

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

**SPARK**

---

SIUE "Bulletin"

University Archives and Special Collections

---

3-19-1979

## Edwardsville Bulletin: March 19, 1979

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.siu.edu/bulletin>

---

### Recommended Citation

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, "Edwardsville Bulletin: March 19, 1979" (1979). *SIUE "Bulletin"*. 234.

<https://spark.siu.edu/bulletin/234>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives and Special Collections at SPARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in SIUE "Bulletin" by an authorized administrator of SPARK. For more information, please contact [jkohlbu@siue.edu](mailto:jkohlbu@siue.edu).

# Edwardsville Bulletin

To the Faculty and Staff of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

Vol. 11, No. 8  
March 19, 1979

*new File*  
~~*Bulletin*~~  
*Adm*  
*Governance*  
*4-1*

MEMO TO: The University Community

FROM: Committee on Governance  
Kenneth A. Shaw, Chairperson  
Robert Campbell  
Melissa Curry  
Panos Kokoropoulos  
Earl Lazerson  
Betty Richardson  
James Rotter  
Arthur Stahnke  
Tom Werner

SUBJECT: Proposal to Restructure the Internal Governance System of SIUE

Attached you will find the proposed restructuring of the Internal Governance System of SIUE, a statement of the background to the proposal and of the assumptions underlying the proposal, and a form on which you may submit your reactions and suggestions if you do not wish to present these at the hearings.

The proposed restructuring recommended by the Committee on Governance is being submitted to the University community for review and comment according to the Transitional Timetable included in this document. Two days of open hearings on the recommendations will be held by the Committee on Governance during mid-April. Notice of the specific dates, times, and locations for the hearings will be announced as soon as possible. Any individual or group desiring to have time reserved for a presentation at the hearings should call Chuck Mecum at 692-2514. Presentations will be limited to approximately fifteen minutes. Written comments and statements, whether presented at the hearings or not, are solicited by the Committee.

If you do not want to write a lengthy statement, please list your comments in the space provided below. Comments and suggestions may be dropped off at the Office of the President, Rendleman Building, or may be mailed to the Committee on Governance, c/o Office of the President, Campus Box 51-A.

Comments on Recommendation II. A.

Comments on Recommendation II. B.

Comments on Recommendation II. C.

Comments on Recommendation II. D.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE  
PROPOSAL TO RESTRUCTURE THE INTERNAL GOVERNANCE SYSTEM OF SIUE

I. Background and Assumptions

During the past two years, several events and conditions have pointed to a growing need for a comprehensive review and reassessment of the internal governance structure at SIUE. Concerns have been expressed by several constituencies, particularly the faculty, about the ability and adequacy of the University Senate structure to provide proper and forceful representation of the positions of individual constituency groups and about the appropriateness of a governance body, composed of all constituencies, in legislating policies and proposals for subject areas which may be the primary concern of a single constituency group. Such concerns have been reflected in the formation and development of the Faculty Senate, in the revised Constitution of the Faculty Senate recently approved by the President, and in the formation within the University Senate of the Blue Ribbon Committee on the Review of Senate Constitution and Bylaws (the Kokoropoulos committee), charged with proposing ways of streamlining and improving the operation of the University Senate. These matters and others prompted the President, in his 1977 and 1978 annual addresses and in his 1978 Annual Report on Administrative Goal Performance, to comment upon the need for changes to strengthen and improve internal governance mechanisms.

Because each previous approach to review and change was centered in an existing governance body, no single review has yet achieved a perspective comprehending all constituency governing bodies and the needs and aspirations of all constituencies. For that reason, and to achieve such a perspective, President Shaw appointed the Committee on Governance in December, 1978. The Committee includes executive officers and representatives from each constituency governing body and from the University Senate, as well as the Provost; the Committee is chaired by the President. It was charged with reviewing the structure and operation of the existing governance mechanism and its components and with devising an improved governance system to address the needs of each individual constituency and of the University community as a whole.

