

Committee on Committees

Annual Report 2013-2014

Membership

Robin Bilyeu (2014), Chair	Arts & Sciences Business Center
Jane Nichols (2015)	Library
Linda Sather (2015)	Human Resources
Stacey Smith (2015)	History
Shelly Signs (2016)	University Events

Executive Committee Liaison: Donna Chastain

Standing Rules – No Changes

Committee Actions

There were no recommendations from last year, so no adjustments were addressed or made this year from prior years.

Members of the Committee on Committees met on March 10, 2014 to review the tasks to be conducted for the year and to outline a plan for completing these tasks. Twelve senate committees were in need of their regularly scheduled review (eight were from prior years, and plus four on their regular rotation). Of those, it was suggested by the Faculty Senate President that we focus our efforts on reviewing the eight overdue committee reviews. Based on that, the committee reviewed the following committees:

- Distance Education Committee – Linda Sather
- Diversity Council – Stacey Smith
- Faculty Economic Welfare & Retirement Committee – Shelly Signs
- Faculty Status – Jane Nichols
- Graduate Council – Linda Sather
- Library Committee – Jane Nichols
- Promotion & Tenure Committee – Stacey Smith
- Research Council – Shelly Signs
- Student Recognition & Awards Committee – Shelly Signs
- Undergraduate Admissions Committee – Robin Bilyeu

Another routine task of the Committee on Committees is to review proposed changes in the Standing Rules for any Faculty Senate Committee. This year we did not review any proposed changes to standing rules.

Recommendations

- Review whether all committees need to have a student member or not. Many do not have a student member or have not had one for a long time, or if they have found someone to volunteer, the paperwork is never processed to formally admit them on the committee. Some committees feel that it would be inappropriate to have a student member.
- Need clarification on who/how proposed changes need to be submitted for review. Reviewing proposed changes is included in the Committee on Committees Standing Rules, but when we interview committee chairs, we are frequently hearing their complaints, concerns, and suggested changes but not certain where to refer them to, or if we just include them in our annual report for someone to address later. A good example of this is when we ask them if the Standing Rules reflect the function of the committee and they explain where the Standing Rules are lacking or misrepresenting their work; we note this in our

report but unless they email it in with their annual report at the end of the year, I don't think it is ever addressed. This seems like overlapping work for them to tell the Committee on Committees and then also report it directly.

- The Distance Education Committee requested more direction and leadership from Faculty Senate and the Extended Campus Office. The long-term purpose/goal of the committee is vague and, without a representative from Extended Campus to answer questions at their meetings, it is hard to get things done when they do not fully understand the situation. If possible, a representative from Extended Campus should attend their meetings and some guidance should be provided as to what their role/function is in comparison to other committees on campus that review extended campus issues/concerns.
- The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has struggled at identifying their role with the new Admissions Matrix being implemented in the Fall 2014. While the standing rules state this committee will be consulted on policy changes, they were not consulted on this matrix, which does not align with other admissions standards. They have failed to identify where this matrix originated from and need assistance in addressing their concerns. If the concern is not addressed, it could create inconsistencies in the admissions process and negatively impact our graduation and retention rates.
 - This creates a larger concern with the recognition and respect Faculty Senate receives on this campus and whether new administrators are aware of the role of Faculty Senate serves on campus. With a number of new administrators, many who are from outside higher education, there is a concern that the opinions of academic faculty are being disregarded and the role of Faculty Senate on campus is being diminished. Administrators are beginning to make campus-wide decisions that may impact faculty interest, and academic faculty members are not being consulted.

Attachments

Five-Year Reviews:

- Assessment Guide
- [Appendix A](#): Online Education Committee
- [Appendix B](#): Diversity Council
- [Appendix C](#): Faculty Economic Welfare & Retirement Committee
- [Appendix D](#): Faculty Status
- [Appendix E](#): Graduate Council
- [Appendix F](#): Library Committee
- [Appendix G](#): Promotion & Tenure Committee
- [Appendix H](#): Research Council
- [Appendix I](#): Student Recognition & Awards Committee
- [Appendix J](#): Undergraduate Admissions Committee