2005-2006 First in 2009 Coordinating Council

Final Report of the Subcommittee on Departmental Governance

Preface

Successful departmental governance is critical to achieving the teaching, research and service mission aspirations set by the Miami University First in 2009 planning process. The Subcommittee on Departmental Governance was charged with developing a set of guidelines and developmental procedures that would help Chairs and departments craft discipline-specific departmental governance bylaws that are up-to-date and consistent with current University policies and procedures. Specifically, the Subcommittee was asked to:

1. Review existing departmental and divisional governance documents across the University to elucidate the current state of the art, identify both best practices and potentially problematic areas, and assess the degree to which variances from MUPIM policies occur across campus.
2. Review the relevant literature on creating effective departmental governance documents with an eye to helping Chairs and departments improve their documents.
3. Conduct open forums and other interactive meetings to explore the needs and challenges relating to departmental governance at Miami.
4. Develop guidelines and a template/checklist for departmental bylaws, including a consensus list of items that should probably be addressed in every departmental governance document as well as items that are problematic and should not appear in any document.

Importantly, as we worked toward these goals, we did so mindful of the fact that any recommendations we made had to be workable under real-world conditions extant within departments. We wanted guidelines and template/check-lists to be as user-friendly as possible, so that departments could engage in document revision in a collegial and time-effective manner, and create documents that would stand the test of time and actually mirror real-world practices within each unit.

Process

During the Fall 2005 semester the Subcommittee requested existing governance documents for all Miami departments and divisions from the University Secretary and the Provost’s Office. A working list of potentially important governance items, both positive and negative, to be considered was assembled by the Provost’s Office and given to the Subcommittee as a starting point for discussions. At the first Subcommittee meeting, members evaluated this list and added/deleted items to assemble a consensus list that would serve as the basis for evaluation of existing procedural documents. Departmental documents were then subdivided between Subcommittee members, and each person was assigned the task of reviewing their subset of departments, using tabular format that
indicated whether the department’s governance document addressed the following positive attributes:

- statement on climate
- role of the Chair
- workload standards
- voting regulations/committee structures
- grievance procedures
- personnel and hiring practices
- Regional campus faculty
- Other praiseworthy procedures

The Subcommittee also scored documents for the presence of policies that were at odds with MUPIM and/or divisional governance procedures (i.e., across the board salary increments, mandated rather than flexible teaching loads, etc.).

The Subcommittee met a second time during the Fall semester to jointly review each person’s tabular information. As a result of this meeting, it was apparent that many commonalities existed, both good and bad, among departmental governance documents across the University, regardless of which division the department was in. From discussions at this second meeting, the group assembled a draft short-list/checklist of:

a) items that should probably be included in every procedural document, and
b) items that should not appear in any procedural document.

This draft short list was issued within an Interim Report submitted to Carolyn Haynes, Chair of the First in 2009 Coordinating Council, in mid-December 2005. The Interim Report was used as a vehicle to frame campus-wide discussions on departmental governance issues and solutions during the Spring 2006 semester. The goal of these discussions was to critique the findings of our Interim Report, especially the items included in short-lists, so that the Subcommittee could prepare a consensus final check-list/template for submission to the First in 2009 Coordinating Council and the Provost for action during the 2006-07 academic year.

The Interim Report was disseminated to all Miami department Chairs in January 2006 via email. This email included an invitation to provide written commentary to the Subcommittee at any time and an invitation to attend Open Forums on either 22 or 23 March. The Subcommittee also met individually with two groups who represent major stakeholders within the University community, the University Multicultural Council and the CAS Committee on Women and People of Color. In addition, the Subcommittee wanted to evaluate the efficacy of findings outlined in our Interim Report under “real world” conditions. To do this, we worked with the History department, which was already in the early stages of revising their Governance Document in early Fall 2005 to incorporate recommendations included in the Dec 2005 Interim Report within their deliberations.

The other Subcommittee task accomplished during Spring semester was a review of the relevant literature on developing effective departmental governance documents, both print and electronic. The goal was to create a brief but user-friendly syllabus as a resource
guide for Chairs and departments engaging in document revision during 2006-07 and beyond.

Findings

General Observations on Existing Governance Documents Across the University:

We found that considerable qualitative and quantitative variation in governance documentation occurs across departments and divisions at Miami. Documents range from a few pages in length to thesis-sized. Most units are lacking at least some of the items that appear on our list of ‘must-have’ items (Table 1 and Appendix 1), and several units do not have on file with the University Secretary or Provost’s Office a statement on promotion and tenure criteria and/or a statement on evaluation of teaching. Importantly, although diversity and climate considerations underpin many important aspects of the First in 2009 initiative, only a handful of departmental and divisional documents have a statement on climate and diversity.

