

**FACULTY SENATE
AGENDA
October 16, 2013
Wells Commons**

3:00 pm refreshments with agenda starting at 3:15 pm

I. Welcome and Announcements

II. Approval of 1 May 2013 Minutes

See DRAFT at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/senate-minutes/2013-2014/september-18-2013/>
Also in Appendix 2

III. Committee Reports

Board of Trustees Representative – Bob Rice
Academic Affairs – Richard Borgman & Judy Kuhns-Hastings
Constitution & Bylaws – Mick Peterson
Research & Scholarship – Emmanuel Boss & Mauricio de Cunha
Finance & Institutional Planning – Jim McClymer & Tom Sandford
University Environment – Michael Scott
Library Advisory – Robert Rice & Howard Segal
Service & Outreach – Martha Broderick & David Yarborough
Committee on Committees – <vacant, FS Exec Comm acting as this committee>
Program Creation & Reorganization Review – Brian Robinson & Mick Peterson
General Education – Harlan Onsrud
Ad Hoc IT Advisory – Michael Scott
Reports of Faculty Members on Committees of the Administration

IV. Questions of the Administration

V. Old Business

VI. New Business

Motion to support the proposed Departmental Structure for the College of Education and Human Development (Appendix 3)

Program Creation & Reorganization Review Committee

(Appendix 4)

Faculty Senate Executive Committee

VII. Adjourn

APPENDIX 1

Faculty Senate, 2013-2014 Academic Year Committee Agendas

The designated areas of responsibility for each standing committee may be found in Article IV at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/bylaws/>. A summary of these responsibilities is included under the last item for each committee titled *General*.

Academic Affairs

Co-Chairs: [Richard Borgman](#) and [Judy Kuhns-Hastings](#)

- 1.) Work with Provost and Associate Provost on policy for faculty authored materials.
- 2.) Finalize a recommendation re. classroom scheduling change.
- 3.) Recommend approval of university calendar.
- 4.) Continue to advocate for retention of tenure stream positions to ensure curriculum integrity. That is, monitor and report on issue of tenure track vs move to temporary, adjunct, non-tenure faculty.
- 5.) Other issues as they arise.

From Bylaws: Process any requests to the Senate relating to academic matters including university-wide degree requirements, curriculum matters involving two or more colleges, the academic calendar, academic freedom, academic standards, academic performance, the assessment of academic outcomes, academic titles, criteria for ranks, admission standards, grading, evaluation of teaching, student academic standing, honorary degrees, and the library.

Committee on Committees

Co-Chairs: [tba \(Executive Committee now serving in role as Committee on Committees\)](#)

- 1.) Process requests to the Faculty Senate for appointment or nomination of faculty members to campus committees formed by the administration or others

From Constitution and Bylaws: The Committee on Committees shall, at the request of the University President or designee, recommend faculty members to standing and ad hoc administrative committees or shall provide a list to the President or designee of faculty members who have agreed to serve on a specific committee. Make recommendations to the President of the Senate for all faculty members of each standing committee. At the March meeting, the Committee on Committees presents preferably at least two candidates for Vice President/President-elect, Secretary and Board of Trustees Representative.

Constitution and Bylaws

Co-Chairs: [Mick Peterson](#)

- 1.) Review the Constitution and Bylaws and propose and process any amendments as needed
- 2.) Review the Faculty Hand-Book, develop a revised draft, post as a web-based html draft, solicit comments and potential revisions and propose for approval by the Senate

From Bylaws: Review any proposed amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.

Finance and Institutional Planning

Co-Chairs: [Tom Sandford](#) and [Jim McClymer](#)

- 1.) Pursue greater inclusion in campus and system financial planning processes
- 2.) Participate in and respond to Blue Sky Task force 2 recommendations and actions
- 3.) Assess the structuring of student fees and their expenditure distribution

From Bylaws: Review matters and make recommendations to the Senate in matters relating to administrative organization, institutional planning, and budgetary issues affecting university priorities and allocation.

General Education

Co-Chairs: [Harlan Onsrud](#)

- 1.) Track and assess development and revision of campus General Education course requirements
- 2.) Explore alternative General Education models with the goal of achieving more effective models
- 3.) Interface with the University of Maine System in regard to the transferability of general education requirements among the UMS campuses and from Maine's community colleges

From Bylaws: Serve as a liaison with all campus administrative committees dealing with general education and bring to the attention of the Faculty Senate issues relating to general education

Library Advisory Committee

Co-Chairs: [Robert Rice](#) and [Howard Segal](#)

1.) Facilitate and promote means for populating the Digital Commons (i.e. the campus Institutional Repository hosted by Fogler Library)

From Bylaws: Review and make recommendations to the Senate in matters relating to the functions of the library including physical plant needs, staffing levels, financial support, service to the academic community, adoption of new technology and policies affecting the campus academic environment.

