institutional Equity is not represented on the committee.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Diversity Committee

- Add associate vice president for the Office of Institutional Equity as a member.
- Engagement of OHR designee is critical to successful impact of committee in many university diversity efforts.
- Consider developing subcommittees through bylaws to focus on different DEI focus areas.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Diversity Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

There is good attendance by administrative members and the committee has had strong leadership over many years. The connection of this committee with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion is strong and well represented. However, there is relatively little direct contact with President and Provost. Some members felt that the committee could interact more with other university offices, including student life, public safety, business and finance, legal affairs, and office of institutional equity (OIE). In the past, the committee has worked with FCBC, GCBC, and CSA. The significant efforts happening in units and colleges are not typically discussed in committee.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Diversity Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Formalize communication channels with President and Provost.
- Will need better integration with OHR initiatives, especially Career Roadmap.

- Could help oversee and coordinate diversity efforts across colleges.
- Could formalize connection to the Women's Place, where significant efforts and impacts in gender equity are being made.

Additional recommendations not covered above:

- Develop regular communication channels with constituency groups.
- Could play key role measuring/serving in President's hiring initiatives.
- Could split into subcommittees or develop structure through areas of effort or advocacy.
- Could support integration of OHR/OIE/ODI initiatives, and implementation of Racial Justice Task Force recommendations

Committee for Evaluation of Central Administrators (EOCA)

Review of EOCA Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

The ad hoc committee concludes that EOCA duties and responsibilities are being fulfilled. EOCA performs reviews of senior administrators and, as such, plays a role of communication in shared governance. It is an uncommon type of committee at the national level, and its functions are considered best practice. There was a general sense that the impact of report is not clear and a noted absence of follow-up. There is no feedback from administration regarding EOCA report recommendations and observations, and there is no follow-up cycle with Senate or EOCA regarding whether recommendations were acted upon. Some committee members expressed a lack of clarity on objectives and next steps, at times. Finally, the interview process is not completed by December (on annual cycle) as specified in the duties and responsibilities.

Recommendations for EOCA Duties and Responsibilities

- Revise duties & responsibilities to remove December completion, and make sequence consistent with academic year.
- Develop an executive summary, which could be more widely distributed, while the full report could be more detailed and confidential.
- Separate evaluation of office versus evaluation of administrator, and the former could be more widely distributed.
- Clarify timing and delivery expectations for chair and review panel chairs to assist work of individual reviews.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of EOCA

Size of committee works well given its charge. There is a lack of active student involvement on committee due to its calendar year cycle. It is unclear whether students are explicitly USG, CGS, IPC representatives as well as student appointees. Frequent absence of spring meetings has effectively condensed work into fall semester. Significant challenge in scheduling meetings is noted.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of EOCA

- The composition of the review panels should be made public through the senate website.
- Committee should be shifted to academic year cycle.

Review of Communication and Alignment of EOCA with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

As mentioned above, increasing the impact and visibility of the work of the committee and closing the loop on reviews are desired outcomes.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of EOCA with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Visibility of results should be improved.

- Report should request a response from the reviewed administrator within one month of delivery, in response to the report (with regard to the reviewed office) and as to which recommendations or observations are adopted.
- If tied to a more public (office-focused) executive summary, there might be a paired (more public) response to the report.
- The chair of EOCA should meet with appropriate other committee chairs to discuss the administrator and office under review.
- Develop a communication plan to share with the larger campus community the work of the offices being reviewed.
- The Provost could offer input on the use of the EOCA reports, including how the EOCA reports are and could be used, and in particular how such reports are integrated with other HR/OAA review processes.

Council on the Physical Environment (COPE)

Review of COPE Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities.

The feedback reveals that many of the duties and responsibilities are not being accomplished, as charged. The general feeling is that the scope is too large for this committee and the duties and responsibilities better describe the Board of Trustees Master Planning and Facilities committee than the senate committee. These include proposing policies, reviewing, and recommending actions on major projects, and recommending items for senate action. The committee listens to speakers from around campus and conducts meetings efficiently with appropriate opportunity for input from committee members.

