

Radford University
Internal Governance Task Force

PROGRESS REPORT AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS
5/2/05

Periodic internal review of university systems is an integral part of determining an institution's effectiveness in achieving its mission and enhancing the quality of student learning, programs, and services (SACS, 2004). Like academic programs and student services, the system of shared governance, the collaborative decision-making process unique to colleges and universities, must undergo frequent and rigorous review to ensure that it operates efficiently and effectively for the good of the university.

This document provides a preliminary report of the activities and recommendations of the Radford University (RU) Internal Governance Task Force (IGTF) that was convened in 2004.

Historical Context of Internal Governance Reviews and Revisions

The Internal Governance System at RU has undergone multiple reviews and revisions (see Appendix A). The Radford University Internal Governance System and Document was reviewed in the 2001-2002 academic year. All RU Senates, Committees and Councils were asked to consider and respond to questions concerning membership, function, recommendations and actions.

The Student Government Association (SGA) made significant recommendations regarding structural changes to committees, including consolidation of committee functions and reduction of student staffing of committees. These changes were implemented in the Fall of 2002.

In response to 2001-2002 review, the Faculty Senate unanimously passed a series of motions on April 18, 2002, that recommended

- the formation of a University wide Task Force charged with making specific suggestions for changes to both structure and function of Internal Governance,
- clarification of the **governance** versus **task** roles of University Committees/Councils,

- clarification of the pathway for decision making to describe the levels of decision making, primary responsibility, final authority, and how decisions are announced, and
- clarification of the articulation of college and department structures with other university governance entities; responsibilities of designated administrators, dissemination of records of committee actions; existing committees not mentioned in the IG document, overlapping structures and functions, and how changes to IG document are made and dated.

The University Executive Council did not act on the recommendation of the FS.

In October 2003, the Faculty Senate, having voiced concerns about the openness, good faith, and trust involved in decision-making at the university for at least three years, passed a resolution that **“the administration does not practice decision-making in a manner consonant with its own Internal Governance system and well established practices of shared governance” (FS minutes, 10-09-03).**

In February 2004, with the support and encouragement of Dr. Warren Self, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, a university-wide Task Force on Internal Governance was formed. The presidents of the Student Government Association (SGA), Staff Senate, Administrative Professional (AP) Senate, and Faculty Senate (FS) charged the IGTF with presenting **a conceptual framework for an effective, efficient and shared decision-making process for RU**. Initially, it was understood that the IGTF was charged with creating a new system rather than fixing the existing system.

In April 2004, the IGTF began a comprehensive review of the current Internal Governance (IG) system.

Task Force Membership

Members of Internal Governance Task Force (IGTF) include

	Representing	Alternate
Benny Skeens	Staff	Doug Gardner
Karen Castele	AP	Patrick Critzer
*Mary Atwell	Faculty	Claire Waldron
Lynn Adams	Faculty	

*Steve Corwin Faculty

Andrea Alaownis SGA Kenda Deleon

Michael Mardis SGA

*Dr. Corwin resigned in July 2004, and was replaced by Dr. Vernard Harrington
*Dr. Atwell resigned in March 2005, and was replaced by Dr. Claire Waldron

Activities

Guiding Principles.

Several task force members began by researching other institution's Internal Governance systems, including systems in other public universities in Virginia and those at RU's peer institutions.

The IGTF reviewed the existing Radford University IG document and strongly agreed with the following principles that are **currently articulated** in its Introduction (noted in **boldface**). Some members of the task force voiced concerns about the section indicated with ~~double strikethrough~~ and recommended that it be stricken, given that faculty members have consistently stated that input is meaningless without impact. Some members of the task force did not agree that it should be stricken.

I. Introduction

This document describes the structure and procedures used to develop policies which are within the authority of the University. Radford University has a strong commitment to collaborative governance among the constituencies of the University community because the results are longer lasting and of higher quality than what one person can accomplish alone. There must be many leaders on a university campus, leaders who are visible, speak often to articulate both issues and values, stand publicly for what is important, and commit themselves to the overall welfare of the University community.

Through a collaborative governance process, individuals and the University can harmonize their goals and set a course for mutual achievement. The willingness to listen to all ideas, to respect competing concerns, to evaluate the merits of many alternatives, and to communicate helps build consensus. ~~The councils/committees which constitute the governance system serve in an advisory capacity and exist for the purposes of advising the University's president and/or his/her designee in the administrative decision-making process.~~

A successful collaborative governance process enables the programs and services of the University to improve in an atmosphere of trust, respect, and open decision making among colleagues. It allows the University to address complex issues, to remain open to discovery, to adapt to changing needs.