Program Creation and Reorganization Review Committee

Co-Chairs: [Brian Robinson](#) and [Mick Peterson](#)

1.) Follow up the processing of all academic programs that went through a suspension process but that have not yet been formally eliminated or reconstituted in another form. Document the findings on the web.

2.) Facilitate interdisciplinary program development as appropriate.

3.) Continue to fine-tune committee procedures to make them clear for new committee members and users.

4.) Monitor growing use of certificates, minors and other evolving academic activities which impact faculty and students.

From Bylaws: Receive and review proposals for the creation, elimination and reorganization of academic programs and present recommendations to the faculty senate for approval.

Research and Scholarship

Co-Chairs: [Emmanuel Boss](#) and [Mauricio da Cunha](#)

1.) Support expanded faculty Peer Mentoring for research and scholarship

2.) Work with the *Office of Research and Sponsored Programs* and the *University Research Council* to assess progress on the *Strategic Implementation Plan for Enhancement of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity* (Jan 2012) with due consideration to the comments made in *Faculty Responses to the UMaine Strategic Implementation Plan for Enhancement of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity* (150 faculty survey responses, April 2012) (See <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/documents/>).

From Bylaws: Review and make recommendations to the Senate on matters relating to research including research priorities, research funds, patents, the protection of human and animal subjects, and research safety.

Service and Outreach

Co-Chairs: [Martha Broderick](#) & [Dave Yarborough](#)

1.) Document or develop service learning opportunities for undergrad and grad students with communities, non-profits, companies and agencies (e.g. implementation is typically at the academic department level)

2.) Explore options for better highlighting faculty service to disciplines or professions

3.) Keep the campus informed about criteria needed to attain or retain campus stature or credentials with external audiences, e.g. Carnegie Classification, and make suggestions to retain or achieve

From Bylaws: Review and make recommendations to the Senate regarding service and outreach issues and opportunities that affect the university and its communities.

University Environment

Co-Chairs: [Michael Scott](#)

1.) Pursue means for achieving better interdisciplinary campus experiences and academic programs for students without undercutting core programs

2.) Pursue physical and technology improvements for classrooms

3.) Pursue electronic teaching, research and communication infrastructure improvements in consultation with the IT Ad Hoc Committee

From Bylaws: Review and make recommendations to the Senate in matters relating to the academic and physical environments of the University including cultural programs, energy and resource conservation, sustainability, free speech and assembly, athletics, public relations, residential life, safety, facilities, and conduct.

Ad Hoc IT Advisory Committee

Co-Chairs: [Michael Scott](#)

1.) Pursue further co-ordination of the various IT groups on campus and across System

- 2.) Work with the Academic Affairs Committee on how academic needs might better drive development of the technologies required for various modes of E-Learning
- 3.) Pursue electronic teaching, research and communication infrastructure improvements in consultation with the Environment Committee
- 4.) Assess progress on the *The University of Maine Information Technology Strategic Plan* (Final Draft 23 Feb 2012) with due consideration to the comments made in *Faculty Responses to the UMaine Information Technology Strategic Plan* (127 faculty survey responses, April 2012) (See 2011-2012 at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/documents/>)

APPENDIX 2

DRAFT FACULTY SENATE MINUTES **September 18, 2013**

Present: John Allen, Steve Barkan, Richard Borgman, Dick Brucher, Stephen Coghlan, Micheal Montgomery for George Criner, Mauricio da Cunha, Benildo de los Reyes, Scott Dunning, Dylan Dryer, Janet Fairman, Michael Grillo, Gordon Hamilton, Dennis King, Judy Kuhns-Hastings, James McClymer, Robert Milardo, Martha Novy-Broderick, Harlan Onsrud, Michael Peterson, Andrew Reeve, Brian Robinson, Jonathan Rubin, Thomas Sandford, Michael Scott, Howard Segal, Allan Smith, David Townsend, Susan Wheaton, Clayton Wheeler, David Yarborough, Bob Rice, Kathryn Slott, William Dee Nichols, Paul W. Ferguson, Jeff Hecker, Carol Kim, Alicia Bolduc (Stud. Gov), Abigail Jones (Grad Stud Gov).

