

# College of Arts and Sciences Reorganization Working Group on Faculty Shared Governance

## Report of Recommendations to Provost Russell Moore

University of Colorado Boulder  
December 13, 2019

### Introduction

During the 2018-2019 academic year, the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) should examine how such a change might be implemented. Below is the report of one of those working groups to

examine how such a change might be implemented. Below is the report of one of those working groups to the College of Arts and Sciences Reorganization Working Group on Faculty Shared Governance which has been charged with examining what faculty governance in the College of Arts and Sciences should look like under this proposed new model, which would involve, in WKH 3URYRVW¶V ZRUGV authority from the current dean to new deans of the current CAS divisions (Arts and Humanities, 6RFLDO 6FLHQFHV 1DWXUDO 6FLHQFHV

The Governance Working Group consisted of the following members:

- x Justin Desautels-Stein (Law)
- x Bob Ferry (History; Boulder Faculty Assembly)
- x Nicholas Flores (Economics)
- x Nils Halvorsen (Astrophysical and Planetary Sciences)
- x Catherine Labio (English)
- x Laura Michaelis (Linguistics)
- x Stephen Mojzsis (Geological Sciences; Arts and Sciences Council)
- x Bernadette Park (Psychology and Neuroscience)
- x Paul Sutter (History)

Facilitators:

- x Michele Moses (Chair; Education; Faculty Affairs)
- x Emily CoBabe-Ammann (Research and Innovation Office)
- x Jeffrey Cox (English; Academic Affairs)

Nota Bene : As a matter of faculty governance, we would like to underscore that this report is intended to offer general principles and suggestions. We strongly recommend that before any changes are considered or taken up, CAS faculty be given an opportunity to weigh in and vote on any changes to the CAS faculty governance organization. Accordingly, the recommendations herein are meant in the spirit of collaboration. The faculty governance organization that is proposed will need to be vetted, negotiated, and owned by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in collaboration with the provost and the CAS deans.



## Principles

### 1. *Deliberative Foundations*

*Participation in faculty governance is based on democratic principles. These include (i) fairness*

(all faculty members seek reciprocal relationships and fair terms of social cooperation, in the

form of providingT /TT4 11 ( )JTJ ET Q q 0 0 612 792 re W\* n BT /TTcBT /TT4 11-11 (u( )5 (d)-11 )-4 (t)5 (y (s )



has an organizational structure and scope of oversight comparable to those of our ASC. The Dornsife Faculty Council President and Vice President collaborate with the dean, and the Council is divided into caucuses with specific charges, e.g., for distinct employment tracks, for diversity/equity/inclusion, for salary and merit issues, and for advocacy and oversight. In addition, Council members are directly elected rather than appointed from the larger academic senate; they are selected from each of the three divisions (Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences) by vote of divisional .97 Td (a)-11 (d)-11 (i)-4 dnd-11 (a)11 (l1 ET Q 5ut4 (l)5 (n)-12 (o)ut4 (l)5



elect their representatives to the ASFS. In addition to an elected representative from each department, we recommend the divisional/school election of additional members to ensure a sufficient number of representatives to staff the committees and provide divisional/school representation on all committees. We imagine these additional representatives coming either from larger departments that are given more than one representative to reflect the size of their faculty or as at-large members elected by the entire faculty of the CAS.

See Figure 2, below.

## Figure 2. Recommended Faculty Governance Structure

To ensure effective faculty governance, it is important that the bylaws of both the ASFS and the School Councils make explicit where they have a determining role and where they act in an advisory capacity to one or more deans. A process for regularly making motions and taking votes on key issues should be established.

We recognize that there are faculty members who may have little faith in faculty governance on our campus. However, the culture around faculty governance can be changed by having these boore these odeve that



revisions to the minimum minor requirements  
revisions to the general degree requirements of the College of Arts and Sciences

While our working group seriously considered other models that devolved even more curricular authority to divisional/school levels, in the end we felt strongly that college-wide curricular review would be essential to maintaining a system of checks and balances that not only protects the liberal arts mission of the CAS, but also encourages interdisciplinarity.

- x *Budget* ±We recommend that we retain an ASFS Budget Committee that advises the Executive Dean on that portion of the overall college budget that does not get devolved to the schools. School Chairs and Directors Councils will work with Deans of Schools to advise on divisional/school budgets.
- x *Planning* ±We recommend that the Planning Committee as it was under the ASC be disbanded and that its functions be folded into the ASFS Executive Committee (see below)
- x *Academic Community and Diversity* ±We recommend that we keep this as a college-wide committee under the ASFS.
- x *Grievances* ±We recommend that we keep this a college-wide committee under the ASFS.
- x *Online Education and Information Technology* ±This committee will, in coordination with the Curriculum Committee and its school-specific subcommittees, approve new online offering and make sure that our online offerings, like the rest of our curriculum, remain under the power of the faculty.<sup>4</sup>
- x *Academic Ethics* ±We recommend that we keep this at the ASFS level.
- x *Appeals Committee on Academic Rules and Policies* ±We recommend that we keep this at the ASFS level.
- x *Honors Council* ±We recommend that we retain this at the ASFS level.



#### Charge 4: How the Newly Proposed Governance Structures Would Interface with Campus -Wide Faculty Shared Governance

o2-.d [(s)9

We would like to underscore that cooperation between campus and college/school governance bodies is essential to faculty governance across the university.

Even though our two-tiered faculty governance system ±campus-wide and college/school governance bodies ±seems to be unusual within the PAC12, we recommend keeping it. Many of the problems that arise in relation to faculty governance are college-specific and best dealt with at that level. However, some are campus specific or joint. A two-tiered system can handle the wide variety of problems that arise more effectively and can provide a stronger response ever at ldre e

x A

(E) In the selection and evaluation of department chairs and academic administrators, the faculty shall collaborate with the campus and system administrations in the development of recommendations for submission to the Board of Regents or its designee(s).

(F) In establishing and reviewing budget policies and plans for resource allocation, the faculty shall collaborate with the campus or system administration in the development of recommendations to the chancellor or the president, as appropriate, for submission to the Board of Regents. This includes review for new academic degree program proposals, academic program review, and program discontinuance.

(G) In the preparation of budgets, the administration shall have the principal role, with early collaboration with the appropriate faculty governance unit(s), subject to the ultimate authority of the Board of Regents or its designee(s).

(H) In the making of other policy concerning the general academic welfare of the university, the faculty shall collaborate with the administration in developing recommendations to the president for submission to the Board of Regents.

(I)