Note: the IGTF recommends that the following paragraph include the Board of Visitors in the framework of governance.

II. Overview of Structure

The Internal Governance Structure provides a broad framework for governance, with the inclusion of the *Board of Visitors*, the President, the President's Cabinet, the Student Government Association, the Faculty Senate, the Administrative Senate, and the Staff Senate, as well as necessary committees and/or councils.

In addition, the participants agreed initially to these guiding principles:

- The final version of a revised shared governance system needs to have the participation and buy-in of those who will be affected by it. Given the impending administrative changes (new President, retirement of Vice President of Academic Affairs, possible changes in upper administrative structure, new members of the Board of Visitors), the IGTF recognizes that a new system will not be final until it includes input and comment from new members of the RU community.
- A more efficient and effective shared governance system depends on changes to both the structure of governance and **university wide culture**. While the structural changes will be complex, it will be easier to change the structure of shared governance than the culture.
- All members of the IGTF committed to being open minded.
- Any revised governance structure needs to ensure a voice, involvement, and input for students, faculty, staff, and administrators.
- The right constituencies should be involved in decision making as early in the process as possible according to the relevance of their concerns.
- Shared Governance should be efficient and specify clear sphere of influence.
- Lines of decision making should be clearly specified.

- A short feedback loop is crucial.
- A governance system should specify level of authority.
- A governance system should be small enough to ensure that participants are informed.
- Each constituency group should select its representatives to groups in the governance system.
- A governance system should ensure development/continuity of leadership while it minimizes long-term influence by individuals. Length of term for group membership, whether elected or appointed, should be clearly stated. Members can be voted back into service by constituencies they are serving.
- A governance system has to realistically account for time constraints of the academic calendar, but governance cannot shut down when the university is not in session. Decision making has to continue.
- A governance system must be characterized by **transparency, openness, and trust**. Participants must be able to have open discussion without fear of retaliation. A culture of retaliation works against the process of collaborative decision in shared governance. While tenured faculty have protection, untenured faculty, administrators, staff, and students must be able to participate without fearing reprisal for voicing their concerns or those of their constituencies.

Assessment of Appropriate Representation

The participation of constituent groups in shared governance was considered, since IGTF members agreed that groups should make relevant contributions that are **proportional to the expertise and interest of the constituents**.

Therefore, IGTF members were asked to rate how their constituent groups would be affected by hypothetical decisions and decision-making related to existing IG Committee/Council functions (Appendix B) using a 3 point scale, where **0** would indicate **No effect at all**, **1** would indicate **Only minor effect**, and **2** would indicate **Direct/significant effect**.

The hypothetical decisions rated by task force members included

- Making recommendations for use of a donated piece of property
- Construction of a new academic building
- Creation of a new college
- Construction of new non-academic building
- Selection of new VP's
- Re-organizing academic units
- Creation of a new high-level administrative position
- Starting a football team
- Creation and review of budgets
- Purchasing land
- Moving departments to a new location
- Long-term facilities planning
- Creation of a new academic program (e.g., Doctoral programs)
- Deciding standards for admissions

Participants also rated the decision-making interest of each group in the **function** of each existing Committee/Council listed in the current IG document.

Findings showed that students, faculty, staff, and administrators share interest in and should have the opportunity to participate in decisions that relate to the following **Core Functions** listed in the existing IG document:

Budget, Strategic Planning, and Resource Allocation Functions:

- Soliciting input and feedback from the University senates and other constituencies regarding the university's strategic plan, action plans and budgets.
- Reviewing the past year's accomplishments, challenges, opportunities, and current trends.
- Reviewing annual strategic action plans.
- Evaluating resource needs and making allocation recommendations.
- Distributing information to the University community regarding the outcome of the planning and budgeting process.
- Assessing the effectiveness of university planning and budgeting.

Planning related to Campus Buildings and Grounds, Capitol Project Planning, Allocation of Space

- Recommending guiding principles for planning related to campus buildings and grounds
- Determining the types and scope of projects that are to be brought before the committee for review.

- Reviewing priorities for capital projects.
- Recommending buildings and grounds to support priorities from the planning process.
- Recommending, according to established university guidelines, the relocation of offices, departments, and teaching spaces in order to make a more efficient and effective use of the campus.

The task force noted that the current IG document states that “major actions (i.e. capital project priorities, master plan) proposed by this committee require the opportunity for comment by each of the senates.”

However, the IGTF noted **that such review typically does not occur**. In addition, the IGTF strongly recommended that these functions be coordinated and integrated with the strategic planning and resource allocation functions

The group also recommended that the composition of a committee dealing with these functions be revised to include staff and to solicit better student input.