A significant minority of departmental documents feature items that almost certainly should not be in departmental governance documents (e.g., statements at odds with MUPIM or specifying questionable salary or teaching load practices; Table 1). Another common problem we noted is that many departments have documents that have not been updated in since the 1970s or 1980s, and this is also the case for at least some Divisional documents. In these cases, written departmental procedures cannot match the reality of departmental functions in the 2000s. Finally, we suspect that in at least some cases, actual departmental operating practices are not in concert with written procedures in governance documents.

On the positive side – and there are many positives – the majority of departments have reasonably good to excellent governance documents. We can identify numerous examples of best practices among departments and exemplary documentation (Appendix 2). These best practices and exemplary documents could provide a good framework for departmental self-assessment and document revision in 2006-07 and beyond.
Table 1. A recommended checklist/template for departmental governance documents

Items that should probably be in every governance document

- climate/diversity statement specific to departmental discipline and challenges
- statement on Chair's role that is in concert with MUPIM/Divisional documents and that does not inappropriately tie the Chair's hands
- workload statements that recognize the varied kinds of teaching, research, and service that faculty engage in and do not mandate inflexible, across-the-board loads.
- Committee structure and voting regulation/procedures
- grievance procedures for faculty and students
- personnel and hiring practices
- Regional campus faculty statement
- junior faculty mentoring system
- statement on how summer teaching is apportioned
- statement on joint appointment procedures and evaluations
- leaves/leave expectations, especially for junior faculty
- procedure for revising aspects of the procedural document (plus already mandated statements on P/T expectations and teaching evaluation, perhaps as an Appendix)

Items that should NOT be in a governance document

- conflicts with MUPIM and/or Divisional governance documents
- statements mandating salary/raise practices not based on merit or otherwise in conflict with University/Divisional standards (e.g. across-the-board salary raises or mandated special raises for people about to retire)
- inappropriate mandates for summer teaching assignments (e.g., "entitlements" for soon-to-retire faculty or other preferences not based on enrollment needs)
- statements on workload that are at odds with the teacher-scholar model for faculty development (i.e., this sort of research is encouraged, this sort is discouraged)
- excessively detailed procedures that are not in fact practiced
- references to specific sections of MUPIM by number (these are renumbered frequently and thus technically invalidate the departmental document)
Results of Focus Group Interactions

During the Spring semester, the Subcommittee met with several constituencies to gauge their reaction to the proposed checklist/template in Table 1 and obtain other pertinent feedback on departmental governance issues. In general, constituencies approved of the items in Table 1. What was especially gratifying was that Focus Groups provided ‘best practices’ feedback that will be extremely valuable as departments undergo the challenge of revising their governance documentation.

The CAS Committee on Women and People of Color (CWPC) provided to our Subcommittee a recommendation paper that reiterated the importance of department/discipline-based discussions on climate and diversity. These discussions should emphasize the inherent value of a diverse faculty and student in improving pedagogy and research within the disciplinary context. The CWPC drafted a sample departmental values statement and suggested procedures and ways in which departments can have frank and productive discussions on this critically-important aspect of academic culture, especially during the process of faculty recruiting (Appendix 2).

Similarly, the University Multicultural Council (UMC) emphasized to the Governance Subcommittee that departmental governance should be transparent and suggested that departments need to engage in conversations about climate and diversity issues within the context of their discipline. They provided a suggested framework for these discussions that we include in Appendix 3. To address the issue of outdated departmental governance documents, the UMC supported the notion that there should be an automatic time frame for procedural document revision established by the University – perhaps changes to MUPIM and/or a Divisional procedure should automatically trigger a review at the departmental level?

In two Open Forum meetings held in March 2006, Chairs and interested faculty shared several valuable insights with the Subcommittee. All agreed that effective shared governance is critically important at Miami, and that departmental governance documents need to mandate broad and inclusive faculty participation in important departmental tasks and service functions. In very small departments, that may mean that some non-essential committees and functions need to be eliminated or refocused. Chairs need to be able to do their jobs as leaders and governance documents should not needlessly handcuff the Chair.

