

Committee Assessment Task Force

December 8, 1998

This is an accumulation of responses to questions submitted via the Senate listserve. For a complete compilation of all responses, email Lora Baldwin at mccllell@indiana.edu

Are there too many committees? Should some be dissolved? Currently the Vice Chancellors are also looking at this task as it regards to administrative committees. What advice would you offer them? Should we have, or do we need the existing Senate Standing Committees?

- All committees should provide an end of the year report stating accomplishments.
- Most committees should be smaller to facilitate easier scheduling of meeting time, yet all faculty need to become involved in campus service.
- Standing committees are necessary for faculty governance.

Should the Senate time slot (on Tuesdays) be set aside for the Standing Committees to meet? Should this time be extended to say 9:00 through 12:15 for all committees to meet? Should divisions be prevented from meeting at this time? Should there be a set time on campus for all divisions to be meeting?

- The existing time for Senate (11:00-12:15) should be set aside for Standing Committees to meet on non Senate Tuesdays.
- Divisional meeting times should not be dictated.

Should there be more rewards for those who are active in committee work and likewise a punishment for those who are inactive?

- Because service can be more than just campus service, this would be difficult to determine.

Could the size of committees be decreased and would this allow more flexibility within a committee?

- Smaller committees would be more flexible.

Should only tenured faculty chair standing committees? Should there be a suggested number of committees and stated responsibilities each faculty level should be involved in? For example, one or two for a lecturer, etc.

- No strong consensus either way.

Currently divisional chairs are allowed to serve on all standing committees with the exception of Workload and Budgetary Affairs. Should chairs be allowed to serve on these two committees? Or should chairs be allowed to serve on any standing committee?

- Chairs already have input on budgetary and workload concerns, and therefore should not be on Workload or Budgetary Affairs Committee.
- No reason for chairs not to serve on other standing committees.

Should committee chairs take attendance and also send letters to divisional chairs detailing each member's contribution (or lack of it)?

- Strong diverse opinions for and against this idea.

Often faculty seem to get placed on a committee because when they filled out the Committee Request Form, they said they would be "willing" to serve, instead of "want" to serve, and then don't get placed on the committee(s) that they really "want" to serve on. Would it be more effective if faculty ranked the top five or ten committees that they wanted to serve on?

- Many favor a change in current practice, either ranking, eliminating the term "willing" or requiring those with a strong desire to serve to write a brief statement on why they want to be on the committee.

We struggle to get a quorum at Senate meetings. Should we reward or punish attenders or non-attenders? Should we switch to a representative Senate?

- Many respondents favored looking into a representative Senate.

When a faculty member serves on a committee, do they represent the Senate, their division or themselves? Do we need divisional representation on all committees?

- Lukewarm response says divisional representation not necessary.