FACULTY SENATE REVIEW REPORT
February 17, 2006

The University Handbook stipulates that a "review of the working and effectiveness of the Faculty Senate" will be undertaken every five (5) years. To this end, a Faculty Senate Review Committee was formed in fall 2005 to complete this task. Dr. Tracey Schwarze, President of the Faculty Senate, appointed three senators to the committee: Dr. Kelly Cartwright (Chair), Dr. Harold Grau, and Dr. Michelle Vachris. These senators held an election in October 2005 via paper ballot delivered to academic departments, and Dr. Harold Cones, Dr. Kara Keeling, and Dr. Kip Redick were elected to serve as the three Instructional Faculty members of the committee.

The Faculty Senate Review Committee developed a 20-question survey to gather the opinions of the Instructional Faculty on issues relevant to the communication, representation, and governance structure of the Faculty Senate. Additionally, the Committee reviewed the minutes of the Faculty Senate for the past five academic years to examine Senate actions and their outcomes as a second indicator of Senate effectiveness. Finally, the Faculty Senate Review Committee assessed the current composition of the university divisions with respect to faculty representation. The Faculty Senate Review Committee gratefully acknowledges the following undergraduate students who assisted with entering and coding survey responses for analysis: Ms. Allison Bock who coordinated these efforts, Ms. Heather Guiffre, Ms. Lindsay Martenak, and Mr. Michael Montano. Specific recommendations of the Faculty Senate Review Committee are in bold print below, and these appear in a list on page 5 of this document.

Executive Summary

Survey Sample Characteristics

Paper surveys were distributed to the Instructional Faculty, and 153 surveys were returned. The sample was fairly representative of the CNU faculty. The majority of respondents were in departments of 11 to 20 members, and departments with fewer than 11 members and more than 20 members were also represented in the sample. Half of the respondents had been at CNU for 5 or fewer years, while half of the respondents had been at CNU 6 or more years. Finally, 41 respondents (27% of the sample) had served as faculty senators. A summary of responses follows.

Survey: Communication Effectiveness

The communication between the Faculty Senate and the Instructional Faculty appears to be relatively effective. A majority of the faculty who responded to the Senate Review Survey reported reading the minutes of Faculty Senate meetings at least occasionally, although newer faculty (those at CNU for 0 to 2 years) were less likely to read minutes, and faculty who reported having been senators were more likely to read the minutes. A majority of faculty reported that the minutes of Faculty Senate meetings are written at the appropriate level of comprehensiveness and detail, and an overwhelming majority of faculty preferred that minutes be distributed electronically, which is the current mode of distribution. Although the Faculty Senate maintains a webpage, only one third of faculty respondents reported accessing the webpage at least occasionally, one third reported never accessing the webpage, and one third were unaware that

the Faculty Senate webpage existed. Furthermore, the faculty who reported having been senators were significantly more likely to access the webpage than faculty who had not been senators.

The majority of respondents reported knowing more than one Faculty Senator, and almost all (88.8%) respondents reported knowing at least one Faculty Senator. Faculty in departments of 11 to 15 members were more likely to know more than one Senator than faculty in departments of 1 to 5 members, and faculty who had been at CNU for 8 or more years were more likely to know more than one Senator than faculty who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years. Finally, respondents who reported having been Senators were also more likely to know more than one senator. A similar pattern of responses emerged regarding communication with senators. The majority of respondents reported communicating with a senator at least periodically. Respondents in departments of 16 or more reported communicating with senators more often than respondents in departments of 1 to 5 faculty members. Faculty who had been at CNU for more than 8 years reported communicating with senators more often than faculty who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years, and faculty who had been faculty senators were more likely to report communicating with faculty senators. Finally, a majority of faculty respondents agreed that communication from the Faculty Senate to the Instructional Faculty was adequate, and a majority of faculty were neutral or agreed that communication from the Instructional Faculty to the Faculty Senate is adequate. However, the most frequent response to this item was "Neutral."

Data on communication effectiveness indicate a majority of faculty perceives the Faculty Senate's communication efforts as adequate. As would be expected, faculty respondents with more experience in faculty governance (i.e., those who have been at CNU for longer periods, and those who have served as faculty senators) were more likely to know senators and communicate with them. Newer faculty members were less familiar with minutes and senators, and these faculty members were less likely to communicate with senators. **The Faculty Senate may wish to consider additional outreach to new faculty so that they are more adequately informed about the Faculty Senate, its procedures, and activities.**

Faculty respondents in smaller departments (i.e., those with 1 to 5 members) were less likely to know or communicate with multiple senators. These data should be interpreted with caution, as only 8 individuals from departments of this size responded to the survey. **The Faculty Senate may wish to consider additional outreach to smaller, under-represented departments.**

Finally, many faculty were completely unaware that the Faculty Senate maintained a webpage. **Thus, the Senate may wish to consider publicizing the webpage more frequently, as it could serve as another avenue of communication between the Instructional Faculty and the Senate.**

Survey: Adequacy of Representation

Most respondents agreed (40.1%) or were neutral (47.7%) regarding the adequacy of the Faculty Senate's representation of the individuals' own views. Faculty in departments of 16 to 20 members were more likely to agree with this statement than individuals in departments of 6 to 15 members (no differences emerged for individuals in departments of 1 to 5 members). Individuals who reported having been senators were more likely to agree with this statement than those who had not been senators.

