

Joint Assembly Retreat

Co-Chaired by Drs. Roxanne Byrne and Dennis Lezotte

- I. **Participants:** Roxanne Byrne, Bill Cherowitz, Mei-Chu Hsia, Dennis Lezotte, Laurie Shroyer, Jerry Perry, Liz D'Antonio-Gan, Jeff Holt, Me-Chu Hsiao, Jan Bialasiewicz, Mary Lee Stansifer, Bruce Neumann, Ken Rens, Pam Laird, Joel Yuhaz, John Wyckoff, Alison Bashe, Colleen Conry, Paula Nelson-Marten, Claire Collins, Krys Cios, and Leslie Jameson. **Special Guest/:** Jerry Davies.
- II. **Introductions:** Dr. Byrne provided a welcome and overview of the retreat's goals. She coordinated each individual introductions, as well as thanked all Faculty Assembly members for taking the time from their busy schedule to participate today.
- III. **Why are we here:** Dr. Byrne noted that her goal was to create a consistent and uniform vision for the UCDHSC consolidated campus' related to campus-based faculty governance
- IV. **Role of Assembly**
 - a. **HSC Report:** Dr. Lezotte noted that it was his perception that the HSC faculty governance across the schools, retired faculty and library was less of a decision-making body (more informational in orientation) related to the role. There were 5 schools including the Graduate School, with large numbers of faculty (e.g., the SOM has approximately 1960 faculty members not including the clinical faculty). The mission related to coordination of current faculty governance groups to work synergistically together. The major committees included Women's Committee, Library Oversight, Diversity (emerging), and GLBTI Committees. The Faculty Assembly decisions relate primarily to reviewing/approving the policies and procedures from Schools planned and attempting to assure, when appropriate, the impact across Schools was viewed carefully. The goal in the longer-term was to make the HSC Faculty Assembly more of decision-making body related to shared governance. The discussion noted that CU was not unionized, where faculty governance teams can be broader focused related to both the content/focus of the campus, as well as serve as an advocate for both faculty and students. Different school-based representatives shared their experiences, as well as it was noted that the vast majority of programs were graduate or professional. The low level of funding is a challenge for education support. Across a two-campus system, the locations of faculty are spread out among buildings at the two primary campus locations and affiliates. The governance service at HSC to-date has not been recognized, rewarded, or reimbursed. Thus, recruitment of volunteers to serve in faculty governance is quite challenging.

- b. **DDC Report:** Dr. Byrne provided an overview of the more active and direct approach was used with monthly meetings. The committee structure is very active, with the key decision-making responsibilities. The different members were elected from the Schools and Colleges (9 total with around 400 faculty), such that there was a diversity of representatives involved. Given the budget drives the academic decision options, but the faculty actively vote on both individual School/Campus initiatives with campus-wide endeavors voted on by the Faculty Assembly. The standing committees include Personnel, Diversity (emerging) including Women's Committee, LETTS, Budget/Priorities, and EPPC. The chairs of the Committees are part of the Faculty Assembly, with 1 course release/year (\$3-5K?). The chair of Faculty Assembly gets 2 course-releases/year. The DDC faculty members are generally on a 9 month appointment with no sick leave or vacation provided. Dr. Byrne noted that there was 1/6th of the 9 months that are set-aside for consulting in your area. Separate work outside of your area of interest is allowed also. Academic units often drive the opportunities that may exist for outside employment. Strong committee chairs drive the enthusiasm and energy related to Faculty Assembly.

V. **Discussion of Next Steps:**

- a. Dr. Byrne noted the strengths and concerns overall of moving very quickly towards options for a consolidated or collaborative approach to faculty governance.
- b. After much discussion, different perspectives related potential faculty assembly organizational structure the question of the purpose of a new committee was raised as a question. The reporting structure was raised as a question for consideration, as to where the Chancellor and Provost contacts may exist? What really were the options that were feasible to consider, as if there were any pre-existing administrative plans for a consolidation of shared governance (at a minimum)?
- c. The question was raised if a co-chair approach might be a reasonable solution. Dr. Byrne noted that her goal was, in context of the strengths and weaknesses, to make the shared faculty governance for both campuses better than they were historically. The question was raised if a committee to decide how to proceed was needed – or if a stronger position might be maintained by two sets of faculty council votes? The concept of a “united nations” for the two campuses may be worthy of consideration. The concern for a faculty identity was raised, as part of a larger academic community. Given the Schools are reasonably separated from the Faculty Assembly concept. Thus, this new “DDC and HSC Collaboration” may allow each faculty member to be empowered to make changes – such that this type of committee process is required to stop being silos and start being a true academic community.
- d. Drs. Lezotte and Byrne agreed to coordinate a new “Faculty Governance Collaboration Committee” <PLEASE PUT CORRECT NAME HERE>

with a start-up meeting to be hosted in late Spring 2007, with start-up planned for Fall 2007.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm. Drs. Lezotte and Byrne thanked the members, as well as noted they would be soliciting volunteers to participate.