

Georgia Southern University

## Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

---

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate

---

11-3-2003

### Shared Governance 11-3-2003

Jean-Paul Carton

*Georgia Southern University*

Faculty Welfare Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Carton, Jean-Paul and Faculty Welfare Committee, "Shared Governance 11-3-2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Index*. 543.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/543>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

*Approved by the Senate: 11/17/2003*

*Not Approved by the Senate:*

*Approved by the President:*

*Not Approved by the President: 12/15/2003*

## Shared Governance 11-3-2003

Submitted by Jean-Paul Carton/Faculty Welfare Committee

11/3/2003

### **Motion:**

---

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee wishes to move that the following be approved by the Senate: (1) a document entitled "Shared Governance-Principles and Guidelines" (attached) (2) inclusion of the document entitled "Shared Governance-Principles and Guidelines" in the Faculty Handbook as 108-1, along with renaming of section 108 as "Shared Governance" (thus 108-2 would be entitled as "Faculty Senate")

### **Rationale:**

---

On 9-5-2003 the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee was charged by the SEC to examine the recommendations submitted by the Task Force on Shared Governance. The Welfare Committee has now completed its task and wishes to submit these recommendations to the Senate for approval. The committee felt that a general definition of faculty governance needed to be provided and agreed upon before moving the articles proposed by the Task Force for approval by the Senate. Thus, this proposal includes such a definition, in addition to the original recommendations of the Task Force on Shared Governance

### **Response:**

---

Motion re: Welfare Committee proposals re: "Shared Governance: Principles and Guidelines" Jean-Paul Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) moved for approval of the document written by the Faculty Welfare Committee regarding Shared

Governance, adding that nine recommendations from the Task Force on Shared Governance were received by the Faculty Welfare Committee last year, who felt a framework was needed to move those documents for approval as the principles of Shared Governance at Georgia Southern were unclear. The committee looked at other institutions and found that in some cases it was with the Senate, and sometimes it was much more than the Senate, and thus they attempted to draw a few introductory principles. In essence, the Introduction, Scope and Item #1 under Method were written up by the Welfare Committee and the remainder is very similar to the recommendations submitted by the Task Force.

Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) read the motion: The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee wishes to move that the following be approved by the Senate: 1) A document entitled, "Shared Governance, Principles and Guidelines," which was attached and posted on the web site, 2) inclusion of the document entitled, "Shared Governance, Principles and Guidelines," in the Faculty Handbook, as Section 108-1 along with the renaming of Section 108 as "Shared Governance," thus 108-2 would be entitled, "Faculty Senate."

Cyr (Moderator) suggested a two motion format, moving forward with the first part, and then a second motion regarding inclusion in the Handbook.

Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) moved for approval of the document entitled "Shared Governance, Principles and Guidelines"; seconded. Edwards (COST) questioned if Faculty Senate approval of a document or a statement was just a statement of support that appears in the minutes?

Cyr (Moderator) provided that if the secondary part of the motion is the inclusion of this in an official publication, then we need to have the language and the principle of that document approved.

Krug (CLASS) commented that this is continuing work that a task force was asked to do by the Senate Executive Committee in November 2001, and it is continued by the Faculty Welfare Committee, which is a committee of the Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern University, so this is very closely related to Senate work. The task force document Jean-Paul mentioned is the method, and what the Faculty Welfare Committee has apparently done is to enhance what the task force, which had a representative from every unit at the University, presented and it was accepted and sent to the Committee for them to do just this.

Randy Carlson (COE) asked if, from the wording of this document, it was safe to infer that every time we want to do something, a committee has to be formed and the faculty have to elect members of a committee?

Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) responded that the areas are limited to numbers one through six, reminded the Senate that this is a first step, and when the nine items were submitted to the committee they did not know how to approach faculty governance, what it meant, to what level and to which areas it applied. The committee endeavored to set up the framework.

Carlson (COE) clarified that his concerns go to seeing the word “all” in a policy statement, and if that might not end up being problematic, fearing the day-to-day practice may be difficult to work with given a strict interpretation of what is written down.

Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) felt that particular wording came directly from the Task Force.

Krug (CLASS) noted that the task force Jean-Paul referred to is the Senate Task Force on the Role of the Faculty in Shared Governance, and the results of a survey that was conducted among all faculty in the various colleges led to the framing of nine original items, but that the six items in the current document really include what the Task Force recommended based on faculty response. The reason this was included was because of responses indicating that there were faculty who wanted to have elected committees for various kinds of decisions, because this was not happening in their units. Rice (COST) noted that this was not to imply that any decision that would normally be under the purview of the President or the Provost without faculty input would now be open to faculty input.