Absent: **Jason Bolton**, Emmanuel Boss, Ian Bricknell, William Congleton, Charlsye Diaz, Marcia Douglas, Thane Fremouw, Robert Gundersen, Ramesh Gupta, Clarissa Henry, Steven Kimball, Dorothy Klimis-Zacas, Mary Ellin Logue, Paul Myer, Ray Pelletier, Jay Rasaiah, Mark Wells, Gail Werrbach, Melvin Johnson, Peter C. Altmann, Charles Rote

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 pm

I. Welcome and Announcements:

Harlan welcomed all to the first full Faculty Senate meeting of the year. For those that were new, Senators are elected from their college. Administrators (President, Provost, and VP for Research) attend the Full Senate meetings, there's an Undergraduate Student Government Rep and Graduate Student Government Rep, and other campus organizations that have representation at Full Senate meetings. For specific processes of Faculty Senate check the website at www.umaine.edu/facultysenate
A Committee sign up sheet will be sent around.

There will be a brunch for those on Senate at Harlan's Sunday, Sept. 29.

II. Approval of May 1, 2013 Minutes

Vote: Motion carried.

III. Committee Reports

BOT Rep – Robert Rice

The BOT met in July, uneventful, there will be a meeting next month in Bangor. The System Office is working on initiatives, i.e., IT issues, the travel policy, and academic credit transfer. Tracy Bigney, Chief of HR, will move to Clerk of Board. BOT will have a retreat in October.

Academic Affairs –Richard Borgman & Judy Kuhns-Hastings

The committee hasn't met yet but will within the next couple of weeks. Topics will include classes running Mon. – Thurs.

Constitution & Bylaws – Mick Peterson

No report.

Research & Scholarship – Emmanuel Boss & Mauricio de Cunha

Meeting in October.

Finance & Institutional Planning – James McClymer & Tom Sandford

The committee will meet with the VP next Wednesday to discuss financial issues and Institutional Planning. It would be nice to have a committee member from Business and one from Education so each college is represented.

University Environment –Mike Scott & OPEN

The committee continues to look at classrooms, bond issue to address classrooms, and other issues. The committee has not met yet.

Library Advisory – Robert Rice & Howard Segal

If anyone is interested in joining, the committee meets with the Dean of Libraries approximately two or three times a semester.

Service & Outreach – Martha Broderick & David Yarborough

The committee has not met but plan to check with Claire and Emmanuel where they left off last year. Will try to contact departments to see what they currently do for Service and Outreach.

Committee on Committees – OPEN

Kim Junkins will be doing 90% of the work for the committee but a Chair is needed.

Program Creation & Reorganization Review – Brian Robinson & Mick Peterson

The purpose of the committee is to receive, review, and recommend program change, creation, or elimination. There are presently six members but ten are needed. The Chancellor recently reinstated two programs, BA in Theater and BA in Women, Gender and Sexuality.

General Education – Harlan Onsrud

The committee reviews general education course requirements across campus. There was a reevaluation of requirements two years ago and something that keeps coming forward. With the System wide credit transfer initiative, this has expanded and will probably end up being an active committee.

Ad Hoc IT – Michael Scott & OPEN

The committee hasn't met yet. There is a Resolution coming up under New Business.

Committee of the Administration

No report.

IV. Open Comments from the Administration

Q.

The news reported a large proportion of tuition goes to Study Group for students. How strong were the incentives to help students graduate?

A.

Study Group is an international company helping to recruit students from abroad. There are two centers, USM and UMaine. Study Group has a five-year contract. First year is 80% (also covers cost of recruiting) and each year after an additional 5% is paid to Study Group as an incentive. Retention/progression rate was researched before Study Group was selected. UMaine faculty are teaching the courses.

Q.

It was reported in the paper that \$1.8 million was being spent to remodel Estabrook Hall.

A.

Estabrook was previously a residential hall and will not be residential any longer. The report was incorrect, the renovation amount is actually \$700,000+/- . The first floor will be office and interactive classroom. Study Group will have a portion of the second floor along with classrooms, some minimal office space and an International Center. The International Office may move over at some point. There will be no residential use of the building. The \$1.8 million is actually \$1 million for Estabrook and the \$.8 million for USM.

Q.

How long is the Study Group contract and does it center on the retention issue?

A.

Five years and history elsewhere show's a high percentage rate for retention.

A.

Provost stated that UMaine is involved with two paths, Engineering and Business, more may be opened up later.

