

Group 1: Overarching Changes

Recommendation	Rationale	Proposed Language
<p>Replace the language that is currently in all committee charges regarding the timing for selection of chair(s) so that it is flexible based on an individual committee’s need. The language currently states that the chair will be elected at the first meeting of fall term. That does not work or work best for all committees.</p>	<p>This language is unnecessarily specific. A blanket statement that committees should elect the chair or co-chairs based on its own needs would be more appropriate and provide for necessary fluctuations. For example, FPC needs to have the next year’s chair identified before the end of an academic year in case an expedited tenure case arises during the summer. Further, there are committees that don’t meet in earnest until the winter and could wait to select chairs until then.</p>	<p>“The committee [council] shall elect a chair(s) from among its voting members at the first possible meeting of a new majority, usually at the first meeting of fall term. In situations where the chair from the prior year is still a member of the committee, that person remains the chair until a new chair is elected.”</p>
<p>Always list ex officio members with an “or designee” option.</p>	<p>Many of the administrators listed as ex officio members may be unable to fulfill their duties due to time, or may prefer to have a separate point person from their department as the committee representative due to expertise. This has always been an accepted practice and this would just codify language to align with practice.</p>	<p>Add “or designee” after individually listed ex officio members.</p>
<p>Modify reporting requirements so that committees are not required to submit an annual report if they have nothing to report (e.g., did not meet or act on anything substantive), reported throughout the year, or are advisory only (e.g., FAC).</p>	<p>Many committees do not send reports and senate leadership has not ever really followed up on this. And what would happen if one wasn’t submitted? Requiring committees to submit reports when they have nothing much to say is simply creating work for already-taxed committee members, committee support staff, and senate staff. Further, the senate can always request a report—orally or in writing—if a committee is working on a topic of particular interest and doesn’t proactively offer one.</p>	<p>“Committees and councils shall provide the senate with an oral or written report regarding substantive work it undertakes in a timely fashion. This does not preclude the senate from requesting an oral or written report from a committee as it deems necessary or appropriate.”</p> <p><i>Note: could still formally require annual reports from certain committees where written annual reports were a must-do. (Though it’s likely that those committees would do one anyway, or report regularly to the senate.)</i></p>
<p>Allow Senate Executive Coordinator to make technical changes to committee 17-point charts.</p>	<p>Titles and department names change frequently, which is the most common technical change that would be required. Other examples might be changing</p>	<p>“The Senate Executive Coordinator (SEC) shall have authority to make technical edits and changes to committee charges and related documents. Such changes might</p>

	<p>“NTTF” to “Career Faculty” or other such changes to align with modern nomenclature. Going through a senate motion to amend a 17-point chart for such changes is a waste of time.</p>	<p>include, but are not limited to, typographical errors or updating titles and unit names which have changed.”</p>
<p>When titles are used, add “or equivalent”</p>	<p>Similar to the technical changes provision, titles often change. The point is clarity around the <i>type</i> of role that should be appointed. This is less necessary if the SEC can make technical changes.</p>	<p>Add “or equivalent” as appropriate</p>
<p>Provide senate leadership with the ability to make a committee inactive</p>	<p>Sometimes the need for a committee goes away, or at least for a certain period of time, yet the committee remains active and is thus subject to appointment needs, meetings, reporting, etc. It would be helpful if senate leadership could render a committee inactive. Inactive status would not disband the committee, thus signaling that the work may be needed in the future but would clearly indicate that certain work is not needed related to that committee (e.g., website updates, appointments, etc.). If a committee is inactive for multiple years, that could serve as an informative signal to the senate that perhaps it could sunset altogether. If there is discomfort with leadership having this authority solely, perhaps it could be written with ratification by senate exec. Any senate president at any time could reactivate it.</p>	<p>“The senate president and vice president may elect to render a committee inactive, after consultation with a previous chair of said committee, and with majority agreement of the Senate Executive Committee. Such action does not disband a committee. The senate president may at any time reactivate a committee.”</p>