Krug (CLASS) mentioned that faculty wanted to have committees that are already existing in their department or their college elected rather than appointed. There are assumptions that policies are in writing in regard to annual review, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. However, in some units faculty indicated that they do not know if they are in writing or that they may not be in writing, so it was recommended that the policies be determined to be in writing and that faculty have access to them, so that they may better prepare for their applications for these various personnel divisions that are directly related to their livelihood.

John Brown (COBA) supported the document, saying that it speaks to the kind of culture we are trying to build at Georgia Southern University, a culture that President Grube has helped promote by putting a Moderator in front of the Senate instead of the President. He is not in favor of being too descriptive in the sorts of things the Senate does, because none of the culture is going to work without good faith on the part of all parties. He asserted that this document establishes a common framework that we can all agree with and live with, and urged the Senate to support it.

Carton (Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee) understood concern over the word “all”, but called attention to Item #2, “All policies regarding faculty must be in writing.” In that

instance, all is appropriate because not one member of the committee could cite an example of a policy regarding faculty that should not be in writing.

There being no other discussion, the document was voted on and approved. Cyr (Moderator) moved to the second motion, the inclusion in the Faculty Handbook of the document as Section 108.1, along with renaming of Section 108 as Shared Governance, thus 108.2 would be entitled Faculty Senate, and so forth. The motion was seconded. Edwards (COST) sought confirmation that approving this motion was, in essence, requesting permission from the President to include the document in the Faculty Handbook. Cyr (Moderator) offered that every motion that is passed by the Senate is passed on to the President for approval. If he approves it, we get a written letter saying so. If he disapproves it, we get a written letter explaining why within thirty days. Cyr (Moderator) called for a vote and the motion carried.

### **President's Response:**

---

12/15/2003 I have received the statement entitled "Shared Governance: Principles and Guidelines" approved by the Faculty Senate and recommended as an attachment to your memorandum to me dated November 24, 2003. There are aspects of the document which will require a discussion involving the Provost, the Senate Executive Committee, and myself. To comply with the 30-day required response time, I suggest we convene a meeting during the week of December 15-19. Alternatively, if the SEC is unable to meet until January, I suggest we agree to waive the 30-day Presidential response time until we can convene to discuss the matter.

### **Attachment**

#### **Shared Governance: Principles and Guidelines**

The faculty and the administration of Georgia Southern University agree that the success of the University and the positive morale of the faculty and administration are dependent upon continued use of the collective intelligence of the university community in planning and decision-making. Shared governance is mutual participation in the development of policy decisions by both faculty and administration, and requires shared confidence between faculty members and administrators.

The following guidelines are the beginning of a process intended to further detail and clarify the way the faculty and administration address certain issues. These guidelines express a mutual desire to work together. In case of any divergence from or

conflict with the Statutes of Georgia Southern University or the Bylaws or policies of the Board of Regents, the official Statutes and the Bylaws and policies of the Board of Regents shall prevail.

## **SCOPE**

Faculty have the responsibility to participate in shared governance and must have a role in developing and implementing University policies, including, but not limited to: short and long range planning; hiring and evaluation of faculty (annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure and posttenure review, and promotion); academic and curricular policies; committee establishment and appointments; selection and retention of academic unit leaders; review and monitoring of the shared governance process.

## **METHOD**

1. Representation of the faculty at all levels of University governance will be carried out by members of the faculty who have been elected directly by their faculty peers or selected by a committee on committees or other faculty body which has been elected directly by the faculty at the University, college, or departmental level.
2. All policies regarding faculty must be in writing, whether they are at the departmental, college, or university level. These policies include, but are not limited to: hiring and evaluation (annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure and post-tenure review, and promotion); committee establishment and appointments. Each department and college must submit a written copy of these policies to the provost.
3. In consultation with the chair and full-time faculty in each department, each dean should verify the existence of, review and, when necessary, initiate revision of, current policies of all departments in the college to guarantee their consistency with university-wide policies for annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure and post-tenure review and promotion. (2003-2004 Faculty 2 Handbook, sections 205-213).
4. In consultation with the dean of each college, the Provost should review and, when necessary, initiate revision of current policies of each college to guarantee their consistency with universitywide policies for annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure and post-tenure review and promotion (2003-2004 Faculty Handbook, sections 205-213).
5. All faculty must have access to written departmental and college policies related to the personnel decisions mentioned above. These policies should appear on each department and college web site and be available in print in the departmental and college offices.
6. All faculty have the responsibility to be aware of written policies of their department and college and Georgia Southern University, as well as those of the Board of Regents.

10-27-2003