There are four students now because recruiting started too late and the season was missed. That number will go up. Study Group is also sending their recruiters to UMaine and Maine to visit so they have first hand knowledge of the campus and area.

Q.

For President Ferguson: Will Faculty Senate continue to have a role in the Blue Sky and Steering Committees or will role be diminished now that it's being reorganized?

A.

There's been a change in management because the project is in year 3. The VP's have specific tasks to get done so Janet and Jeff have a lot of tasks. Each VP will transition the group to an advisory committee and meet regularly with the faculty group. This change doesn't diminish the role of Faculty Senate but has more to do with the fact that the project is in year 3.

Q.

The Faculty Senate last year discussed and forwarded suggestions but we've seen little progress.

A.

They still remain priorities.

Q.

What's happening with the Faculty Fellows Program Proposal and why hasn't there been further involvement from the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate in the development of the program?

A.

President Ferguson stated the original concept was for Faculty Leadership Academy was early on but that changed to Faculty Fellowship. Several from Faculty Senate were involved early on and had continued input. The program is not finalized and a call hasn't been sent out.

Q.

Shared Governance Policy makes clear that there is to be collaboration with faculty, deans, and administration. There were no open sessions for input for the Provost position. While there is strong support on the selection the process is important. Why weren't the normal procedures followed and will they be in the future?

A.

Not sure that Shared Governance wasn't followed. When Provost Hunter shared on July 1 that she was leaving there was limited time to fill three positions. There were conversations, sought input, and comments taken. Each position is a two-year fixed length terms and then a national search will be done. It seemed appropriate to fill the positions that way with the best people at UMaine. Once Provost Hecker was appointed he used the same process to fill the other two positions.

Provost Hecker explained the process for filling the positions that were open.

A comment was made regarding Shared Governance not always being followed and it should be.

Stated that in the spirit of Shared Governance, Faculty Senate's Committee on Committees was notified to fill positions on the Dean Search Committee.

Harlan stated that some questions presented were due to a lack of communication over the summer.

Q.

Mike Scott stated that last year, working with Stuart, there was a committee of faculty involved with the active classroom. Is there any follow-up with that?

A.

Janet Waldron stated she'd check in to the issue and get Mike linked back in.

V. Old Business

None

VI. New Business

RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE TO PRESIDENT FERGUSON

PREAMBLE

The University of Maine System (UMS) Information Technology (IT) Transformation Plan, "A Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery," was approved by the UMS Board of Trustees, January 2013. "A Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery" is in its first phase of implementation, directed by UMS Chief Information Officer (CIO) Richard Thompson, by explicit instruction of Chancellor James Page. The plan was developed in response to the Chancellor's December 2012 revised charter, after his rejection of the recommendations of an administrative IT review committee representing all campuses, formed by charter of the Chancellor May 2012. The vision of the approved plan, authored by the CIO, is "[t]o deliver seamless, high-quality and effective information technology infrastructure and services that matter to students, faculty and administrative users." ("Administrative Review: Information Technology Services," 2). The approved plan proposes "transformational change that establishes an accountable person within a framework that provides high engagement and oversight from campus leadership, as well as a commitment to efficiencies, savings, and a greater focus on academic programs and activities" (ibid, 4) a "new focus on academic technology" with the planned outcome of "a seamless information technology delivery system which is responsive to the needs of leadership, faculty, students and administrators" (10). The plan identifies "change of governance, development of communication, accountability and oversight," as key factors for achieving "a streamlined and efficient system of service delivery and asset management" (15) securing "efficiencies resulting in savings of at least 10% of current operating budgets" (7) by Fiscal 2016. The plan calls for modernization and transformation by systematically reassigning campus-level responsibilities for IT management, growth and delivery to system-level administration (the Office of the CIO), centralizing and standardizing services, procurement and funding, and policies and practices; by consolidating to system-level the management and delivery of campus and system infrastructure, support, data center operations, and communications systems; by unifying delivery of end-user technology across campuses; and by centrally organizing academic IT, web development services and learning management systems through a shared services model, all to be achieved by applying best practices (Appendix 3—Recommendations, 25-29). The plan is to be fully implemented by April 2015.

