REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE TASK FORCE TO REVIEW THE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Senate President, Claudia Baldwin, appointed a Task Force to review the governance documents for the departments and colleges at Iowa State University. Concerns over inconsistent contents surfaced during some grievance and appeal cases. These concerns led to the desire to start a review process to determine if the corresponding department or college documents contained all the information that is required or suggested in the Faculty Handbook and if the documents were consistent.

TASK FORCE CHARGE

The charge that was given to the task force is quoted below:

"***Rationale:**

The purpose of the proposed Task Force on Governance Documents is threefold:

1. *To ensure that department and college governance documents are consistent with the expectations of shared governance as delineated in the Faculty Handbook;*

2. *To confirm that the practice of shared governance is recognized and valued at all levels of the institution;*

3. *To develop a process that affords the prerogative of shared governance to all faculty [members].*

***Summary Charge Statement:**

The Task Force on Governance Documents is charged with developing a procedure for the ongoing review of department and college governance documents and with reviewing the governance documents of departments and colleges.

Commentary to Charge:

The task force will review governance documents to identify inconsistencies in the governance documents of departments within a college and to identify inconsistencies between department governance documents and their college document. The review will be guided by the standards of care found in such governance procedures as set forth by the ISU Faculty Senate and by suggestions promulgated by the AAUP and other similar organizations. The review will focus on consistency of college and department documents with respect to areas such as, but not limited to shared governance, promotion and tenure processes, post tenure review and voting procedures.

The Task Force will not focus on the delineation of uniform topics or criteria for the governance document of each [academic unit] nor will the task force undertake policy-making. It is also not the charge of the task force to review subject matter within the auspices of the P & T Task Force; however, the Governance Documents Task Force will benefit from the newly reconciled issues undertaken by the P & T Task Force."

TASK FORCE'S WORK AND PROCESS

The Task Force's work and process consisted of the following activities:
- Obtained a copy of each department's and college's governance document,
- Determined the significant items to review in all the documents,
- Divided and assigned the review of the documents to the Task Force Members,
- Reported the results by each Task Force member of their reviews to the Task Force for discussion,
- Compiled the findings in a compendium matrix spreadsheet for all departments and colleges,
- Recommended future activities, including a series of recommendations for continued future reviews and possible compliances,
- Developed new bylaw language to satisfy the need for the continued review.

FINDINGS

Table 1 shows the tabulation of sections of the Faculty Handbook that were the major focal point of the Task Force's review for each governance document. The criteria for including these focal point sections:
- recent legislation by the Faculty Senate,
- procedures for the P and T process,
- requirements for non-tenure appointments and advancement,
- experiences from the appeals process

Table 1. Matrix of Governance Document Review:

ITEM FOR REVIEW	CRITERIA IN DOCUMENT?	CRITERIA IS MISSING	CRITERIA NEEDS UPDATING	Handbook Section
Double Voting				Good practice status from previous Senate

				Policy in 2006 – Senate passed final Handbook language 2/13/07
PRS Process				5.1.1.5
Post Tenure Review Proc.				5.3.5
P&T Review				5.2.4.1
Non-Ten. Track- Initial Appointments				3.3.2.2 - 3.3.6
Non-Ten. Sr. Lecture Rev.				5.4
Non-Ten. Other proc.'s				5.4
Policy for 3yr. review				5.1.1.3
Administrator review proc.'s				5.1.2
Other criteria: _____				

The headings across the top of Table 1 were for the purpose of the input from each member of the Task Force for the tabulation of the completeness and correctness of the respective topical item as found in the governance document for that department or college being reviewed.

Table 2 shows a compendium of the findings for each department and college reviewed using the topics and criteria shown in Table 1. For each college, and the departments of that college, a Task Force member was assigned the responsibility for a comprehensive review of the associated governance documents. The results of that review were summarized and presented to the entire Task Force. The contents of Table 2 are a compilation of the summaries and thus reflect interpretations by the individual task force members assigned to each college of the contents of the documents.

Note particularly in Table 2, the last tabular row showing the "% complete". These percentages, in general indicate that there is significant work that needs to be done by departments and colleges to update their governance documents. The following topics show only the indicated percentages of the university governance documents that follow the faculty handbook topics:

- Double voting – 20% (note, the lack of compliance with the double voting prohibition is in many cases because that requirement was only adopted in February of this current year)
- PRS process – 47%,
- Post tenure review process – 61%,
- Promotion and Tenure (P & T) review – 89%,
- Non-tenure track initial appointments – 64%,
- Non-tenure senior lecturer review process – 67%,
- Other procedures for the non-tenure track appointments – 59%,
- Policies for the three-year review – 56%,

- Review of the cognizant Administrator – 67%, and
- Overall compliance and consistency with the Faculty Handbook – 59%.