In pursuing its task, the Committee accepted certain assumptions concerning the nature of a restructured governance system. Briefly, these assumptions are: (1) the governance system should produce solutions to real problems and concerns and not occupy itself with busywork; (2) the governance system should provide for strong constituency groups with access to administrative leaders; (3) some form of all-university governing structure should exist to deal with all-university matters; (4) the design of the system should avoid overlap and duplication as much as possible; (5) components of the existing system that work effectively should be kept; (6) the design of the system should not block open communication between constituencies and their governing bodies, the all-university governing body and the administration; and (7) any changes in the governance system should be phased into existence in an orderly manner.

Meeting twice a month since mid-January, the Committee has reached agreement on a restructured governance system to recommend to the University community.

The remainder of this Report will explain the proposed changes to be made in existing bodies, the new elements to be introduced into the restructured system, and the timetable for review and implementation of the proposed system.

The proposed new structure would give legislative authority to the constituency governing bodies over many matters now within the jurisdiction of the Councils of the University Senate. All-university committees would be established and function only in those areas which are truly of an all-university nature. The proposed restructuring would involve the following three changes, details of which are spelled out in the section that follows: (1) abolition of the University Senate; (2) redistribution of the functions now performed by the Senate and its Councils either to constituency governing bodies or, when appropriate, to all-university committees; and, (3) creation of a coordinating body, the Coordinating Committee.

The proposed restructuring is designed to provide greater involvement by the constituencies in the matters which affect them most directly; to eliminate duplication of action by governing bodies, some of which now have overlapping jurisdictions; to foster and encourage closer and more cooperative relations between the various constituencies and the administration, and to provide for a more open and informed decisionmaking process.

## II. Specific Recommendations of the Committee on Governance

- A. To abolish the University Senate and to redistribute the matters now handled by the Senate to the constituency governing bodies (Faculty Senate, Student Senate and University Staff Advisory Council) or to function-based, all-university standing committees established through a new coordinating body, the Coordinating Committee. The redistribution of functions is explained in item II. B. below.

### RATIONALE

For some years, faculty members have been concerned because, while students are represented through the Student Senate and non-academic personnel through the University Staff Advisory Council, no comparable body has existed for faculty members. With the establishment of the Faculty Senate and the approval of the Constitution of that Senate, such a body now exists.

With three strong constituency governing bodies, there remains no apparent need for the University Senate in its present form. Most tasks handled by the University Senate are the primary concern of a single constituency and properly should be considered by that constituency's governing body. Consideration by the appropriate constituency governing body would increase efficiency. A frequent complaint concerning the University Senate Councils has been the amount of time

and energy expended in considering policies of no particular interest to many persons on a Council and this, in turn, has led to difficulties in maintaining attendance at University Senate and Council meetings.

- B. To redistribute the University Senate functions. (The Committee on Governance suggests below how the proposed system would work in its final form. Interim arrangements for the period of transition are suggested in the Transitional Timetable.)

Each constituency governing body would send proposals or recommendations on matters under its jurisdiction to the President for action or approval. If such a recommendation affected another constituency group, the recommendation would be sent to that constituency group for reaction or comment before the President would take action on the recommendation.

1. Curriculum functions, undergraduate and graduate, would operate through the Faculty Senate under a committee or council structure to be devised by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President. This would include the functions of the existing Curriculum Council and the graduate curriculum functions of the existing Graduate Council. As specified by Board of Trustees Statutes, General Studies program matters would continue to be reported directly to the Provost, although consideration of General Studies matters would be integrated in some fashion into the curriculum function of the Faculty Senate. The Committee on Governance recommends that the curriculum function to be devised by the Faculty Senate have some method included in it to provide formal and ongoing student representation in curricular matters.

#### RATIONALE

While student concern for curriculum is undeniable, it is the faculty who are permanently committed to courses and programs at any university. Consequently, the process of curriculum and program review and adoption is primarily the business of the faculty, and the appropriate curriculum and review committees should be housed within the Faculty Senate. This in no way should be construed as denying to students the right to speak out on curricular matters, nor does it debar the Faculty Senate from soliciting and welcoming student participation and suggestions.