Importantly, Open Forum participants addressed the issue of trust and process. Concerns were raised that if departments go through the considerable effort of revising their governance documents, positive and supportive feedback must be forthcoming from the Central Administration on their final documentation. That is, Chairs and faculty would like to see the process result in a closed loop. If a suggested departmental governance document template is adopted by Miami University (i.e., similar to our Table 1), and a department revises their department’s governance document to conform with the template, then the Central Administration should then affirm the document’s acceptability and validity.
Finally, Open Forum participants would like to see a more transparent and accessible governance documentation system at Miami University. It was suggested that all divisional and departmental governance documents, including statements on promotion and tenure criteria and evaluation of teaching performance, be made available on the Miami University website, preferably as PDF files or other easily downloadable formats.

The History department worked with the Governance Subcommittee as they successfully revised their Departmental Governance document during the 2005-06 academic year. In the process, the History department represented a successful ‘beta test’ of the governance document revision template outlined in Table 1. Their report on procedures they developed for reconsidering their Governance Document (Appendix 4) could provide a best-practices example for other Miami departments as they struggle with revising their own documents. The History Governance Committee and department Chair reported that the guidelines summarized in Table 1 were of value in focusing initial departmental discussions around critically-needed changes. They also reported that reaching departmental consensus at each step in the process was key to crafting a living, workable governance document that addresses the issues in Table 1 within the context of the History department’s disciplinary focus.

**Pertinent Literature on Creating Effective Departmental Governance Documents**

Our Subcommittee split into three subgroups to review literature sources on departmental governance issues for their applicability to the task of revising governance documents within the Miami University structure. Two important sources of information were identified from the Department Chair Online Resource Center of the American Council on Education (http://www.acenet.edu/resources/chairs).

Particularly useful at this website is the downloadable document “Developing Departmental Guidelines” under the heading “Department Chair Online Resource Center.” This excellent document provides suggested criteria and strategies for developing clear promotion and tenure guidelines as part of a governance document. Rather than prescribing either content or format, the document promotes interactive work among faculty, between faculty and Chair, as well as with Deans and Provosts. This process avoids hierarchy and informs deans and provosts about the individual unit’s priorities. This becomes the foundation for appropriate, clear, complete and useful promotion and tenure criteria. A second extremely useful article at the Department Chair Online Resource Center is “How to build a high-quality department?”, which is largely a bibliographic reference source for departmental development, including aspects of governance.

We also conducted a survey of other on-line and print documentation of possible use to Chairs and departmental faculty as they contemplate governance revision. A comprehensive website that deserves further study is the AAUP web site: http://www.aaup.org/governance/resources/index.htm.
Beyond that, we found several other good examples of department governance:

1. Procedures, Criteria, Standards, and Bylaws--Department of Art: Central Michigan University
   http://www.fps.cmich.edu/documents/art.pdf

2. Saddleback College Department Chair Handbook
   http://www.saddleback.edu/administration/instruction/documents/Department_Chair_Handbook_000.pdf

3. University of Nebraska English Dept. governance document
   http://www.unomaha.edu/english/govdoc.pdf

4. Department of Physics and Astronomy --Arizona State University

5. The Department of Second Language Studies -- University of Hawaii
   http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/handbook/governsls.html

6. Department of History-- University of North Carolina-Greensboro
   www.uncg.edu/his/docs/Governance%20Document.pdf

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

At present, departmental governance documentation at Miami University is uneven at best. A number of departments already possess excellent and effective governance procedures that could serve as models for implementing best practices in other departments. Unfortunately, many departments also have at least some governance document elements that are ineffective, outdated, or at odds with established policies in MUPIM and/or Divisional governance procedures. In addition, several departments apparently lack required documentation on promotion and tenure procedures and on evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Further, even though the great majority of departments that have these documents on file with the University Secretary/Provost, they are not currently linked in any tangible way to departmental governance documentation.

By analyzing existing documentation across the University, our Subcommittee was able to assemble what we hope is an effective and straightforward checklist/template outlining both positive and negative attributes of governance documentation. In the process, the tabular information we assembled (Appendix 1) for all Miami departments will allow Chairs and departmental faculty to compare and contrast their existing departmental documents in the context of documents from other cognate departments.

Collectively, this information on best practices already in use by cognate Miami departments, along with the feedback (Appendices) we received from Focus Groups, and the literature sources on governance documentation above, should permit departments to
critique and revise their governance documentation in a time-effective and collegial manner – *within the context of their individual discipline and departmental culture*. That is, departments can and should approach the task of governance documentation in the same spirit that they have already used to craft effective discipline-specific promotion and tenure documents and teaching evaluation plans. The result we envision would be a higher degree of consistency in governance across the University, more effective policy and procedure implementation within local departmental units – and much less valuable faculty time wasted on unproductive procedures and policies.