Most respondents agreed (53.7%) or were neutral (32%) regarding whether the Faculty Senate adequately represented their departments' views. Respondents in departments with 16 or more members were significantly more likely to agree with this statement that respondents in

departments with 6 to 15 members, and no differences emerged for departments with 1 to 5 members. Faculty who had been at CNU for more than 8 years were more likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had been at CNU for 0 to 2 years (who were more likely to express a neutral position). Finally, faculty respondents who had been Senators were more likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had not been Senators.

Most respondents agreed (45.6%) or were neutral (43.6%) regarding the Faculty Senate's representation of the Instructional Faculty's views. Those in departments of 16 to 20 members were more likely to agree with this statement than those in departments of 11 to 15 members, and no other group differences emerged.

In sum, the Faculty Senate's representation of the faculty's individual, department, and the Instructional Faculty's views appears to be adequate. Most faculty respondents agreed or were neutral regarding the adequacy of representation, and no substantial disagreement emerged. Similar to data on communication, faculty respondents with more experience in faculty governance (i.e., those who had been senators and those who had been at CNU for longer periods) were more likely to agree that the Faculty Senate's representation of faculty views is adequate.

Survey: Governance Structure
Most respondents agreed (55.1%) that the procedures by which we elect Faculty Senators are adequate, and an additional 29.9% of respondents were neutral regarding the adequacy of election procedures. No group differences emerged for this item. A majority of faculty members agreed (52.7%) that non-tenured faculty should be allowed to serve on the Faculty Senate, while one third of respondents disagreed with this statement (few respondents expressed a neutral position). Not surprisingly, faculty who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had been at CNU for more than 8 years. Faculty who had been Senators were significantly less likely to agree that non-tenured faculty should serve on the Senate than faculty who had not been Senators.

A majority of respondents (55%) expressed agreement with the current governance structure for the faculty senate, an additional 20.1% were neutral on this issue, and 24.8% of respondents expressed disagreement with the current governance structure. Individuals in departments of 6 to 10 members were significantly more likely to express disagreement with the current governance structure than individuals in departments of 16 or more members. No other group differences emerged.

A majority of respondents (59.6%) agreed that the current governance structure provides adequate representation for their departments, 21.9% of respondents were neutral on this issue, and 18.5% disagreed with this statement. Faculty in departments of 6 to 10 members were significantly less likely to agree that the current governance structure provides adequate representation for their departments than individuals in departments of 16 or more members. No other group differences emerged. Finally, a majority of respondents disagreed (46.3%) or expressed a neutral position (30.6%) when asked if they would prefer a different governance structure. However, 23.1% of individuals agreed that they would prefer a different governance structure. Faculty in departments of 6 to 10 individuals were significantly more likely to prefer a different governance structure than faculty in departments of 16 to 20 individuals. No other group differences emerged.

Question 17 of the survey provided the following options for governance structures and asked respondents to rank them in order of preference: (1) the current model (4 senators from

LA, S&T, and SSPS; 3 senators from SOB); (2) a model like the current one, with different groupings of departments (please describe); (3) one senator per department; other (please describe). Of the 153 respondents, 122 (79%) selected a first ranked option for senate structure, 33.3% made a second choice, 27.7% made a third choice, and 6.5% made a fourth choice. The current model was ranked first or second by 66.3% of respondents. One senator per department was ranked first or second by 30.1% of respondents, a model like the current one with different groupings was ranked first or second by 19% of the respondents, and "other" was ranked first or second by 7.9% of respondents. Faculty suggestions for alternative models and other written comments in response to question 17 are recorded in Appendix A.