While the Statutes of the Board of Trustees mandate certain functions to a General Studies Committee and to the Graduate School, it is the hope of the Committee on Governance that the Faculty Senate curriculum function will ensure that curricular and review committees do not duplicate efforts and that courses and programs at all levels be examined and reviewed in the context of the total University commitment.

2. Graduate Council policy functions would operate according to the existing arrangement. Graduate policy matters which have no budgetary or governance implications would be reported directly to the Provost. Graduate policy matters which have budgetary or governance implications would be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for action and then to the President.

RATIONALE

The function of the Graduate Council and committees is highly controversial and is apt to remain so. Since the graduate faculty bears primary responsibility in this matter it is the opinion of the Committee on Governance that this matter should be given over to the Faculty Senate for deliberation. Debate on this issue should not be permitted to impede the governance restructuring discussed in this document.

3. Planning Council functions would become the charge of a standing all-university committee. The proposed planning and budget standing committee would absorb the functions of the existing Planning Council and its committees including the Augmented Budget Review Committee and, probably, the existing Parking and Traffic Committee. Existing planning and budget committees would continue as presently constituted and in accordance with the provisions of the Transitional Timetable. The Committee on Governance initially suggests that the composition of the standing all-university planning and budget committee be: ten faculty, three non-academic employees and three students. Members of the standing committee would be appointed by the constituency governing bodies in accord with recommendation C. 2. (b).

RATIONALE

Planning and budgetary matters clearly demand the participation of all three constituencies. In addition, for planning and budgetary committees to function efficiently, the committees must involve administrators familiar with these areas. Such administrators may either participate in the committee or may be consulted on an ad hoc basis. Because of the nature of planning and budget problems and of the membership necessary to solve these problems, it is not possible to fit the planning and budget committee into any of the three constituency governing bodies. The planning and budgetary functions of the Parking and Traffic Committee also would fit into this structure better than any other. Matters of individual parking ticket appeals and waivers would be handled by an administrative unit.

4. Student Affairs Council functions would be absorbed by the Student Senate except for the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee. Because of N.C.A.A. regulations, it is anticipated that the I.C.A.C. would become an all-university standing committee. Appointments of members to the all-university athletics committee would be made by the Coordinating Committee upon recommendations from the Student Senate. Athletic fee or budget matters that have no policy implications would be forwarded to the Vice President for Student Affairs. Athletic matters which have policy implications would be forwarded to the Student Senate for action and then to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

RATIONALE

While faculty members are concerned with such matters as student conduct, most matters handled by the Student Affairs Council at present are primarily the concern of the students, and the appropriate committees should thus be housed within the Student Senate. This should not be interpreted as denying to faculty and non-academic personnel the right to speak out on student affairs matters, nor does it prohibit the Student Senate from soliciting and welcoming faculty and non-academic employee suggestions and participation.

5. Welfare Council functions would become the jurisdiction of the individual constituency governing bodies. Each constituency group would then have policy development authority over its own welfare issues.

RATIONALE

Few matters handled by the present Welfare Council are of concern to more than one constituency. Provision has been made for situations in which two or more constituencies are affected by any policy recommendation.

- C. To establish a Coordinating Committee.

RATIONALE

Not all matters can be simply assigned to one constituency body or another. A coordinating body is needed. It is proposed that this take the form of a University Coordinating Committee. While the primary function of this body would be to maintain communications, it also would have the power to establish all-university councils and committees when it clearly is necessary to involve representatives from all constituencies in planning and decisionmaking.

This Committee would have no policymaking or legislative powers. It could, however, recommend ideas or proposals to the constituency governing bodies or to all-university committees for their consideration.

Such a coordinating committee could also ensure administrative responsibility. When, as on many campuses, constituencies operate in complete independence of each other and without knowledge of each other's concerns, conflict among constituencies is common and administrators may be tempted to encourage conflict when it is to their advantage to do so.