Finally, we urge the Central Administration to effectively partner with departments as they undertake a revision of governance documentation. Standards to be embraced should be clear and unambiguous, a reasonable timeline should be established for compliance, and in the end revised governance documentation produced by departments should be ratified and supported at both the divisional and central administration levels. To make governance documentation more transparent and accessible, we recommend that all divisional and departmental governance documentation, including statements on promotion and tenure criteria and teaching evaluation plans, be posted on the Miami University website as PDF files or other readily-downloadable format.

Respectfully Submitted

6 April 2006

The First in 2009 Subcommittee on Departmental Governance

David A. Francko, Chair
Robert Benson
Raymond Gorman
Patrick Haney
Charles Nies
Kate Rousmaniere
Douglas Troy
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Appendix 2: Feedback document from CAS Women/People of Color
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Appendix 4. History department: Memorandum on Procedures for Reconsidering a Departmental Governance Document
APPENDIX 1. Critiques of existing departmental governance documents, arranged by division

**College of Arts and Science**  
**Natural Sciences/Mathematics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOT</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X exemplary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No bads, good fac. mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Xgood</td>
<td>Xgood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X but need voting rules</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>fac mentors good salary good sum teaching doc, no bads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X but no voting</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no bads, good summer plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBI</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no mentoring Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>good mentor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>good mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOO</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>many good practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Physics and Psychology apparently do not have P/T or teaching evaluation statements on file. Geology is apparently missing its teaching evaluation plan.
### Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Climate</th>
<th>chair's role</th>
<th>workload</th>
<th>committees</th>
<th>voting</th>
<th>grievance</th>
<th>hiring/raises</th>
<th>regional/sum</th>
<th>good stuff</th>
<th>bad stuff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>only in the hiring section</td>
<td>clear statement for role of chairs in CAS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no/N.A.</td>
<td>yes/N.A. for raises</td>
<td>no/yes</td>
<td>role of G.A.s &amp; syllabi</td>
<td>not updated w/ new titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>not clear</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes/N.A. for raises</td>
<td>no/no</td>
<td></td>
<td>not updated w/ new titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>yes w/ expect. Of colleagues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes but hidden in committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>searches/ good</td>
<td>liaison/ good</td>
<td>link to prof org; eval; teach phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes, but not fully defined</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>faculty only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T process in committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>yes/voting process</td>
<td>no/ yes</td>
<td>defining leave expect</td>
<td>statement about voting on salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>limiting power</td>
<td>yes, plus process for dif. Require</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes-faculty,grad, ugrad</td>
<td>yes/</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T/no</td>
<td>a lot on paper - not in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC/GEN</td>
<td>In evaluations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>student part weak</td>
<td>part time &amp; visiting/h allocation</td>
<td>address relationship/yes</td>
<td>joint appt guides</td>
<td>grievance not updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPE</td>
<td>In grievance section</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>weak and not updated</td>
<td>limited/ no</td>
<td>yes/ yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>grievance not updated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Communications apparently does not have P/T or teaching statements on file; Soc/Geron is missing its P/T statement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>P/T?</th>
<th>Teach?</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Hiring/Eval?</th>
<th>Climate? Problems?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Some on hiring, yes on evaluation</td>
<td>NO Across the board salary, pp. 2-3; &amp; summer teaching preferences for retirees, p. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NO Summer teaching preference for retirees, p. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Sort of, in “purpose,” pp. 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish &amp; Portuguese</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; Italian</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Evaluation for promotion, but not really annual evaluation</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yes on hiring, not so much on annual evaluation</td>
<td>Salaries, p. 9 &amp; p. 12; &amp; summer teaching preference for retirees, p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Some on rules for voting in hiring; not so much on annual evaluation</td>
<td>To some extent, in “Mission,” p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### R.T. Farmer School of Business

**Departmental Governance Documents**

**Describe chair’s role in:**
- Hiring
- Annual evaluation of faculty and staff
- Mentoring (asst., assoc., & full professors)(VAP's & lectures)
- Salary recommendations --merit-based
- AFA/FIL recommendations__merit-based
- Teaching assignments
- Curriculum development
- Strategic and long-term planning
- Convening departmental meetings (& composition of dept membership)
- Interaction with regional campus faculty

**Committee composition, voting privileges (student?, VAPs?) and procedures:**
- P & T committee
- Search committee
- Grievance committee

**Personnel matters:**
- Promotion and tenure expectations
- Role of service and evaluation of service (& what “counts” toward P & T)
- Process for evaluation of teaching
- Annual evaluation process
- Hiring process
- Oxford faculty (refer to Acad. Affairs hiring procedures document)
- Regional campus faculty (refer to Acad. Affairs hiring procedures)
- Classified and unclassified staff (refer to…….)

