This ad-hoc subcommittee was formed in Fall 2017 and officially charged by Faculty Senate President Cathy Paris to broadly examine Faculty Senate process and procedures and make recommendations that would support increased faculty engagement in Senate operations. Towards this end, we surveyed members of the faculty Senate and met with individuals that presently (or historically) have played leadership roles in the Senate’s leadership both at the full Senate and in its various Standing Committees. From these efforts, two major and inter-related themes emerged as underlying barriers to Senator engagement:

1) Information relevant to senate meetings is not always disseminated in the most efficient manner, resulting in the majority of the meetings being consumed by “report out” or informational agenda items rather than true discussion/debate.

2) An implicit cultural expectation that items under Senate consideration should be expediently voted on and/or approved without being given ample time for discussion and debate.

As a result of our analysis of the Faculty Senate survey results, our individual meetings with various Faculty Senate stakeholders, and internal discussions, this ad-hoc committee has outlined below a number of explicit proposals that are intended to improve both efficiency and engagement of Faculty Senate membership. These items are being presented to the Senate body for consideration as guidelines for Senate “best practice”. After Senate discussion we will ask for the Senate to vote to approve these guidelines. We bring these proposals for Senate consideration as a single body, with the understanding that individual items may be modified as a result of Senate discussion prior to vote.

Faculty Senate Meeting Procedures and Engagement “Best Practice” Proposal.

1. Establish a New Senator Orientation open to new and existing faculty on an RSVP basis.

2. Limit presentations by administrative offices or committees to those items for which Senate input or vote is required. When such presentations are necessary, provide context and mark on agenda as “Senate Education”.

3. “Report out” agenda items, such as committee reports that do not require Senate action, should be disseminated electronically and not put on the formal agenda unless otherwise proposed for discussion by the Senate floor.

4. Provide sufficient time for discussion before a vote takes place. Ideally issues should be discussed at one meeting and brought to the Senate for a vote the next meeting.
5. Provide a brief, dedicated “New Business” item on each agenda to appear early in the agenda as opposed to the end.

6. In order to more clearly link the work of the Senate and the Standing committees, a representative/s from each committee should be invited at least once a year to generate discussion on current committee-related issues that may benefit from broader participation/brainstorming from the senate floor and to answer questions. These are not to be “progress reports” which can be handled and viewed electronically.
   a) At least once a semester, the FPPC provide the Senate membership with a presentation about the budgetary matters relevant to the Senate.

7. We welcome interaction with the President and the Provost, but we request that they address the Senate no more than once a semester, unless events require them to address a specific issue.
   a) In addition, once a year we request an open forum where the President/Provost would field questions from the Senate floor.
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