Information Technology

- Planning for and promoting the improvement of information technology resources, including program assessment towards goals and integration of recommendations with strategic planning and budget process.

The task force noted that the current IG document states that “proposed actions from this committee require the opportunity for comments from all senates prior to submission of a final report to the President’s Cabinet.” However, the IGTF noted **that such review typically does not occur**. In addition, the IGTF strongly recommended that these functions be coordinated and integrated with the strategic planning and resource allocation functions.

Parking

- Recommending and reviewing policy governing vehicle registration
- Recommending and reviewing policy governing student, faculty, and staff parking regulation
- Establishing an Appeals Committee that oversees, implements and enforces a procedure for appeals of campus parking and traffic citations;
- Reviewing and editing the publication of *Parking and Traffic Regulations*.

As with the two other committees, the IG Document states that “Proposed actions from this committee require the opportunity for comment from all the senates prior to submission of a final report to the President’s Cabinet through the Vice President for Business Affairs.”

The IGTF recommends that the composition of this group include specific term limits, so that one group or person does not have control indefinitely.

University Executive Functions

- Reviewing the effectiveness of the existing internal governance structure and proposals to change that structure.
- Approving changes to the internal governance system and university committees/councils that are designed to strengthen the effectiveness of the system
- Granting recognition to newly formed special interest groups and organizations, excluding student clubs and organizations and groups that report to senates subject to the approval of the President’s Cabinet.
- Advising the President of the University and members of the President's Cabinet on any matters brought before it, especially issues on which varying recommendations may be sent forward by one or more of the senates and by one or more of the University committees.
- Reviewing and making recommendations concerning the university calendar.
- Making recommendations about the long-range university calendar and any other calendar issues

Faculty have long-standing concerns that their proportional representation regarding these functions is not in keeping with their level of interest and expertise in the decisions made.

Other constituent groups did not share faculty concern about the composition of this group.

Nature of governance groups

The IGTF designated each *function* of existing IG Committee/Councils, not including the senates, as either an ongoing Governance function or a task related Non-Governance function.

The results are contained in the Table in Appendix B.

Communication Recommendations

Procedural integrity regarding the communication of shared governance processes and decisions was felt to be paramount. During the review, it became apparent that communication of information regarding decision making at all levels in the university was a major concern that should be addressed immediately.

Recommendation 1:

The IGTF recommends immediate improvements in the communication of Shared Governance processes and decisions. The ***transparency*** of decision making and the ***open flow*** of information to those involved in shared governance processes and to all other interested University constituencies would be supported by improved availability and timing of communication.

- A. An Internal Governance website should be created and regularly updated. The IG website should have a direct link from the main RU web page and should include:
 - Links for all IG groups (function, membership, Chair, Designated Administrator)
 - A list/calendar of IG meeting times and locations
 - Minutes from all meetings that would be submitted by the group's Chair
 - Updated IG policies

- B. A central person should be identified to coordinate the daily tasks of maintaining the communication of the IG system. This person should work in the President's Office. It is understood that this might require additional resources or the shifting of job responsibilities as this responsibility will require time and diligence in maintaining current information. This person should notify senates and other appointing authorities of group vacancies and deadlines by February 1.

- C. The person designated to coordinate and maintain communication regarding Shared Governance will need to collaborate with administrative personnel, faculty, staff, and students to address concerns about establishing security and access so that communication about Shared Governance decisions is transparent, accurate, and timely.

- D. IG group Chairs will have the responsibility of making sure that all minutes are submitted to the IG central contact within one week of the meeting. As they may not yet be approved, the minutes will be marked “draft” until approved by the committee at the following meeting. Then the Chair would send the draft of the most recent minutes. At that time the Chair would verify that the previous minutes were approved and make any necessary changes as determined by the committee action.
- E. When possible, IG appointments should be made by July 15th. Groups with core functions should be constituted by the end of the Spring Semester so that work can proceed during the summer. Appointments unfilled by the fall census date will remain unfilled for the remainder of the academic year.
- F. Groups charged with handling core functions, **in which all constituent groups** have interest, should have set meeting dates and times that will be predetermined. This will eliminate the current complication with coordinating meetings to accommodate group members’ availability. In the past, getting the initial meeting scheduled reduced the amount of time that the group could work towards accomplishing the directed function.
- G. All Groups with Core Functions will have a designated administrative professional who will be responsible for notifying groups of meeting times, taking minutes and distributing relevant information. This person will be appointed by the designated administrator for the group.
- H. All Core groups will have a representative from each of the four senates. It will be the responsibility of the senate representatives to inform their respective senate about the business of the respective group.
- I. An information session will occur prior to the implementation of the IG changes so all designated administrators and involved constituents are informed of new policies, procedures and expectations.