Recommendations for COPE Duties and Responsibilities

- Narrow the scope of the committee to general policy directions and feedback on initiatives coming out of the Office of Administration and Planning.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of COPE

While the committee has the right composition, there is an inadequate connection to decision-makers.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of COPE

- Clarify the connection to the board's Master Planning & Facilities Committee

Review of Communication and Alignment of COPE with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The feedback indicates that administrative members are willing to share information, but not early in the development process. The committee is not being included or consulted on university decisions about the physical environment. Communication with decision makers is generally absent and the work of the committee is not as visible as desired.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of COPE with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Consider documenting (e.g., via a MOU) the committee's areas of responsibility with the Office of Administration and Planning
- Connect with Student Life facility planning and design office.
- Interact with Vice President of Planning, Architecture and Real Estate.
- Develop a formal connection to PARE, FOD, Landscape, and have representation on Planning and Development committees and/or design review.
- Develop communication with Senate Fiscal committee.

Steering Committee

Review of Steering Committee Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

The Steering Committee provides leadership and guidance for senate. It fulfills its role in reviewing proposals and emerging issues and assigning responsibilities to senate committees. The duties and responsibilities listed in the rules do not mention the job of steering proposals to senate committees, nor developing and approving the senate agenda. setting the strategic objectives for the other 18 senate committees. A need to improve as channel of communication with President and Board of Trustees was identified.

Recommendations for Steering Committee Duties and Responsibilities

- Refresh duties and responsibilities to incorporate the steering of proposals to senate committees and the development and approval of senate agendas.
- Reorganize steering priorities to discuss and provide feedback on new strategic directions of the administration, and to ensure that the appropriate senate committees are engaged.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Steering Committee

The Steering Committee is broadly represented by the leadership of the constituents of the university, with 6 faculty, 4 students, 3 administrators and 1 staff member. Feedback was positive on composition and operation. There is one voting staff member on this committee which is a concern from an onboarding, transition, learning curve and contribution perspective. Concern was also expressed about distribution of voting members from various constituency groups.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Steering Committee

- Add the President to the committee.
- Add the Chair of the Board of Trustees as a non-voting member.
- Add one of the five staff senators as a voting member.
- Consider creating a subcommittee to facilitate communication and issue management with the 18 standing committees.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Steering Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The committee is effective in setting the agenda for senate meetings, and steering proposals to committees. There is good alignment with the Provost, while alignment with President's Cabinet and Board of Trustees could be improved. It is noted that interactions with Business & Finance are not well-used and most fiscal issues are addressed in the senate Fiscal Committee. Steering chair is the chair of faculty cabinet and so has good opportunity for communication and alignment with other senate committees. As charged, the committee hears regular updates from senate committee chairs. Opportunities exist for improving communication from Senate to constituencies. Improving the process of setting strategic initiatives for the entire academic year, that are coordinated throughout the year is another identified need.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Steering Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Given that financial issues are rarely discussed in the steering committee, the senior vice president for business and finance could be removed as a member.
- Adding representatives from the board of trustees and the president's office will help engage additional interactions and communications with administration.
- Communicate more broadly on the work of the senate (how it works, how it supports shared governance) by more actively engaging the constituent groups.
- Report out the work of the committee with a regular cadence to the senate and its committees both verbally and through written updates.
- Create an annual orientation of new committee chairs. These sessions should set expectations and emphasize priorities for the year. To the extent possible the orientation could incorporate former chairs.
- Focus more on strategic initiatives for the entire academic year. The committee could drive (and align) priorities across senate committees.

Additional recommendations not covered above:

- The Steering committee may consider better alignment with the Board of Trustees and their agenda for the academic year.
- Steering serves the full senate to ensure appropriate shared governance over university strategic initiatives; Steering could consider ways to measure/evaluate this role (for example, by creating internal measures or by benchmarking against peer institutions).
- Opportunities exist to better incorporate/overlap former committee chairs with current chairs in a more systematic way (done in some committees), to ensure succession planning and continuity; Every committee should add language to their bylaws that address leadership succession.

Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee (FCBC)

Review of FCBC Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

Overall, feedback indicated that FCBC performs its duties and responsibilities effectively. Some members indicated that several responsibilities are not fully addressed by the committee. These include consideration of life/other insurance, travel reimbursements, educational benefits, recreational benefits.

Recommendations for FCBC Duties and Responsibilities

- Ensure all responsibilities receive agenda time/discussion (or eliminate them from responsibilities); add parking to committee's responsibilities.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of FCBC

Most committee members felt the committee was the right size and composition. A lack of associated and clinical faculty among the committee membership was noted, and a need for representation was expressed.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of FCBC

- Consider increasing the number of associated/clinical faculty on this committee and change the responsibility to include more discussion of benefits and compensation for this group

Review of Communication and Alignment of FCBC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The committee interacts well with administration, overall. It was noted that the relationship with human resources could be improved. Combined meetings with Fiscal committee was considered to be a valuable connection.

Ad hoc committee members discussed the possibility of combining GCBC and FCBC into one committee (Benefits and Compensation). Both current committees could work as subcommittees of the larger Benefits and Compensation committee. Full committee would only have to meet once a semester, with most of the work done in subcommittees. This would help with administrative support (especially for GCBC). Additionally, the possibility of adding staff representation to this combined committee (for benefits related topics only) was discussed. However, ultimately, this suggestion of combining the FCBC and GCBC committees and adding staff representation was not supported by current membership of FCBC and GCBC, as both committees wish to retain their autonomy.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of FCBC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Continue yearly combined meeting with Fiscal

Fiscal Committee

Review of Fiscal Committee Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

Overall, the committee effectively fulfills most of its duties and responsibilities. An exception is in the duty to advise the president on the alternatives and strategies on the long term and short-term allocation of university resources, which was identified as an area of improvement by some members. An additional area for improvement is regarding the duty to advise the president in the event of an imminent financial crisis whether a determination of fiscal exigency is warranted.

Recommendations for Fiscal Committee Duties and Responsibilities

- Add a responsibility to include “state of emergency” (currently just advise the president to determine fiscal exigency); continue working with President to support long term vision and goals for the University

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Fiscal Committee

Feedback indicated that the committee is the right size and composition to execute its duties and responsibilities.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Fiscal Committee

- The committee should remain the same size and composition.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Fiscal Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The committee has very strong administrative support. The committee could provide a more holistic fiscal guidance for the university, such as what are funding priorities; Once funds get into units, it is harder to track – more could be done in this space. The committee works well with FCBC, GCBC, USG, and USG; chair is ex officio member of Research committee. Information sharing with other stakeholders could be strengthened.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Fiscal Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Have President present vision for University and funding implications on a yearly basis
- Consider combined yearly meetings with FCBC/GCBC to review how compensation and benefits fit into the University fiscal picture.

Graduate Associate Compensation & Benefits Committee (GCBC)

Review of GCBC Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

GCBC has three stated responsibilities and feedback indicates that all are done well or very well. The committee was noted to deal more with benefits beyond compensation.

Recommendations for GCBC Duties and Responsibilities

- There are no major recommendations to improve execution of GCBC duties and responsibilities.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of GCBC

Graduate student representation and leadership are strengths of the committee. Feedback indicated that the committee would benefit from administrative support to help its work.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of GCBC

- Increase administrative support.

Review of Communication and Alignment of GCBC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The committee enjoys good administrative support on compensation issues. Administrative representation and overlap of areas of interest with Graduate Council were identified as areas for further discussion and improvement.