**Diversity climate**

**What should not be included in governance document:**
- Across-the-board salary increments
- Inappropriate summer teaching "entitlements”, e.g., to raise salary base of those about to retire:
- Mandated (rather than flexible) teaching loads

**Approval of governance documents**
- Deans approve departmental
- Provost approves divisional

**Overload teaching permitted on any campus**
- Academic rank and length of service as a criterion in ARA.FILs
- Proficiency exams prohibited
- Equal teaching assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>BTE</th>
<th>DMS</th>
<th>ECO</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>MGT</th>
<th>MKT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Climate Statement</th>
<th>Role of Chair</th>
<th>Workload Stds</th>
<th>Committees/ Voting</th>
<th>Grievance Policies</th>
<th>Personnel &amp;Hiring</th>
<th>Regional Campuses</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC/ID</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes-exemplary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes for both procedure and standards; very specific; good criteria for P&amp;T in Appendix; doc could be reduced by references to MUPIM</td>
<td>N/A (No ARC or ID courses are offered on the regional campuses)</td>
<td>Out of compliance re: merit raises; no mentoring system defined; summer appt criteria well defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but not collected in one place: spread throughout document</td>
<td>Yes-exemplary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes for both procedure and standards; refers to SFA gov doc which refers to MUPIM; good criteria for P&amp;T</td>
<td>No – a problem given that there are substantial programs as well as FT and PT faculty on both regional campuses</td>
<td>No mentoring system defined; no summer appt criteria defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Poorly defined, especially in comparison to role of Asst Chair which is defined in detail; factual</td>
<td>No workloads defined at all, particularly troubling given the current distribution of teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but no published criteria for tenure or promotion; no description of how candidates are to be</td>
<td>No – yet there are music students as well as PT faculty on both regional campuses</td>
<td>No mentoring system defined; no summer appt criteria defined This document is in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>errors should be eliminated</td>
<td>evaluated</td>
<td>of serious overhauling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No workloads defined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes for procedure but no for standards; no criteria defined for scholarship or creative work</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Summer appt criteria should be clearer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School of Education and Allied Professions

EDL
- A very spare document.
- No climate/diversity statement as mission of department (the “16 Principles” of the department, available on the website and other documents, articulate this information, but maybe it should be in the Governance Document)
- No grievance procedure in the formal document (separate)
- No statement on hiring
- No statement on regional campus
- No statement on new faculty mentoring
- Teaching statement is in a separate document
- No salary or summer teaching information (specifics are left up to Chair)

EDP
- A very full document
- Includes student admissions procedures and retention issues, and graduate and undergraduate benchmarks
- Includes priorities for retiring faculty for overload and summer teaching

FSW
- An unusually packed full document including extremely meticulous details that in some cases tie the hands of the chair and faculty. For example:
  - Chair job is minimally described, with little identified authority
  - Maximums set for independent studies
  - Specific guidelines on where and how to publish
  - A faculty annual evaluation co. does annual evaluations and raises
  - Positions with required release time, such as library liaison and summer administrative coordinator.
- Summer teaching—preferences noted for retiring faculty

PHS
- Nothing on workload, grievance, mentoring, summer teaching, salary or teaching evaluations but a long section on rules for electing a University Senate rep.

EDT
- Good statement on mentoring and teaching evaluations
  - Statement on rights and responsibilities of each faculty member
School of Engineering and Applied Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MUPIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>refs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MME</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: teaching assessment documents apparently missing from CIT, CSA, ENT, MME, and PCE.
APPENDIX 2. Recommendations for Departmental Governance Documents
College of Arts & Science Committee on Women & People of Color

Sample values statement:
Diversity creates the opportunity for department members to recognize and learn from those who are socially different. This includes creatively expanding the discipline’s parameters and discourses, empowering the departmental workplace through mutual respect, strengthening teaching and advising through sensitivity to inclusion, and enriching collegial interaction through active engagement with difference. The Department of XX shall, as a result, incorporate diversity as an important criterion in hiring and retention practices and a key component of democratic and transparent decision making in the department.

