The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Acting Chair Gapko at 3:03 p.m. on Tuesday, February 7, 2006 in the Presidents Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of December 6, 2006 approved with header correction on pages 2 through 4

2. Open Forum
   - No items

3. Review of tentative agenda for February 14, 2006 meeting of University Senate
   - Approved as distributed conditional on action by Executive Committee on tentative motion

4. Continued Discussion of Academic Program Chart
   - Discussion timely as Board of Regent agenda this week includes item on streamlining academic program planning and review process
   - Proposal resulted from shared governance group looking at ways to make institution more nimble and able to respond to change
     - Started with current undergraduate program change action chart
       - Streamlined to process of delegated authority with checks and balances
       - Decentralized from Senate to other smaller bodies for more focused, informed discussion
     - Salient features
       - Idea of faculty responsibility not eliminated, only streamlined where appropriate
       - Removes linear progression to speed process
       - Allows colleges to set own structure
       - Any controversial actions can be brought forward to University Senate or University Faculty in an expedited timeframe
       - Specific offices are given responsibility to forward revisions to Academic Affairs
   - Pros
     - Any issue on which there is an objection comes back to faculty
   - Cons
     - Many faculty don’t pay attention; need to change that so they don’t miss curricular changes
     - Chart does not include everyone that should be consulted, just who initiates revisions and who must act on them in some way
   - Proposal is starting point, should not reject for implementation issues that can be worked out
   - List developed to show chart revisions – some of redundancy of original chart removed
   - Dean and college are single entity in new proposal – administrative role of dean not replaced in proposed plan
   - Looks like departments can be established and eliminated without dean approval
• Intent is to integrate – curricular items would be sent to dean and must go through some faculty mechanism and also be approved by dean
  • Perhaps that needs to be made more clear
  • Administration responsible to look at resources; chairs and deans not locked out
• “I” designates information, but there is also an approval process involved; may need stronger term
• “I” means it is shared for information, but if there are any objections, then issue goes to larger audience – University Senate
• Allows item to go to deans and APC at same time – if there is disagreement, it goes to University Senate
• Not sure of University Senate role if objection is matter of resources
  • See two types of issues covered on chart – those that are curricular in nature and those involving organization of institution
  • Perhaps those should be separated out
  • Uncomfortable that individual departments do not seem to have voice in their own existence
• Could probably never be able to eliminate departments if that action required approval by that department
• Review and possible overruling by University Senate of actions not approved by deans ties hands of administrators so they can’t do their job
• One section does include that dean approval required
• Items not implemented because of resources probably should be taken to higher level for discussion about resources
  • Need to prioritize and figure out where to spend resources
  • Priorities ought to be something into which faculty have major input
• In old chart all University Senate actions are recommendations to chancellor; that part not being removed
• Role of chancellor indicated in role of provost; needs to be made more explicit in proposed chart
• Some of old language under asterisks should be included in implementation paragraph
• “A” in charts means an action that must be voted on by some body; “I” intended to share results of committee action and see if there are objections – could improve words used
• See problem if someone is confused or has questions about ramifications, but not really an objection – do they need to frame it as an objection to hear more?
• Can call for clarification, which may rise to level of an objection
• Often programs with resource implications are approved at Senate level
  • Means Senate apparently believed they were worth resources
  • Then chancellor, provost, and dean would have to work out resource piece
• Like idea of decisions being made close to program concerned
  • If deans’ objections based on resources, often faculty don’t have enough of resource piece to have productive conversation
• May need to go to level above colleges on resource questions if is matter of external reallocation between colleges
• One of difficulties provost has in voting on APC is that decision on program might be right academically, but budget will not allow such action; decisions cannot be made in vacuum
• Can’t forget that faculty have primary, although not exclusive, responsibility for curriculum
• Proposal would make decisions close to people who know
• Seems old chart basically followed in cases where there are objections
  • If no objection, then go through streamlined new chart
• Could save lots of meetings where in past just said okay and moved many proposals through committees
• If this proposal approved, Chapter 7 on function of APC would be entirely different than role contained in Chapter 3
• Things like that would have to be considered once general principles of new chart determined
• Streamlining not intended to disempower – looking to future; may not be able to survive if don’t do some of these things to be more nimble and efficient
• May work as long as there is good communication, especially about implementation
  • Information coming to registration often fragmented
• Bold boxes indicate who is responsible for implementation and dissemination to involved parties
• Many items brought to Curriculum Committees go back to departments with questions or concerns; just forwarding may not be sufficient
• Not intended to be rubber stamp; at all steps would expect proposals to be reviewed
• Seems it is in organizational changes where people are being disempowered
• Senator Wick will convene subcommittee of Dean Christian, Senator Hollon, and Senator Russell to reexamine and revise proposed chart

5. Discussion of Administrators Voting on Committees
• Provost brought up issue at last meeting and again today about administrators with final veto voting on items as they progress through committees
  • Odd to vote on committee and in end be administrator responsible for approving final action
  • Made up list of all committees, and possible changes to make administrators ex officio non-voting members
• Seems we just had this whole conversation last spring
• Several people this fall, including provost, have brought issue back because they felt administrators had role beyond committee meetings as part of shared governance process
• Can continue discussion at another time if so desired

6. Miscellaneous Business
• None

7. Announcements
• Faculty Representative Wick, Academic Staff Representative Blackstone, Vice Chancellor Soll, Provost Tallant and Foundation President Halberg to attend Board of Regents meeting on Thursday and Friday; chancellor will be keynote speaker at conference in Colorado but will report on regent meeting at Senate on Tuesday

Meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary of the University Senate