Time line

The IGTF intends to finalize its recommendation concerning changes to structures and procedures by the end of Fall semester, 2005.

Remaining tasks include meeting with the incoming President, the Vice Presidents, and each of the Deans about their experiences and recommendations concerning effective and efficient shared governance.

The group agreed to distribute a survey early in Fall 2005 to solicit input and suggestions from all persons serving on internal governance committees regarding how best to contribute to ***an effective, efficient and shared decision-making process for RU***. The survey would be analyzed no later than October 1, 2005.

Appendix A

History

History of Internal Governance System at Radford University

(prepared by Bonnie Hurlburt November, 2001, and presented at meeting of Senate presidents, designated administrators, and University committee chairs)

SGA – The Student Government Association was established March, 1, 1914 to develop, promote, and administer the honor system → govern all activities

1920's - Advisory Council of SGA (3 Faculty, President of college, Dean of Women, matron)

1960's- SGA had Rules Committee

Prior to 1972, proposals for changes were submitted by SGA through that Dean of Women to the President (and BOV as required). Academic matters were reviewed by the Dean of the College.

Faculty - Officers were elected and faculty opinions were expressed through General Faculty Meetings

Faculty Affairs Council was formed in 1972 (had subcommittee)

1964- Radford College got its own Board of Visitors (when separated from Virginia Tech)

196? To 1972, Academic and Administrative Council – Reviewed all proposals (comprised of administrators, faculty and perhaps one student)

March, 1972 – A task Force was formed by newly appointed President Donald and charged with proposing a new system of Internal Governance for Radford College. The task force was comprised of students, faculty and staff and was chaired by Dr. William Larsen, Professor of History.

Dedmon President Dedmon approved a proposal from the Task Force which eliminated

Academic and Administrative Council, established Committees → 4 councils
(College/University Affairs Council, Student Affairs Council, Faculty Affairs Council,
Graduate Affairs Council) → President → BOV (as needed)

Committee composition based on constituency(ies) served

IG document revisions were proposed to BOV

November 1994 Faculty Senate constitution approved by General Faculty

February 1995, Ad Hoc Committee on IG (“Lutes Committee”) was formed to review IG system. Committee conferred with Dr. Covington when he was selected as President. Faculty had a sub committee of IG.

Lutes (chair), Bob Gill, Doug Wooley, SGA Pres & VP, Will Stanton, Joe Scartelli, Bonnie Hurlburt

Changes proposed/approved

Eliminated councils
IG Committees report to Designated Administrators (rather than councils)
Established 4 Senates
Established UEC (permanent committee to review and revise the IG system as needed and advise the president Cabinet about proposals on which there is disagreement)

1995-96 – IG system implemented on an interim basis

1995-96 ad hoc IG Implementation Team

Betsy Little (chair)
Jill Alcorn, pres of Faculty Senate
Jim Graham & Evelyn Wilson, co-chairs of Staff Senate
Christi Leftwich, AP senate
Lauren Egan, SGA President
Bonnie Hurlburt & Charlene Lutes (members of formed ad hoc committee

on IG)

September 26, 1996 – IG Document published (for 1996-97)

BOV delegated authority to the President to approve revisions to the IG document as needed

Since 1996, UEC has reviewed & approved all revisions to IG document, subject to approval of the President and his Cabinet

Establish role of designated administrators (previously called “responsible administrators”)

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Douglas Covington, President and members of the President's Cabinet

From: University Executive Council (UEC)

Subject: 2001-2002 Review of University Internal Governance

Date: May 8, 2002

After conferring carefully for the better part of the academic year on Dr. Covington's charge to review internal governance, the University Executive Council (UEC) offer the President and his Cabinet this summary of our activity, findings and recommendations. Dr. Covington convened the UEC on October 16, 2001 to discuss the principles of this assessment process, beginning with each senate and internal governance committee self-examining its function, membership and (annual) goals.

The UEC went to work, first by developing a questionnaire with guidelines for the assessment process of the RU Internal Governance System document. Next we called a conference on November 28th of senate presidents, committee chairs and designated administrators to talk about the questionnaire and the subsequent objectives of the assessment process:

1. decrease committee membership where achievable to increase productivity.
2. assure committee membership in appropriately representative of all affected constituencies, i.e. faculty, staff, students, and administration,
3. establish resource positions as needed and where possible within respective committees to increase efficiency,
4. combine, or eliminate some committees to economize duplication of effort, and
5. modify function statements to most accurately reflect the committee's responsibility.