Ad hoc committee members discussed the possibility of combining GCBC and FCBC into one committee (Benefits and Compensation). Both current committees could work as subcommittees of the larger Benefits and Compensation committee. Full committee would only have to meet once a semester, with most of the work done in subcommittees. This would help with administrative support (especially for GCBC). Additionally, the possibility of adding staff representation to this combined committee (for benefits related topics only) was discussed. However, ultimately, this suggestion of combining the FCBC and GCBC committees and adding staff representation was not supported by current membership of FCBC and GCBC, as both committees wish to retain their autonomy.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of GCBC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Increase involvement of the Dean of Graduate School with GCBC
- A clear process for referring compensation and benefits discussion from Graduate Council to GCBC should be outlined.

Committee on Intellectual Property, Patents, and Copyrights (IPPC)

Review of IPPC Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

IPPC was considered to fulfill its duties and responsibilities very well. The duty to “Serve as a board to which a researcher may appeal actions of the vice president of technology commercialization” generated discussion reflecting some confusion on this duty. This duty likely varies by year and there is a policy to address (Section VIII of the University’s Intellectual Property Policy includes the committee’s role in disputes).

Recommendations for IPPC Duties and Responsibilities

- Ensure all committee members understand the committee’s role in dispute resolution based on the policy listed above.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of IPPC

Overwhelmingly it was felt that the committee is the right size. A need for better representation from broader demographics was identified by some members.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of IPPC

- Ensure that committee appointments reflect the diversity of the university.

Review of Communication and Alignment of IPPC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

IPPC speaks openly with administration about what works and does not work well. More proactive and extensive faculty engagement is desired. Increased interactions with the Research committee could facilitate progress on shared goals.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of IPPC with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Improve communication with faculty on the role and responsibilities of the committee.
- Explore ways that IPPC can work more closely with the Research Committee.

Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR)

Review of CAFR Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

CAFR operates in a very timely fashion in addressing issues of academic freedom and responsibility. The consensus-based approach is noteworthy. Members believe the committee is addressing contemporary needs of faculty and the university. Some concerns were expressed regarding issues that might be presented to CAFR that are more about faculty grievances than actual matters of academic freedom or responsibility. There were expressed feelings that processes for faculty grievances may not be as clearly defined.

Recommendations for CAFR Duties and Responsibilities

- Work with OAA to develop a “flow chart” or pictorial communication to outline the relationships between CAFR and other faculty concern outlets (such as the Ombudsperson), and other affiliated committees (such as Hearing)
- Develop strategies for CAFR to be more “educative” in proactively making faculty aware of the roles and responsibilities of the committee. Consider New Faculty Orientation activities as an outlet for such proactive faculty engagement.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of CAFR

The size and composition of CAFR is appropriate to its duties, responsibilities, and workload.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of CAFR

- Other than the larger structural issues of where CAFR fits into a constellation of outlets for faculty concerns, no real recommendations regarding the structure of CAFR itself.

Review of Communication and Alignment of CAFR with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

Strong connectedness with administration and also with Hearing and Rules Committees are noted. Some concerns were expressed across the university community regarding the lines of demarcation between CAFR and Hearing, which can often serve as a source of confusion regarding the interplay between the two committees.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of CAFR with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- As above, develop communications to outline the relationships between CAFR and Hearing and other faculty concern outlets (such as the Ombudsperson).

Faculty Hearing Committee

Review of Faculty Hearing Committee Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

Feedback indicates that the Hearing committee operates in a fair and thorough fashion. Panels are carefully constructed, and balanced, and careful attention is paid to the P&T documents of units. Issues are addressed expeditiously. There were concerns expressed regarding panel selection and potential variability in outcomes, particularly regarding 05 cases.

