Appendix A: Possible Configurations of UFC/Faculty Senate

Based on the 2023 UFOC Reports as well as current plans for academic organization, the following models are recommendations to investigate for adaptation and/or implementation. According to §2.3.2.4, changes to §2.3.4 (UFC) must be approved by majority votes of the faculty governing bodies of each college through procedures to be determined in each college. The final proposed model should be determined no later than November 2024. It would need to be voted through all college governing bodies no later than January 2025.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Current Model: UFC with 18 members** **9 CAS** (3 Health/STEM: biology, chemistry/physics, computer science, Earth/environmental sciences, mathematics, or health/physical education/recreation) (3 Social Sciences: economics, geography, history/American studies, historic preservation, political science/international affairs, psychology, or Sociology/anthropology) (3 Arts/Humanities: art/art history, classics/philosophy/religion, communication/digital studies, English/linguistics, modern languages/literatures, music, or theater/dance) **3 COE** **3 COB** **3 At-Large**  | **Option 1: Modified UFC with 14-15 members** **8 CAS** 2 School of Life & Physical Sciences 2 School of the Arts 2 School of the Humanities 2 School of the Social Sciences  **2 COE&H** 1 Education 1 Nursing/AHPE  **2 COB&CS** 1 Business 1 ECON/MATH/CPSC  **2-3 At Large** (Could be truly at-large or 1/college if 3 reps)  Consider adding qualifications: * Where units have multiple representatives, they must be from different departments.
* Can a contingent faculty member be added? (Compensation was a challenge when these conversations began in 19-20.)

 Pros: * Cuts down on number of service roles needed to fill this group.
* Most similar to currently-adopted system.

 Cons: * Maintains current model that some have complained exacerbates communication issues.
* Current UFC has a 50/50 split between CAS and COE/COB/At-large; this model is a 57/43 split. Numbers could be adjusted if needed. However, at-large positions tend to be CAS due to larger population.

 Implementation Considerations: * College governance for CASFC would need to be revisited, perhaps with a representative model (1/department). The UFC reps would automatically be on CASFC, and then supplemental departmental reps would support communication.
 |
| **Option 2: Faculty Senate with 24-25 members:** **CAS (15)** School of Life & Physical Sciences (3 depts) School of the Arts (4 depts) School of the Humanities (4 depts) School of the Social Sciences (4 depts)  **COE&H (3)** 3 depts: EDUC, NURS, AHPE  **COB&CS (4)** 4 depts  **2-3 At Large** (Could be truly at-large or 1/college if 3 reps)  Consider adding qualifications: * Can a contingent faculty member be added? (Compensation was a challenge when these conversations began in 19-20.)

 Pros: * Having one rep per unit may reduce communication issues.
* Some faculty have expressed interest in returning to a Faculty Senate model.

 Cons: * Smaller departments would have a larger burden of staffing this model year after year. Some other schools have affordances for smaller departments to waive their representation and/or “bundle” with another unit, and these options could be explored.
* Current UFC has a 50/50 split between CAS and COE/COB/At-large; this model ranges from a 62.5/37.5 split (24 members) to a 60/40 split (25 members). However, at-large positions tend to be CAS due to larger population. Requiring at-large members to come from separate colleges could help with dispersing representation.

 Implementation Considerations: * What would the role of an at-large rep be in a Faculty Senate? Are they still needed?
* Like Truman State, can smaller units (under a set number of full-time instructional faculty, like 5?) collaborate with others to send one representative that represents both departments? Would this be a double vote or a single vote?
 | **Option 3: Faculty of the Whole with TBD members (entire full-time instructional faculty)** Composition: Entire full-time instructional faculty  Pros: * Streamlines communication, with every person representing themself.

 Cons: * Does not streamline service load; would require all instructional faculty (if interested) to attend monthly meetings.
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