1. Composition of the Coordinating Committee.

The Coordinating Committee would be composed of four faculty (the President, President-Elect and Secretary of the Faculty Senate and a member-at-large selected by the Faculty Senate); two students (the Student Body President and Vice-President); and two non-academic employees (the Chairperson of U.S.A.C. and one other member selected by U.S.A.C., one a civil service employee and the other an administrative staff employee). The President of the Faculty Senate would be the permanent chairperson of the Coordinating Committee.

2. Specific functions and powers of the Coordinating Committee.

(a) The Coordinating Committee would function as a coordinating body and would facilitate communications among constituency governing bodies, all-university committees, administrators and appropriate constituents. Meeting notices, agendas, minutes and recommendations of all constituency governing bodies and their subordinate units, and all-university committees would be sent by each committee and constituency body to the Coordinating Committee in order to make possible this flow of communications. Meeting notices, agendas, minutes and recommendations would also be forwarded by the Coordinating Committee to the President and the Vice Presidents.

(b) The Coordinating Committee would create and maintain all-university committees to consider all-university issues. The Coordinating Committee would establish the all-university committees' structures and general charges. All-university committees would either be standing, permanent committees to deal with matters of a continuing nature or ad hoc committees to deal with temporary issues or problems. Additional standing all-university committees would be established only with the concurrence of all three constituency governing bodies. These all-university committees would report their recommendations through the Coordinating Committee to the President for approval. The Coordinating Committee would distribute all recommendations received to the constituency governing bodies for information and responses. Each constituency governing body would appoint or select members from its constituency to serve on these all-university committees. At present, only two all-university standing committees are proposed: Planning and Budget and Intercollegiate Athletics. The Coordinating Committee would make appointments of members to the standing Intercollegiate Athletics Committee upon recommendations received from the Student Senate.

The function of the Coordinating Committee in the establishment of all-university committees would not in any way limit the authority of the President or the Vice Presidents to create committees, councils or other bodies to consider matters that they determine should be handled by such bodies.

(c) The Coordinating Committee is to oversee the implementation of performance appraisals of the President and Vice Presidents.

- (d) The Coordinating Committee would be empowered to call together for a joint meeting any two or more constituency governing bodies to attempt to resolve differences between such bodies. This power would be used only in cases in which there is significant dispute or controversy between two or more constituency governing bodies or in which two or more constituency governing bodies forward contradictory or incompatible recommendations to the President. The chairperson of the Coordinating Committee would be the presiding officer over any such joint meetings of constituency governing bodies.
- (e) During the transition period, the Coordinating Committee would assist in the temporary transfer of existing committees and councils to appropriate constituency governing bodies or would take the responsibility for maintaining such committees and councils until such time as new procedures for handling the duties of those committees and councils could be developed by the appropriate constituency governing bodies or by the Coordinating Committee.

D. Additional recommendations

To maintain lines of communication and exchanges of information despite the decentralization of legislative functions to the constituency governing bodies, the Committee on Governance proposes that the following matters be embodied as a part of the new governance system.

1. Each constituency governing body, in developing committees or councils to deal with its responsibilities, shall be free to structure into its processes representatives of other constituency groups or the administration which have an interest or expertise in a given subject area. Each constituency governing body may, as it deems appropriate, grant voting rights to such representatives.
2. Each constituency governing body, the President and the Vice Presidents shall have the right to designate a participating representative to any council, committee or agency of any constituency governing body. Participating representatives would not have voting privileges unless they were granted by the committee or council to which the person was a representative. Participating representatives would be responsible for keeping their own constituencies informed; participating administrators bear the same responsibility to the administrative officer to whom they report. All bear responsibility for providing appropriate information to the council or committee to which they are assigned.
3. Each constituency governing body, and all subordinate units of such bodies and each all-university committee would be responsible for forwarding to the Coordinating Committee all meeting notices, agendas, minutes and recommendations. These materials would also be forwarded by the Coordinating Committee to the President and the Vice Presidents.