Committee’s thinking about strategies for departmental discussion:
Each department document shall include a clear statement about diversity. This statement shall serve as a values statement (see sample, above) and would produce, specific plans, through discussion, for implementation of which programs and departments shall be accountable.

The statement will include a clear definition of diversity and climate and the procedures the department will use to strive for and meet clear goals for enhancing and maintaining diversity, for insuring that the department’s climate is welcoming and inclusive.

Possible strategic text for departmental governance documents:
Recruitment: Prior to the appointment of a search committee as searches begin, each department chair or program director should discuss and document with all faculty in the department or program the ways that a diverse pool of candidates and the hiring of diverse faculty could enhance the program and composition of the faculty. The conversation should make clear that the faculty understand the value of diversity (of ethnicity, gender, physical ability, religion, class, region, sexual orientation) for collegiality, curriculum, and interdisciplinary breadth. This discussion might take place in a department meeting, a chair’s advisory committee, and/or in department committees responsible for ensuring faculty diversity.

Following the department- or program-wide discussions, the chair or program director shall, when requesting a line or position, include one or more sentences in each position request that states ways the proposed position would help to diversify the department or program and a specific explanation of how the program or department plans to insure a diverse pool. The goal is not simply to have diverse candidates in the pool but to hire when possible.

In terms of procedures to insure a diverse pool, each department or program should operationalize specific steps and procedures (basic recommendations below):

Prior to a search:
• Meet with a representative of the Office of Equity & Equal Opportunity to review procedures
In building a large and diverse pool:

• Write advertisements that are more inclusive and welcoming

• Announce position in targeted outlets, such as caucuses of the American Association of Higher Education

• Make the announcement available to OEO for distribution at conferences

• List position in joint advertisements posted by the Department in appropriate outlets

• Use minority directories to identify possible candidates

• Use on-line postings in field-specific outlets, including any that are aimed at women or people of color

• Contact chairs or graduate study directors of doctoral programs that are known to have a high enrollment of minority students, such as HBCUs

• Contact individual faculty who train graduate students in the field, especially those who are themselves women or people of color

• Contact committees within the field that address minority or gender issues, not only to confer about specific candidates but also to discover current trends and issues

• Encourage all departmental faculty who have connections with prospective candidates to solicit applications from them

• Attend conferences to identify appropriate candidates, either through meeting likely applicants who are on the program or by seeking advice of those who train them

• Write individual letters seeking applications from identified candidates

In recruiting candidates:

• Develop standard questions and answers and use them with all candidates

• When setting up campus interviews, ask candidates what they would like to see or know about, then tailor the visit accordingly

• Introduce candidates to those in other departments with similar interests or situations during campus interviews

• Conduct informal exit interviews at the end of campus visit to identify areas of concern that might be addressed or make contact immediately following the interview to ask about questions or concerns

In the decision-making process:

• Request and review Applicant Flow Data Report from OEO

• Adopt clear criteria in advance for discussing candidates; explore these for gender or other bias

• Require full participation in the search process of all faculty who vote on a decision

• Allow any colleague to bring forward a name out of the pool for consideration by the department

• Ensure that all department members meet to discuss the hire

• Be prepared to seize opportunities that advance the goal of diversity
• Take all reasonable measures to speed up the search process so that offers can be made in a timely fashion

After an offer has been made:
• Encourage colleagues to contact the candidate
• Invite candidate for family and housing visit, and use it as a further recruitment effort by involving future colleagues in and out of department

At Program Review:
The department shall conduct an audit of its membership and determine ways to enhance its diversity and monitor its progress toward an always dynamic critical mass of diverse faculty. The department shall establish diversity goals and demonstrate how those goals have been advanced.
Appendix 3. Questions for Departmental Governance Subcommittee
From the University Multicultural Council regarding Climate

Introduction
☐ Have all faculty members been given their own personal copies?
☐ Have you provided opportunities for new members of the department to ask questions and make inquiries of governance procedures?
☐ Have you set in place a schedule whereby the governance document is periodically reviewed and revised by members of the department?
☐ Is your governance document easily accessible? Is it on the web?