February 15, 2002 was established as the deadline for the completed questionnaires to have returned to the University Executive Council.

The Student Government Association was the first to respond by circulating its proposal in late January to UEC, senates and internal governance committees. The UEC endorsed the SGA proposed reduction in the number of students serving on committees and recommended consolidation of some committees that report to the Vice President for

Student Affairs on February 25, 2002. The judgment by the UEC was that the SGA would need time during the spring semester to make its 2002/03 committee assignments.

The University Executive Council has made substantial progress during 2001-02 in facilitating, receiving and proposing changes to Internal Governance and University committees that will increase the effectiveness and efficiency of these committees. The University Executive Council agrees with the Faculty Senate and other that additional study of the system of internal governance is needed to further enhance its effectiveness. Therefore, we propose that the President and/or his cabinet charge the UEC or a special task force (in consultation with UEC) to conduct further study of the internal governance system in consultation with committees, the four senates, and designated administrators during 2002/-03 academic year. We suggest that the charge include the topics that have been suggested by the Faculty Senate in the motions that they approved on April 18, 2002, as well as other matters that the President and his cabinet may wish to include in the charge.

References

PRINCIPLES OF accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement copyright 2004 by The Commission On Colleges Of The Southern Association Of Colleges And Schools.

Appendix B

Questions for INTERNAL GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE Completed June, 2004

IG Task Force Rating

How much INFLUENCE should your group have in these decisions? Put rating in column for your constituency.

No influence – 0

Some influence – 1

Direct/important influence - 2

Put rating in column for your constituency.