Recommendations for Faculty Hearing Committee Duties and Responsibilities

- Develop a process for 05 cases outcome reconciliation when significant differences occur across panels.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Faculty Hearing Committee

The committee has appropriate size and composition to carry out its work. The one concern discussed was regarding clinical faculty, and a desire to have more inclusion of clinical faculty (and faculty of other types) as potential panelists to adjudicate cases.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Faculty Hearing Committee

- Build on opportunities to leverage more diversity in faculty types, with specific focus on clinical faculty committee membership for adjudication of cases involving clinical faculty.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Faculty Hearing Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

A strong alignment with administration was noted. Although it is out of the management responsibility of the committee, some concerns regarding timely feedback after suggestions and reports are submitted to the President's office. A strong connectedness with CAFR is a strength. There have been some concerns expressed across the university community regarding the lines of demarcation between CAFR and Hearing, which can often serve as a source of confusion regarding the interplay between the two committees.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Faculty Hearing Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Work with OAA to develop a "flow chart" or pictorial communication to outline the relationships between CAFR and Hearing and other faculty concern outlets (such as the Ombudsperson).
- Develop strategies for Hearing to be more "educative", in proactively making faculty aware of the roles and responsibilities of the Hearing committee. Consider New Faculty Orientation activities as an outlet for such proactive faculty engagement.

Honorary Degrees Committee

Review of Honorary Degrees Committee Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

The Honorary Degrees committee successfully carries out its duty reviewing/vetting achievements and qualifications of persons nominated. The only area where potential need for improvement is ensuring that standards and procedures for nominations have been created and followed. More in-depth discussions and greater outreach to solicit new nominations was suggested.

Recommendations for Honorary Degrees Committee Duties and Responsibilities

- Ensure there is a process for a wide cast in seeking nominations

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Honorary Degrees Committee

College representation was identified as a potential issue. Also, while perhaps not a weakness, discussions are generally done through e-mail with few in-person meetings. A resulting issue may be the depth of the discussions.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Honorary Degrees Committee

- Faculty Rule provides that no more than two members be from the same college. Ensure greater diversity with no college having more than a single member.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Honorary Degrees Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

Communication with Administration is strong on both sides. Committee is consulted and advice is sought. Communication with the greater Campus Community is also strong. Some concerns were expressed regarding touchpoints with other committees responsible for decisions regarding other University Awards and Recognitions.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Honorary Degrees Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Develop plans to strengthen communication with other committees responsible for University recognitions. Consider shared vetting and consideration, to ensure that the established goals and standards of various special recognitions across the University are maintained and upheld.

Rules Committee

Review of Rules Committee Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities

The Rules Committee is viewed very favorably regarding fulfilling all duties and responsibilities. It is strong in terms of responding to, and monitoring, rules pertaining to the senate, initiating revisions of rules, and reviewing and making all necessary changes to rules. The committee works well together, is thoughtful, and considers varying perspectives. It seeks out external key stakeholders when considering revisions. A holistic review of the rules to ensure they are accurate and consistent across the board should be considered. Also, rules take time to modify resulting in some slowness to the process.

Recommendations for Rules Committee Duties and Responsibilities

- Develop a sub-committee of the Rules committee with specific focus and responsibility of “on-going rules maintenance”. This sub-committee will be tasked with general maintenance of existing Rules, ensuring contemporary language and relevance, as well as ensuring that university policies and rules are in alignment. The balance of the committee will focus on changes to rules that are submitted for consideration from University stakeholders.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of Rules Committee

No concerns were expressed in terms of size or composition. OAA and OLA are highlighted as appropriate and helpful nonvoting members. Some members mentioned that learning curve for new members (in particular, staff and students) is challenging. It was also noted that most of the rule changes thus far have impacted faculty and not focused on student and staff issues.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of Rules Committee

- Appoint a vice-chair who can then be ready to lead the following year.
- Institute longer term appointments (e.g., 3-year terms) to improve contributions of members and committee stability and consistency.
- Develop onboarding for committee members, with a focus on the impact that members can have, especially on rules affecting their respective constituencies.

Review of Communication and Alignment of Rules Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The Rules Committee has strong administrative support and is proactive in seeking advice during decision-making, and consults with many university constituencies on regular basis. Rules has strong relationships with those committees where rules may have an impact.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of Rules Committee with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- No specific recommendation. Rules Committee is a narrowly defined committee that is highly effective in its tasks and engagement with administration, senate, and the campus as appropriate.