WHEREAS the University of Maine System ("The System") Information Technology (IT) Transformation Plan, A Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery ("The Plan"), is currently in its initial phase of implementation; and

WHEREAS aspects of The Plan implemented since inception have included establishment of a multi-campus IT Director, an Academic Information Technology Service Management Committee, a CIO council, a communications plan for leaders, administrators, technical staff and innovators, a campus commonalities report for identifying, reviewing and organizing IT services into a shared services model with campus IT management, and establishment in part of a new organizational structure; and

WHEREAS aspects of The Plan implemented since May 2013 have included governance changes impacting oversight at the campus level; and

WHEREAS aspects of The Plan implemented since May 2013 have included changes to infrastructure impacting or potentially impacting academic IT at the campus level; and

WHEREAS aspects of The Plan implemented since May 2013 impacting campus oversight and/or academic IT have been enacted without either soliciting input from or informing in a timely fashion University of Maine faculty representatives to the Academic Information Technology Service Management Committee;

AND FURTHER,

WHEREAS The Plan systemically removes autonomy and authority over development, management and delivery of academic IT infrastructure and services from University of Maine vests such autonomy and authority in The System;

AND FURTHER,

WHEREAS The Plan does not quantify or otherwise consider consequences of cost-management decision-making on the effectiveness of academic IT use and development, nor the potentially mitigating effects on proposed cost-savings due to academic IT-educational services solutions mismatches; and

WHEREAS The Plan is not informed by any study or review of current academic IT practices and needs of faculty at University of Maine and other campuses; and

WHEREAS The Plan is without mechanism for shared, direct communication between system-level administrators of The Plan and campus faculty, *despite recommendation from the May 2012 review committee to "Form constituent-based advisory opportunities for consumers of IT services. These should include formally assembled groups of students, faculty, and administrative staff to have the ability for their needs to be heard and to provide priority and voice to their ideas and input"* ("Administrative Review," 10); and

AND FURTHER,

WHEREAS academic IT network and digital communications supporting are today integrated into daily classroom activities of more than 50% of University of Maine campus-based courses; and

WHEREAS The Plan makes no acknowledgement of the deep daily integration of academic IT in daily classroom activities; and

WHEREAS seamless, high-quality and effective information technology infrastructure and services via campus-based network and digital communications are further relied upon by University of Maine students in their daily and academic lives and equally by University of Maine faculty in their daily and professional lives; and

WHEREAS the vision of The Plan is precisely to deliver seamless, high-quality and effective information technology infrastructure and services that matter to students, faculty and administrative users; and

WHEREAS disruption of access to academic IT resources and services implies immediate disruption of delivery of educational materials and services for both campus-based and distance-learning courses; and

WHEREAS such disruption of services compromises the effectiveness of the teaching faculty, the reputation of affected campuses, and faith in The System's ability to effectively oversee and manage IT centrally;

AND FURTHER,

WHEREAS repeated disruption of IT infrastructure network services occurred throughout the University of Maine campus during the first two weeks of the Fall 2013 semester; and

WHEREAS such disruptions severely negatively impacted hundreds of classes and distance-learning offerings, some repeatedly, during the first two weeks of the Fall 2013 semester; and

WHEREAS no organized system-level communication about or response to issues was evident to UM faculty or other campus-level IT stakeholders during the first two weeks of the Fall 2013 semester; and

WHEREAS System-level response to campus-wide disruptions in IT infrastructure network services was slow and inadequate, appeared to have insufficient direct knowledge of campus-level events with a concomitant lack of urgency in responsiveness, appeared inaccessible to general end-users seeking remedy from the consequences of disruptions in service, and appeared slow to acknowledge the scope of campus-level disruptions; and

WHEREAS these recent events have made superabundantly evident the need for robust mechanisms whereby faculty and other campus-level stakeholders can provide continuous input and receive timely feedback to System-level administrators implementing The Plan throughout all phases, in formats best promoting effective communication of stakeholder and end-user needs, issues, solutions and innovations;

AND FINALLY,

WHEREAS this Body has previously brought to the attention of the University of Maine administration, specifically the Office of Administration & Finance, and the Office of the Provost, concerns about lack of process and communication with regard to implementation of The Plan, and received assurances from University of Maine administration that faculty would be duly included and informed through conduits to be instituted as a campus-level priority; and

WHEREAS it has been the experience to date among UM faculty that campus-level administrative assurances of input & inform have not been adequately realized in practice;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University of Maine Faculty Senate prevail upon the Office of the President to 1. Immediately convene an open meeting of campus-wide academic IT stakeholders before October 1 to discuss concerns with current implementation strategies and timelines of The Plan; and, 2. Begin co-development of a process for creating a proper, permanent communications mechanism between faculty campus administration and System-level administrators of The Plan, to maximize benefit and positive impact of technology integration and transformation of the "Redesign of Information Technology Service Delivery" on the teaching and research missions of the University of Maine.