Climate/Diversity Statement
☐ We recommend that rather than adopt another department’s or organization’s unit, your department hold a conversation to generate your own statement on inclusion. By doing this, you will be better assured of crafting a statement that fits your department’s future needs, anticipated mission and culture. One way of beginning that conversation is to consider that between now and 2015, 22% more students will probably enroll in college, reaching 16 million. Students of color, which have traditionally been a segment that under-enrolls in college, will represent 80% of the increase in college-aged students. Nearly 50% of this growth will be among Hispanic students, and 45% of those eligible to enroll will come from families with the lowest socioeconomic status. Given the changing demographics of college students, how can your department ensure that these students will be welcomed into the department and will be enriched to their fullest? Does the statement reflect a commitment to and the importance of diversity in enhancing the learning for all department members, faculty, staff, and students?

Workload Statement
☐ At colleges and universities across the country, research has shown that women faculty, ethnically diverse faculty, and other diverse faculty provide the majority of service – often not done out of malice but to insure diverse perspectives on departmental and university committees. How can you structure a workload statement that prevents this from occurring? How does the department support faculty career flexibility?

Policies and Practices
☐ Recent studies of the climate for women conducted at top universities demonstrate ongoing concerns, including salary inequities, and policies and practices that marginalize women faculty, often unintentionally. With that awareness do certain policies, procedures, or practices impact female and male faculty differently? Do policies, procedures, or practices reinforce stereotypes (e.g. women are better advisors)? Are there different expectations for faculty with children than faculty who are single (e.g. assumptions around teaching evening courses)? Are merit, P&T, and evaluation processes sensitive to the needs of those who take advantage of university’s policies that support new parents and others who utilize medical and personal leaves?
☐ Are personnel and hiring practices designed to be proactive (rather than passive)? Do they include effective procedures designed to increase the diversity of applicant pools?
APPENDIX 4.

MEMORANDUM ON PROCEDURES
FOR RECONSIDERING A DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT:
The History Department Example Submitted by J.P. Zinsser (Chair of the Committee)

Step I: The Choice of the Ad Hoc Committee
The Chair of the Department appointed the ad hoc committee to consider revision of the governance document. It was representative in a number of ways of department constituencies: non-tenured faculty, a former chair who had been involved in writing previous versions, a representative of the regional campuses, a full professor with a particular interest in constitutional documents. Each member could also be seen as representative of fields, and gender. The Chair served ex officio.

Step II: The Charge to the Committee [See Attachment A]
The Chair of the Department and the chair of the Committee met to write the charge for the group’s deliberations and to plan a tentative schedule for completion of the tasks. In the charge, these tasks were carefully divided and delineated, to indicate that the Department would have opportunities for discussion and voting in the course of the process, not just at the end of the Committee’s work. The charge itself was presented (unofficially) to the proposed members of the Committee, and then to the Department at its first meeting in August, 2005 for approval. As a result of discussion, the process of review and revision was defined as two separate phases, with approval given only for Phase I—to review the current governance document in line with current departmental needs and practices, and to bring it into conformity with University practices. Only after this, did the Committee, now formally constituted and charged, have its first meeting.

Step III: The Process of Review and Revision [See Attachments B, C and D]
At its first meeting, the Committee agreed to work by consensus, and to complete Phase I by the October Department meeting. Each member annotated the governance document to indicate: provisions out of line with current practice; areas of significance that we would want to discuss and investigate further; areas identified by the University Subcommittee on Departmental Governance chaired by Associate Dean Francko. Having done this, we compared our document to MUPIM, and then proceeded to study governance documents from other comparable departments.

At the beginning of October we circulated an annotated version of the governance document with suggestions for “minor” additions and changes in conformity with Phase I of the charge. We also suggested “longer” additions that we believed should be added. Finally, we indicated in blue areas that we would study should the department authorize Phase II, a more extensive review of the document. At its October meeting, the Department accepted our recommendations and authorized us to go on to Phase II.

Phase II meant the drafting of new paragraphs in a number of areas: 1) to conform to University policies and practices (for example, the Department had no grievance procedure); 2) to alter or amend practices (for example, the voting procedures for departmental hires); 3) to fill gaps not covered by MUPIM (for example, relations with Regional Campus faculty, and spousal hires). The new complete draft of the document was ready for departmental review and discussion by the beginning of January. Again, the draft was annotated, and a cover letter included to indicate changes and to highlight
those of more significance. The Department could vote on it provision by provision or on the changes as a whole.
ATTACHMENT A:

Charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance – Fall 2005

I request that in order to bring out governance document up to date and to change, amend, or modify it as appropriate and ad hoc Committee on Governance be convened with the following charge, to:

- Create a mechanism for facilitating open discussions among members of the department about the ways we are currently governed and for making suggestions for changes in our governance process, where desirable.
- Create a timetable for review, revision, and approval of new governance document for the department.
- Review the current governance document in line with current needs and practices in the department.
- Review the current governance document, informed by practices in comparable departments, both within the university and in benchmark institutions.
- Formulate proposals for revisions to the document, informed by faculty sentiment.
- Facilitate an open process of departmental review and discussion of governance document revisions.

