

My previous reports provided a general overview of faculty contributions in teaching, research and service as well as updates on general trends in the evolution of our curriculum. This report will focus on some of the activities of Faculty Senate. Since my last oral report there has been one Faculty Senate meeting. Another will occur between the time this report is written and your meeting on February 22nd . Below is summary of the work done by a small sample of the dozen or so Senate Committees since my last report. ad hoc Committee to Review Doctoral Program Guidelines. Given recent changes to state law that may make it possible for the University to increase the number of Doctoral programs, it seemed like a good time to revisit our guidelines for proposing such programs. This committee has completed its review and will recommend a few minor changes to refine language and clarify the routing of such proposals. The most significant recommendations from this committee are 1.) to explicitly charge the Faculty Senate Graduate Council to review all such proposals for both academic rigor and potential conflicts/overlaps/opportunities with existing programs. The latter will be a new charge for that committee. 2.) require the Faculty Senate Committee on Budget and Priorities review and report on the potential financial impact of any new doctoral programs. ad hoc Committee to evaluate the purpose and operation of CGEIP. I mentioned this committee in my previous report. Since then, the committee has begun meeting and should have a final report to present at the April 11 Senate meeting. The need for this committee comes from the need for more efficient and effective methods of program and course assessment. The value of program and course assessment (as distinct from faculty or student assessment) has become increasingly recognized in higher education over the past decade or so, and, like many of our peer institutions, we are struggling to find better ways to carry out this process. The committee has begun meeting and although they have no recommendation as of yet, I am confident they will come up with several practical ideas to improve the situation. The committee consists of both faculty and administration and based on what I have seen of their operations so far this committee is a model of effective shared governance. Committee on Policy Review. This is a new committee this year. Its main function is to review new and existing policy and suggest improvements. It is proving to be an effective channel of communication between faculty and administration. The committee is currently working on recommended guidelines for hiring Department Heads. Beyond the above, the routine business of Senate continues. In our first two meetings of this calendar year the full Senate will have considered 21 curricular proposals and another 100 plus will have made their way through the approval process without requiring consideration by the full Senate. In addition, the many standing committees of Senate continue the often mundane and largely invisible tasks necessary for effective governance. They do this in addition to the main functions of faculty – teaching and research – which consume the vast majority of our energies. Finally, this is my last report. My term as Faculty Senate Chair expires on April. I want to take this opportunity to let you know that serving in this position has given me a more comprehensive view of the university and how it operates. This experience has deepened my already significant respect for the faculty, staff, and administrators whose combined efforts make MSU the great institution it is.

---

Page 77 of 110 - Board of Governors' Meeting 2/22/2019