SUBMITTED BY: Faculty Senate Executive Committee and Ad Hoc IT Committee of Faculty Senate of the University of Maine.

Discussion

This resolution came from faculty frustration, disruption to classes during the first week, and no reporting method when there's a disruption. There needs to be reliable communications when IT disruptions are coming. President Ferguson didn't believe a resolution was necessary but agrees there has been frustration and will be meeting as soon as possible with Dick Thompson. There were assurances that something like this would not happen but it did. The System needs to come have a conversation about the issues. Janet Waldron agreed, clear communication is needed and so far it's not acceptable. UMaine Strategic Plan will guide the campus direction, IT Governance Council and IT Effectiveness Council. The Councils have been generated and will need to work with UMaine to enforce that campus is driving the technology needs. John Gregory stated that communication is a serious issue but not sure the outage could have been avoided since they were not tied to the restructuring. PeopleSoft and other services were already here but we do need better communication moving forward.

It was stated that the Resolution was a stronger tool if it's not passed today. If postponed, while waiting to see how a meeting with the System Office goes, the Resolution becomes stronger.

Vote: Resolution Approved

Adjourned at 4:50 pm

Respectfully submitted

Kathryn Slott

Appendix 3

Motion to support the proposed Departmental Structure for the College of Education and Human Development. Program Creation & Reorganization Review Committee

Background

COEHD does not have departments. Three new departments are proposed, including A) Exercise Science and STEM Education; B) Teacher and Counselor Education; and C): Educational Leadership, Higher Education and Human Development. The COEHD proposal was posted on the PCRRC website on August 21, and the open meeting was held on October 4, 2013, attended by Dean Nichols and seven faculty including the new chairs, and four PCRRC committee members. Everyone at the meeting was in favor of the new departmental organization. Concern was raised regarding departmental names to assure that the disciplines are clear to students. It was agreed that naming and content of the departments was an ongoing project, but that the number of departments and their makeup took into consideration existing programs and faculty. The PCRRC committee voted to recommend that the Faculty Senate support the full proposal for the creation of new departments in the College of Education and Human Development

Motion:

The Full Faculty Senate supports the full proposal for the creation of new departments in the College of Education and Human Development

Appendix 4

MOTION ON SHARED GOVERNANCE FROM THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE TO PRESIDENT FERGUSON

Motion of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

In April, 2009, the Faculty Senate of the University of Maine and the President of the University and its administration agreed to share governance in all academic affairs. The principles of shared governance are documented in the *University of Maine Shared Governance Policy* (available at <http://umaine.edu/facultysenate/files/2010/12/SharedGovernanceUMaine.pdf>). The sense of trust and collaboration captured in this policy is emphasized by terms such as "shared confidence," "mutual respect," "mutual desire to collaborate," "collaborative process."

Due to a perceived need to move quickly, both administrators and faculty agree that during the summer of 2013 a number of administrative searches were not performed in full accordance with the agreed-on shared governance policies. This motion should not be interpreted as a statement for or against any individual appointed to a position. The failure to follow the *Shared Governance Policy* did not provide the faculty sufficient input or information to make a determination of the appropriateness of appointments. The *Shared Governance Policy* must be followed in order to ensure a fair, open, and collaborative process.

THEREFORE IT IS MOVED that the Faculty Senate requires that the principles of shared governance detailed in the *University of Maine Shared Governance Policy* be followed in the future. There is no emergency or expediency justifying circumvention of these core principles, no matter the time of year.

The sections of the *Shared Governance Policy* relevant to the selection of deans, provost, associate provost and other vice presidents and appended as part of this motion are as follows:

From Section II E (a) which states:

The faculty and administration will collaborate in the recruitment and selection of deans, the provost, associate provosts, and other vice presidents. Administrative searches are normally competitive and include open sessions to allow faculty members and other appropriate sectors within the university community to meet and give input regarding candidates. Search committees for administrators will include faculty chosen by accepted faculty governance procedures, as specified in Section A. Faculty representatives shall comprise at least half of each search committee for deans and associate provosts.

Section A in the above paragraph refers to Section II A which states:

Representation of the faculty at all levels of University shared governance will be: a) chosen by direct election by the faculty to the Faculty Senate; b) appointed by an elected faculty officer; or c) appointed by an administrator from a list of several nominated by the Committee on Committees of the Senate. For some committees, faculty members may be appointed directly by the administration or other representative body, as long as there are also faculty representatives on these committees appointed according to a, b, or c above.