RATIONALE

On such matters as student conduct and curriculum, primary responsibility can be assigned to a constituency governing body, but, clearly, other constituencies will be concerned with policies, positions, and decisions. In order to facilitate effective decisionmaking, the Committee on Governance recommends that information be solicited by the appropriate constituency governing body from representatives of other constituency governing bodies or the administration. Such representation can bring to the attention of the constituency governing body problems, questions and concerns that will have to be taken into account at some point in the decisionmaking process. It will help avoid the turmoil experienced in a climate of adversary relationships. At the same time, the Committee on Governance does not wish to dictate the structure, nature, and powers of any such representation. These matters should be left to the constituency governing bodies.

III. Transitional Timetable and Interim Arrangements

March 19, 1979

The Committee on Governance recommendations are to be forwarded to the University community for review and comment on the restructuring proposal. All considerations, recommendations and reactions should be completed and forwarded to the Committee on Governance by April 23.

Mid-April

The Committee on Governance will hold two days of open hearings on the recommendations. Presentations at the hearings will be limited to approximately fifteen minutes. The Committee requests copies of comments or statements presented at the hearings to assist them in reviewing the recommendations. Any individual or group desiring to have time reserved for a presentation at the hearings should contact Chuck Mecum at 692-2514. Specific dates, times and locations of the hearings will be announced as soon as possible.

April 23, to  
May 8, 1979

Committee on Governance would review the comments and recommendations received and make any necessary adjustments or changes to the restructuring proposal.

May 9, 1979

The final restructuring proposal would be forwarded to the constituency governing bodies and the University Senate for review with a request that each body ratify the proposal. All review and ratification actions should be completed and the results forwarded to the President and the Committee on Governance by May 30, 1979.

June 1, 1979

Presidential action would set the new system and interim arrangements in motion: abolition of the University Senate, establishment of the Coordinating Committee, implementation of the communication links between constituency governing bodies and between those bodies and the Coordinating Committee, transfer of the welfare functions to each constituency governing body, and the transfer of existing committees or councils to one of the constituency governing bodies or the Coordinating Committee until the transitional adjustments are finalized.

EXISTING COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS WOULD BE HANDLED AS FOLLOWS UNTIL NEW PROCEDURES ARE DEVELOPED AND APPROVED.

1. THE CURRICULUM COUNCIL AND GRADUATE COUNCIL WOULD BE PLACED IN THE FACULTY SENATE AND REMAIN INTACT IN TERMS OF DUTIES AND MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION. THIS WOULD CONTINUE UNTIL A REORGANIZED AND CONSOLIDATED CURRICULUM FUNCTION WAS DEVELOPED BY THE FACULTY SENATE AND APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT.

2. THE PLANNING COUNCIL, AUGMENTED BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE WOULD BE MAINTAINED BY THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE AND WOULD FORWARD ANY RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT. THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE WOULD BE MAINTAINED BY THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE AND WOULD FORWARD ANY RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS.

FOR THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION, IF MEMBERS OF TRANSFERRED COMMITTEES OR COUNCILS RESIGN OR THEIR TERMS EXPIRE, NEW MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE APPROPRIATE CONSTITUENCY GOVERNING BODY. THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD IS PRESENTLY EXPECTED TO BE JULY 1, 1979 TO JUNE 30, 1980.

October 1, 1979

At the start of the 1979-80 academic year, each constituency governing body would develop specific plans on how its functions would be organized and handled within the governing body. These plans should be completed as soon as possible and forwarded to the Coordinating Committee for information and to the President for approval.

THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE WOULD DEVELOP RECOMMENDATIONS DETAILING ITS OPERATION AND THE FUNCTIONS AND OPERATION OF ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES AND REVIEW EXISTING POLICIES AND PROPOSE REVISIONS TO MAKE THEM CONSISTENT WITH THE GOVERNANCE SYSTEM. ALL RECOMMENDATIONS ON THESE MATTERS WOULD BE FORWARDED TO THE PRESIDENT. THE PRESIDENT WOULD TRANSMIT THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CONSTITUENCY GOVERNING BODIES FOR REVIEW PRIOR TO TAKING ACTION ON THEM.