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
task	Schedules and plans university convocations (held during the opening of the fall semester, on Founder's Day and others that may be scheduled), commencements, and related activities. The committee will submit recommendations concerning the selection of speakers for convocations and commencement programs to the President.	1	2	1	2	
Delete Or ad hoc as needed	Recommends and reviews policy and procedures concerning equity issues. Serves as advisory group to the President's Cabinet and the University's Equal Opportunity Official on diversity and equity issues. Develops and recommends strategies for recruitment and retention of underrepresented groups (students, faculty, and staff). Develops and recommends strategies and reviews issues related to students, faculty and staff with disabilities.	1	2	2	2	
Gov	Studies and analyzes data on demographic trends; sets enrollment targets for new freshmen, transfers, graduate students, summer and off-campus enrollments; and reviews the recruitment and marketing plans for appropriateness to the specified goals. This committee has the authority to recommend the management strategies for the reports to SCHEV.	2	1	2	0	
Gov	Recommends and reviews policies concerning intercollegiate athletics; recommends the addition and elimination of intercollegiate athletic sports. Proposed actions from this committee require the opportunity for comment from the SGA and Faculty Senate.	1	2	2	2	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
Gov	Solicits input and feedback from the University senates and other constituencies regarding the university ' s strategic plan, action plans and budgets. Reviews the past year ' s accomplishments, challenges, opportunities (prepared by the President ' s Cabinet), and current trends (prepared by the Director of Institutional Research). Reviews annual strategic action plans (prepared by the President ' s Cabinet). Evaluates resource needs and makes allocation recommendations. Distributes information to the University community regarding the outcome of the planning and budgeting process. Assesses the effectiveness of university planning and budgeting.	2	2	2	2	
GOV	Reviews, for effectiveness, the existing internal governance structure and proposals to change that structure. Approves changes to the internal governance system and university committees/councils that are designed to strengthen the effectiveness of the system and grants recognition to newly formed special interest groups and organizations, excluding student clubs and organizations and groups that report to senates subject to the approval of the President ' s Cabinet. Advises the President of the University and members of the President's Cabinet on any matters brought before it, especially issues on which varying recommendations may be sent forward by one or more of the senates and by one or more of the University committees. Reviews and makes recommendations concerning the university calendar. make recommendations about the long-range university calendar and any other calendar issues needs to be reconsidered.....not enough Faculty input/do we want a super IG committee	2	2	2	2	
Task	Hearing grievances regarding an employment matter directly and adversely affecting the professional well being of a member or members of the administrative/professional faculty. Non- grievable issues are specifically outlined in the Administrative and Professional Faculty Handbook. Specific grievance timelines, procedures, appeal routes, and reporting guidelines are also found in the handbook.	0	0	2	1	
task	Hears appeals of recommendations or decisions related to evaluations, non-reappointment (including those resulting from post-tenure review), tenure, promotion, and termination for cause. The Committee shall report its findings and make its recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the appeal is of the Vice President of Academic Affairs ' s recommendation, the Committee shall report its findings and make its recommendations to the President of the University. If the appeal is of the President ' s action, the Committee shall report its findings and make its recommendations to the Board of Visitors.	2	0	1	0	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
Refer to fac senate	Hears grievances regarding an employment matter directly and adversely affecting the professional well being of a member or members of the teaching and research faculty, which is not related to evaluation, reappointment, tenure or promotion, and which is not covered by other University policies, procedures, or regulations.	2	0	2 (HR?)	0	
GOV	Reviews and recommends policies concerning class attendance, examination, class withdrawal, grading, registration, scheduling, academic advising and other academic policies and procedures.	2	2	0-1 (registrar)	0	
GOV	The Academic Program Review Committee is a review body with an obligation to complete a rigorous assessment of each academic program 's Program Quality Assessment report and make continuance recommendations based on the established criteria in the Academic Program Review Guidelines. The Committee makes program development recommendations focused on the quality of the program, student engagement, and student learning. Deans, VPAA FS	2	2	0-1 (maybe SA)	0	
GOV	To assist the administration in developing standards and procedures for implementing policy regarding intellectual Property as stated in Section 3.4 of the Radford University Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook. And, to recommend amendments to the policy as needed. Collapse into faculty senate	2	1	1-2	0	
Gov	Recommends policies and procedures regarding concerning the following specific areas as they relate to graduate programs: admissions, recruitment and retention, academic standards (including advising, transfer credit; class attendance, student expectations, experiential learning experiences, etc.) student financial aid; program and curriculum development and revision; graduate faculty membership; student research and creative activity.	2	2	2	0	
Gov	Helps in the development of the Radford University library as a strong resource and research center, which will aid students and the University academic community through the review, recommendation, and implementation of policies concerning the library's operation.	2	2	1	0	
GOV	Provides input into, assesses and monitors long-range planning for professional education programs; reviews all curricular changes from all Colleges that impact professional education programs; reviews and monitors student admission and retention policies; monitors student assessment programs (Praxis I and Praxis II); promotes collaboration between the University, PK-12 schools and external organizations to enhance professional education programs. This should go to ed	2 (Faculty in relevant programs)	2	2 (depends on function) 1 in gen	0	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
Gov	Plans, monitors, and evaluates all functions related to academic advising to include the advising of students, registration processes, QUEST, graduation check-out, degree-audit, and academic policies affecting student progress and retention. The committee makes recommendations to improve academic advising as well as polices and practices affecting students ' success and progress toward graduation. Ensures that all undergraduate students receive adequate and equitable advising that is appropriately evaluated. More student input wanted here	2	2	2 (depend s on function) 1 in gen	0	
Gov	Reviews and approves course and curriculum proposals and revisions in the major and minor academic programs in the college. All proposals and revisions approved shall be forwarded to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Catalog Review Committee and, if affecting general education, to the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee and the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate; and/or if affecting graduate curriculum, to the Graduate Curriculum and Catalog Review Committee.	2	2	0-1 depends on function	0	
Gov	Reviews and makes recommendations to the department on course and curriculum proposals and revisions in the major and minor academic programs in the department.	2	2	0	0	
GOV	Recruiting and recommending the hiring of all full-time faculty for the department; recommending the granting or denial of tenure; recommending reappointment or non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty; administering student evaluations of all faculty teaching for the department; evaluating the chairperson both as a faculty member and as a chairperson; and provide for the hearing and review of student grade appeals (in accordance with the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook). ?? student on search comm./ artic with HR	2	1-2	0	0	Policy & proc issue
Make univer. Wide awards comm. TASK	Develops the criteria, publishes the criteria and nomination process, and solicits nominations from faculty, staff, and students for the Donald N. Dedmon Professorial Award, and the RU Foundation Awards for Creative Scholarship and University Service. After review of the nominees' materials, the committee will recommend to the President the recipient of each award. Also solicit nominations and nominates outstanding faculty for the State Council of Higher Education Outstanding Faculty Awards Program in accord with the criteria and procedures annually established by the State Council. Staff not included	2	2	1	2	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
