

CLAS MOPP Revision Proposal

Concerns and Responses

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Fall 2023

Values guiding this revision

- **Transparency is essential**
 - The operations of the college need to be visible, clear, and consistent.
- **Importance of shared governance**
 - Committees operate optimally when they know their function and how they interconnect.
- **Elevating Faculty Assembly**
 - The voice of the body needs to reach collegiate leadership.
- **Giving staff a voice**
 - Staff can facilitate their own governance without faculty approval.
- **Positioning CLAS to be relevant and successful**
 - CLAS needs to be aligned with UI and collegiate operations to ensure a strong future.
- **Elevate the voice of instructional track faculty**
 - Expand opportunity for ITF to be part of shared governance structures by including them on Executive Committee

More on Transparency and Shared Governance

- The shared governance bodies of CLAS and the dean's office need to be in constant communication
 - History of the dean's office not being engaged with FA for over 10 years
- The new MOP is placing a greater emphasis on transparency and shared governance
 - Policies are *written down* and on policy website
 - Agenda Planning Committee is emphasized
 - Dean and associate deans as partners with faculty, departments and shared governance bodies to ensure an active feedback loop

Most acute concerns

- Speed of process
- Separating policy and procedure
- Representation
- Dean as co-chair of the Faculty Assembly
- The role of CLAS shared governance as advisory
- Election process and secret ballots
- Removal of appointed committees
- Change in the role of FA in proposing and approving amendments

Speed of process

Concerns

- Why does this feel rushed?
- What is the urgency?
- What else are you trying to rush through?

Responses

- The CLAS MOPP has not been in alignment with the UI or other colleges for years. We've been asked by UI leadership to address this after the document has been further reviewed by OGC and Provost office. A prime example of a concern is the amendment and revision process.
- Due to inconsistencies and errors, the college doesn't have a functional MOPP – which makes it challenging for the departments and college to operate. It also leads to confusion for shared governance bodies. The sooner we can fix it the better for the entire operation.
- The Office of the Dean and EC began this process in February and solicited input over the summer from faculty through surveys and focus groups and are continuing that feedback process now.
- We have extended the timeframe to ensure opportunities for departmental conversation on how shared governance structures operate in CLAS and the MOPP.

Separation of policy and procedure

Concerns

- Separating policy and procedure in the new MOP will take away faculty influence on policy.
- Policies may be changed without faculty input or awareness.

Response

- CLAS has a clear process for revising or creating policy. Policies associated with undergraduate and graduate curriculum are approved through UEPC and GEPC. College level policies, such as DEO policies or policies that impact departments, are approved through EC. That will continue. FA has historically been asked to provide feedback for some policy changes or informed of policy changes after one of the other elected shared governance bodies has passed the policy change.
- The current MOPP does not and never has captured most collegiate policies, meaning faculty and shared governance have not had influence over those areas including HR, finance, research, grievance, promotion/tenure.
- CLAS does not have a history of writing down policies which has changed since 2020 when the policy site was developed. This site was designed to ensure transparency among faculty and consistency between departments.
- CLAS policies are more transparent, documented, and accessible than ever before via the [policy website](#). That will continue with this revision and will continue to expand.

Representation in shared governance

Concerns

- Adjusting to more proportionate representation in Faculty Assembly will hurt smaller areas of the college.
- Executive Committee should be more representative than it is, especially to Instructional Track Faculty.

Response

- For Faculty Assembly to be effective and relevant as a shared governance body in the college, it needs to faithfully represent the college with faculty who understand how the college operates.
- Representation in FA is currently imbalanced (i.e., social sciences are not represented, arts and humanities are over-indexed).
- Proportional representation ensures voices across all areas. The revised MOP will revisit this issue every three years by EC.
- Based on your feedback, and because representation matters, we have added an ITF faculty member to EC in this revision.
- With smaller numbers of members on UEPCC, GEPC, and EC, proportional representation does not make sense. The goal is to ensure voice across all areas of CLAS.
- With the restructuring occurring in CLAS that will not take effect until academic year 2025-2026, proportional representation on FA will be evaluated that year to account for any changes in faculty numbers.

Dean as co-chair of Faculty Assembly

Concern

- The Dean will dominate and control the agenda and silence voices, especially ITF.
- Faculty would potentially lose control of the Faculty Assembly.

Response

- Dean's office has attended all FA meetings since 2020
- The proposed co-chair is a shared role. The co-chairs will work together to create the agendas.
- Like EC, FA would have the ability to meet without the Dean present, if necessary.
- Part of our goal in this process is to reaffirm the college's commitment to shared governance and elevate partnership with FA. FA has more influence when the Dean engages directly with it. FA originally had the Dean chair for this reason.
- Co-chairing offers a collaborative model for maintaining active, ongoing communication on issues important in CLAS.
- All FA members are expected to use their voices to represent their constituents. That is their role in the body.

Advisory role of shared governance

Concern

- If CLAS shared governance is advisory, it diminishes faculty power.

Response

- The UI Operations Manual defines shared governance groups as [advisory bodies](#). Our draft MOP mirrors this language.
- Our current MOPP does not assign decision-making authority or veto power to CLAS shared governance groups, except for EC in specific instances as defined in the current MOPP and proposed MOP.
- CLAS shared governance committees already function as advisory. This is not a change. The MOP revision adds language to make the advisory role clearer to avoid confusion in the future. The added language clarifies this role. It does not change it.

Election process

Concern

- Dean's office is taking over election process from having an outside source who previously managed elections.

Response

- Elections were historically run by one person who worked for IT.
- IT has decided that they do not have the resources to run CLAS elections. The other colleges manage their own election processes. CLAS has no option but to determine a new strategy for managing their own election process moving forward.
- Options for managing elections are being explored and will go into effect FY25.
- Processes implemented WILL ensure integrity and anonymity in voting and election process

Removal of non-elected committees

Concern

- Dean's office can dissolve or change purpose of non-elected, appointed committees.

Response

- The purpose of appointed committees is to respond to specific issues requiring long or short-term attention. Members are appointed based on their expertise, experience, and ability to represent affected groups.
- The purpose and function of appointed committees may change based on changes that occur at the Provost or President level.
- Many of the appointed committees are already operating outside terms of the MOPP due to changes that have come from the Provost office, UICA, or due to changes in workload and CLAS structures. (e.g.: named and distinguished professor committee, information technology committee, scholarship committee)
- These are appointed committees and the goal is to have a streamlined MOP that is related to elected shared governance processes.
- Current amendment process for these committees impact their ability to function due to the timeline of voting.

Change in FA role for proposing and approving amendments to MOP

Concern

- FA is no longer able to move amendments to the MOPP forward for faculty vote

Response

- FA will have a voice in MOP amendments by recommending changes to the MOP to EC
- EC can consult with FA about possible amendments in advance of their vote
- This process keeps the amendment and revision process consistent for CLAS
- All Faculty of CLAS as defined by the MOP will have the ability to vote upon any proposed amendments that have been voted for by EC