Updating these documents is extremely important in order to avoid grounds for grievances and appeals due to a possible flawed process caused by inconsistencies in the contents of our university's governance documents. An overall consistency and compliance with the Faculty Handbook of only 59% opens the door to many potential grievances or appeals. Corrective action is urgently needed as soon as possible.

Criteria Complete in Document	Double Voting	PRS Process	Post Tenure Review Proc.	P&T Review	Non-Ten. Track-Initial App.	Non-Ten. Sr. Lecture Rev.	Non-Ten. Other Procs.	Policy for 3 yr. Review	Administrator Review Proc.'s	% Complete
College of Agriculture	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Ag & Biosystems Engineering	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Ag Education & Studies	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	**33**
Agronomy	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Food Science and Human Nutrition	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Entomology	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**11**
Horticulture	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Plant Pathology	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	**56**
Genetic Development & Cell Biology	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Natural Resource Ecology & Mgmt.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**100**
Animal Sci (revision not available as of 3/07)										
College of Business	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**100**
Accounting	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	**89**
Finance	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	**89**
LOMIS	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	**89**
Management/ Marketing	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	**78**
College of Design	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Landscape Architecture	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	**67**
Community and Regional Planning	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**33**
Art and Design	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	**67**
Architecture	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	**22**
College of Engineering	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	**33**
Aerospace Engineering	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	**67**
Chemical and Biological Engineering	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Civil, Construction and Environmental	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	**78**
Electrical & Computer Engr.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	**22**
Industrial Manufacturing Systems Engrg.	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	**56**
Materials Science & Engineering	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	**67**
Mechanical Engineering	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	**67**
College of Human	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**11**

Sciences

Human Development and Family Studies	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Apparel Ed Studies & Hosp. Mgmt.	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Curriculum & Instruction	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Educational Leadership and Policies Studies	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	**44**
Health and Human Performance	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	**78**
College of LAS - General Assembly	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	**22**
BBMB	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	**78**
Chemistry	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	**22**
Computer Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Economics	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	**78**
Ecology, Evol. & Organismal Biology	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	**78**
English	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	**67**
Foreign Languages & Literatures	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**11**
Geological & Atmospheric Sciences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**11**
Greenlee School of Journalism	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Math	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	**78**
History	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	**33**
Music	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Philosophy & Religious Studies	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	**78**
Physics	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**78**
Political Science	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**11**
Psychology	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**56**
Sociology	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	**33**
Statistics	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	**56**
Anthropology	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Library	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	**89**
College of Vet Med	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**89**
Veterinary Clinical Sciences	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**22**
Vet Micro & Preventive Medicine	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	**56**
Vet Diag & Production Animal Medicine	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	**44**
Vet Pathology	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	**22**
Biomedicial Sciences	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	**33**
% Complete	**21**	**49**	**66**	**89**	**66**	**69**	**61**	**56**	**67**	**60**

Key: 1 = Present, clear, complete
 0 = Not present, not clear, or not complete

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTIONS

The Task Force on Review of Governance Documents recommends the following courses of action:

1. That the findings shown in this report are to be distributed to all departments and colleges with a joint request from the President, Provost, and the Senate that all governance documents be updated to include the provisions that are in need of correction to be consistent and comply with the requirements of the Faculty Handbook. The corrective action is urgently needed as soon as possible.

2. That the Bylaws of the Senate be changed to include a standing committee under the Governance Council that would continue this review process and that all college and departments would receive a periodic review by this new standing committee. A draft of the proposed bylaw changes is shown below: (shown in italics in the format of the committees for the bylaws)

3. The Task Force recommends that all the governance documents contain language specifying that if conflicts exist among department, college, and university documents (e.g. Faculty Handbook), the higher administrative level document shall prevail. The lower level administrative document, however, can be more restrictive as long as it does not negate the requirements of the higher document.

Proposal for Governance Document Review Committee

The Governance Document Review Committee will report to the Governance Council.

Charge: Monitors college and department governance documents; informs departments and colleges of new legislation to be included in governance documents; provides assistance to units on questions regarding governance policy issues; and conducts ongoing reviews of governance documents.

Membership—Voting: The voting members of the committee will be the chair, four additional representatives, and the chair of the Governance and Document Committee.

Non voting: ex-officio members will be a representative from the Provost Office and the chair of the Governance Council.

Respectfully submitted by the task force members:

Dorothy Fowles
David Holger
Cynthia Jeffrey
Tom Loynachan
John Mayfield
Jim McKean
Peter Reilly
Carl Smith
Denise Vrchota
Max Porter, Chair
April 14, 2007 /Editorial by EB May 8 & Sept. 4