GOV	Provides recommendations regarding policies and activities related to research and scholarly activities, research support, sponsored programs, and the Faculty Professional Development Leave program. Reviews applications and makes recommendations regarding Faculty Professional Development Leave. More encouragement, streamline this, assign to fac senate?	2	1	1	0	
Gov	Considers assessment reports on the effectiveness of the general education program or elements thereof, recommends curricular programmatic modifications in general education that are based on assessment results, and reviews and comments on such recommendations made by the President or Vice President for Academic Affairs. Faculty Senate should comment and approve any changes. Comments are required of the SGA.	2	2	1	0	
Gov	Receives proposals for changes in academic requirements and course proposals from College Curriculum Committees, reviews for duplication of existing courses; monitors changes to the academic sections of the University undergraduate catalog, including the accurate inclusion of policy developed by appropriate university bodies. Monitors catalog for compliance with accreditation requirements.	2	1	1	0	
task	To review and recommend resolutions to co-curricular activity and co-curricular activities facilities issues (i.e. student union, other cocurricular facilities, campus recreation, intramural program, RU Outdoors, sports clubs, programming, etc.) that are brought to the committee. Recommends, reviews, and administers policy regulating student clubs and organizations. The committee grants recognition to student clubs and organizations in accordance with the authority delegated to the committee by the Vice President for Student Affairs. Decisions regarding policy matters are referred to the Student Affairs Executive Council.	1	2	2	0	Send to SGA and look at sending to SAEC Get student opion
gov	Recommends, reviews, and administers policy regulating student clubs and organizations. The committee grants recognition to student clubs and organizations in accordance with the authority delegated to the committee by the Vice President for Student Affairs. Decisions regarding policy matters are referred to the Student Affairs Executive Council.	1	2	1	0	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
Gov	Reviews and recommends policies and procedures concerning student life and campus experiences, including co-curricular activities, policies and procedures for the allocation and expenditure of student activity fees, student leader compensation, the Standards of Student Conduct, the campus judicial system, space utilization of Heth and the new student union, and all policies that may have an effect on campus life and/or environment for students. Members of this council should consult with their constituencies before final decisions are made by this council and recommended to the Vice President for Student Affairs. As necessary, this council will continue to act in an advisory capacity to the Vice President for Student Affairs. This council also reviews and recommends revisions to the Internal Governance Structure concerning Student Affairs and serves as the appellate body for appeals of actions taken by other committees that report to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Works better after latest revision, ask students	1-2	2	2	0	
GOV	Reviews and recommends policies and procedures concerning student evaluation of faculty. Proposed actions from this committee require the opportunity for comments from the SGA and the Faculty Senate prior to joint submission. Proposals from this committee are to be submitted jointly to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Vice President for Academic Affairs. ? mediation point, management,	2	2	1-2	0	
GOV	Recommends, reviews, and administers policy concerning the student media. The committee appoints and removes student media editors and business managers and approves student media budgets. Works to solve problems and resolve conflicts among the student media, between the student media and other constituencies.	1	2	2	0	Don't touch
task	Serves in an advisory capacity to the Office of Financial Aid and seeks to provide assistance in identifying areas of concern while promoting and increasing public awareness to the student body. Significant proposals require comment from the SGA prior to submission to the Director of Financial Aid. SGA hasn't seen anything	1	2	2	0	
task	Responsible for reviewing and recommending nominations for this annual award funded by the Radford University Foundation based upon specific criteria. One award shall be granted to a graduate student and two awards shall be granted to undergraduate students. Big awards committee??	1	2	1-2 SA-2	1	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
task	Selects, funds, and assists university departments and appropriate student organizations in the presentation of lectures of general university interest. The committee shall select, fund, and review scholarly lecture proposals and advise the sponsoring organizations. Leave alone for now. Karen mentioned theme based planning/promotions	2	2	1	1	
task	Hears appeal cases from student-athletes who have had athletic grant-in-aid (student aid) reduced or canceled and transfer eligibility issues. Written procedures shall be followed that provide for consistent and fair treatment for all student athletes. There is no further appeal of this committee's decision. This committee is convened only when business needs to be addressed. Mandated, but has to be separate from ICAC	1	2	2	0	
task	Reviews, recommends, and administers policy and the selection process concerning the Who's Who Program, the Outstanding Student Awards, and other campus-wide student award activities. Decisions regarding policy matters will be referred to the Student Affairs Executive Council. Big awards committee??	1	2	2	0	
task	Serves in an advisory capacity to the Director of the Student Health Center on non-medical policy related to the operation of the Center. Hours of operation, program suggestions and feedback on the administration of the Center are all areas of discussion to the committee. Proposed actions require comment from the SGA prior to submission to the Director of the Student Health Center.	0	2	2	0	Ken Lott privatized
task	Arranges and promotes the University Performance Series.	2	2	2 (PR)	0	
CORE	Recommends guiding principles for planning related to campus buildings and grounds, including a determination of the types and scope of projects that are to be brought before the committee for review. Reviews priorities for capital projects. Recommends buildings and grounds to support priorities from the planning process. Recommends, according to established university guidelines, the relocation of offices, departments, and teaching spaces in order to make a more efficient and effective use of the campus. Major actions (i.e. capital project priorities, master plan) proposed by this committee require the opportunity for comment by each of the senates. clarify articulation between this group and UPBAC, review composition, no staff on this now, students never felt like they got input, clarify function	2	2	2	2	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
CORE	Plans for and promotes the improvement of information technology resources, including program assessment towards goals and integration of recommendations with strategic planning and budget process. Proposed actions from this committee require the opportunity for comments from all senates prior to submission of a final report to the President ' s Cabinet. NEEDS SERIOUS REVISION	2	2	2	2	
CORE	Recommends and reviews policy governing vehicle registration; recommends and reviews policy governing student, faculty, and staff parking regulation; establishes an Appeals Committee, oversees, implements and enforces a procedure for appeals of campus parking and traffic citations; reviews and edits the publication of <i>Parking and Traffic Regulations</i> . Proposed actions from this committee require the opportunity for comment from all the senates prior to submission of a final report to the President ' s Cabinet through the Vice President for Business Affairs. ROTATE THIS SO ONE PERSON DOESN'T HAVE CONTROL	2	2	2	2	
task	Seeks to help provide the best possible service to students, faculty and staff and provide a forum for open communication between the Bookstore and all campus constituencies. Proposed actions require the opportunity for comment by the SGA and Faculty Senate prior to submission to the Director of University Services.	2	2	2	2	
task	Seeks to help provide the best possible service to students, faculty and staff and provide a forum for open communication between the Dining Services and all campus constituencies. Proposed actions require comment by the SGA prior to submission to the Director of University Services.	2	2	2	2	
??	Strives to acquaint alumni, students, faculty and others with the University's ideals and objectives. Maintains a mutually beneficial relationship between alumni and the University.	1	2	1	0	
??	Strengthens the role of private assistance to Radford University.	2	1	1	1	