Further, I propose that the committee consist of the following members:
- Judith Zinsser (chair)
- Michael Carrafiello
- Steve Norris
- Allan Winkler
- Mary Cayton (ex officio)
ATTACHMENT B

3 October 2005

Dear Colleagues,

Attached you will find a copy of the department governance document. There also will be one in your mailbox. This multi-colored wonder represents Phase I of the charge given to the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance.

- Review the current governance document in line with current needs and practices in the department
- Review the current governance document, informed by practices in comparable departments within the university

Since receiving our charge, we have met and gone over our governance document and compared it with those of four departments: Psychology, English, Political Science and Management. We did not look at governance documents outside of the university because we learned that the Provost has established a university-wide committee for this purpose.

We identified and have indicated in the copy you have received three kinds of changes that would be made in line with Phase I of our charge.

- Minor additions to conform to current practices – indicated in bold in the text
- Minor deletions to conform to current practices – indicated in the text with a line through the words to be deleted
- Longer additions that we recommend be added to conform to general university practices – indicated at the end of a paragraph as Add:…

These are the items that we would like the department to discuss at the meeting on 12 October from 2-3:30. At the next formal meeting of the department on 26 October, we will ask you to decide whether or not you approve of the changes indicated, and to authorize us to formulate language for those items we believe need to be added.

What does all this blue mean? These are areas that we have identified as part of the more extensive review that would constitute Phase II of the charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance. At the formal department meeting on 26 October, we will also ask you to consider whether or not you wish to authorize us to go on to Phase II.

Judith P. Zinsser, chair of committee
Michael Carrafiello
Steve Norris
Allan Winkler
Mary Cayton (ex officio)
ATTACHMENT C

Dear Colleagues,

At the department meeting on 26 October, you will be asked to consider two questions concerning the department “Constitution and Rules”:

1. The Committee on Governance has completed Phase I of its charge. It recommends
   - Approval for the minor additions and deletions **bolded** or **struck out** in the accompanying copy of our Constitution
   - Approval for further discussion and addition of some procedures, such as for Grievances, to bring our Constitution into conformity with University guidelines, indicated in the attached draft as **To add after discussion**.

2. The Committee asks approval to proceed to Phase II of its charge:
   - Review the current governance document, informed by practices in comparable departments, both within the university and in benchmark institutions.
   - Formulate proposals for revisions to the document, informed by faculty sentiment.
   - Facilitate an open process of departmental review and discussion of governance document revisions.

Judith P. Zinsser, chair
Michael Carrafiello
Steve Norris
Allan Winkler
Mary Cayton (ex officio)
ATTACHMENT D

3 March 2006

Dear Colleagues,

Attached you will find the revised Governance Document. As with previous drafts, the deletions are indicated by strikeouts. The changes have been bolded. Rather than vote on each separate change, we would like to follow the same procedure as with the Graduate Program Revisions. We would like to draw your attention to the major changes, discuss them after Spring Break, and then at a subsequent meeting of the Department vote on the document as a whole.

The following are the substantive changes:

B1 The number of Departmental officers has been expanded.

B3a The duties and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee have been consolidated and the relationship with the Chair clarified.

B3d The Speakers Committee’s responsibilities have been expanded.

B3e For Ad Hoc Search Committees there are a number of changes:
  • the role of the Ad Hoc Search Committees in the recommendation of candidates has been modified
  • a graduate student liaison chosen from among the Ph.D. students added.
  • guidelines for Spousal/Partner hires have been formulated
  • provision has been made for voting by e-mail attachment

B3g A Regional Campus Affairs Committee has been created to meet the new University guidelines and to reflect the mission of the Regional Campuses

B3h In conformity with University guidelines, there is now a Grievance Procedure for Students and Faculty (See also Appendix C on Student Grievance Procedures).

D. An amendment procedure has been added, and a requirement for periodic review of the Governance Document.

Appendices A and B now show the most recent version of the consolidated Guidelines for all history faculty for tenure and promotion. These Guidelines have also been brought into conformity with University policies. They will need to be approved in a separate meeting of the P & T Committee.