Gov Or task?	Committee/Council FUNCTION	Faculty	Students	AP Specify Division:	Staff	Specify people or position who should be involved
Gov	Recommends policy and reviews the institution's program for humane care and use of animals for teaching or research, and inspects the institution's animal facilities, including animal study areas, at least once every six months; prepares reports of the evaluations and submits those to the Institutional Official. The ACUC insures that deficiencies are corrected. The committee reviews, and if necessary, investigates concerns involving the care and use of animals at the institution resulting from public or in-house complaints. The committee reviews, and either approves, requires modifications in (to secure approval), or withholds approval of those components of proposed activities related to the care and use of animals, and of any proposed significant changes regarding the care and use of animals in ongoing activities.	2	1	1	0	
GOV	Recommends and reviews policy regarding the protection of human subjects participating in research; reviews and approves or disapproves all proposals involving research on human subjects and reports all action taken to the Director of Sponsored Programs and Grant Management; monitors all research on human subjects approved by the committee; submits required reports to state and federal agencies; reports alleged violations to the appropriate College Dean and recommends sanctions for the individuals who fail to comply with established policies and procedures to the appropriate College Dean.	2	1	1	0	

Principles of Shared Governance

Definition: Shared Governance is the process by which the University Community respectfully shares responsibility for reaching collective decisions on matters of policy and procedure.

It should embody the following principles:

- A climate of shared governance relies upon consistent, trustworthy communication that is multidirectional.
- A formal memorandum of understanding between various stakeholder constituencies (administration, faculty, staff and students) acknowledging the mutual acceptance of principles and processes is essential.
- All participants in the shared governance process (committees, constituent groups, administrative groups, and administrators) are accountable for the proper execution of their role.
- The principles of shared governance should permeate the campus, reaching into all levels of decision making. Shared governance is a model to be used at all levels of the University Community.

Representation:

- **Participation:** Those who will be affected by a decision on policy or procedures are entitled to be informed of and have opportunity to influence the discussion of these governance issues.
- **Selection of Representatives:** The various stakeholder constituencies should select their representatives to governance committees.
- **Areas of Primary Concern:** While many governance issues will involve multiple constituencies the process needs to acknowledge the fact that certain areas are the primary concern of one group either because the matters considered are of almost exclusive interest of one group or because one group holds the expertise in these matters.
- **Proportional Representation:** Committee representation should be in proportion to the level of interest of the stakeholder constituencies.
- **Authority:** Shared governance recognizes the statutory authority of the president and the Board of Visitors of the University. However, the spirit of shared governance requires that the administrative rejection of shared governance committee recommendations should be rare and for compelling reasons, provided in writing and subject to collective response.