Generally, faculty respondents seemed to be satisfied with the current governance structure. However, faculty members from traditionally under-represented departments (i.e., those with 6 to 10 members) were less satisfied with the current structure than other respondents, and 23% of respondents indicated that they would prefer a different governance structure. **A review of respondents' comments indicates faculty suggested governance structures that would ensure a greater chance of representation for traditionally under-represented departments or structures that would ensure proportional representation for faculty constituencies. The Faculty Senate may wish to consider revising the current governance structure to satisfy these aims.**

Review of Senate Actions

The Faculty Senate Review Committee reviewed the minutes of Faculty Senate meetings that occurred between 2001 and 2005 to examine Senate actions and their outcomes as a second indicator of Senate effectiveness (see Appendix C). The committee found this task to be more difficult than anticipated. Although the details of Senate actions were often apparent, the minutes did not often address the outcomes of Senate actions. **The Faculty Senate Review committee recommends that the Senate consider keeping more detailed records of the outcomes of Senate actions.**

Issues Related to Current Composition of University Divisions

According to the packet of information distributed during Getting Started Week, the faculty is distributed among the current divisions of the university governance structure in the following manner.

- *Liberal Arts* (Communication Studies, English, Fine Art & Art History, Library Science, Modern & Classical Languages & Literatures, Music, Philosophy & Religious Studies, and Theater): *92 faculty*
- *School of Business* (Accounting, Economics, & Finance, and Management & Marketing): *25 faculty*
- *Science and Technology* (Biology, Chemistry, & Environmental Science, Mathematics, and Physics, Computer Science, & Engineering): *56 faculty*
- *Social Science and Professional Studies* (Government, History, Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work): *55 faculty*

These numbers indicate that there is not a balance of representation across the divisions. Thus, the Faculty Senate may wish to consider realigning the division composition or division representation on the senate to better reflect the actual faculty composition.

The Leadership Studies Department is not yet assigned to a particular division in the university governance structure. Thus, the Senate Review Committee consulted all of the members of the Leadership Studies Department who indicated unanimously that **Leadership Studies seemed to fit most appropriately in the SSPS division.**

Currently, the University Handbook does not provide a mechanism for departments to change divisions within the current governance structure, should they wish to do so. **The Faculty Senate Review Committee recommends adding language to the handbook to address this issue, such as "A department may seek reclassification in the current division structure by submitting a written request to the Faculty Senate for consideration."**

Conclusion

Overall, the Faculty Senate appears to be performing satisfactorily in its communication with faculty and representation of faculty views, though additional efforts to publicize and utilize the webpage and to reach new and underrepresented faculty may be warranted by survey responses. Furthermore, most faculty are satisfied with the existing governance structure, and those who are not would be more satisfied with a model that increases the likelihood of representation of traditionally under-represented departments.

List of Recommendations

1. The Faculty Senate may wish to consider additional outreach to new faculty so that they are more adequately informed about the Faculty Senate, its procedures, and activities.
2. The Faculty Senate may wish to consider additional outreach to smaller, under-represented departments.
3. The Faculty Senate may wish to consider publicizing the webpage more frequently, as it could serve as another avenue of communication between the Instructional Faculty and the Senate.
4. A review of survey respondents' comments indicates faculty suggested revised governance structures that would ensure a greater chance of representation for traditionally under-represented departments or structures that would ensure proportional representation for faculty constituencies. The Faculty Senate may wish to consider revising the current governance structure to satisfy these aims.
5. According to the "Getting Started Week Packet," numbers of faculty indicate that there is not a balance of representation across the divisions (LA, SB, SSPS, S&T). Thus, the Faculty Senate may wish to consider realigning the division composition or division representation on the senate to better reflect the actual faculty composition.
6. The Faculty Senate Review committee recommends that the Senate consider keeping more detailed records of the outcomes of Senate actions.
7. Leadership Studies is not yet assigned to a division, and it seems to fit most appropriately in the SSPS division.
8. There is no formal mechanism for departments to change divisions, if they wish to do so. The Faculty Senate should consider adding language to the handbook, such as "A department may seek reclassification in the current division structure by submitting a written request to the Faculty Senate for consideration."

Summary of Data from the Instructional Faculty Survey

Sample Characteristics
A total of 153 Instructional Faculty members returned surveys. The following tables provide descriptive data for these individuals, including size of department, years at CNU, and whether the individuals had ever served as faculty senators. Means and standard deviations for each of these groups, for each question, are reported in Appendix B.

Size of department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 to 5 members	8	5.2	5.3	5.3
	6 to 10 members	24	15.7	16.0	21.3
	11 to 15 members	65	42.5	43.3	64.7
	16 to 20 members	30	19.6	20.0	84.7
	More than 20 members	23	15.0	15.3	100.0
	Total	150	98.0	100.0	
	Missing	3	2.0		
Total		153	100.0		

How long have you been at CNU?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 to 2 years	51	33.3	34.0	34.0
	3 to 5 years	25	16.3	16.7	50.7
	6 to 8 years	13	8.5	8.7	59.3
	More than 8 years	61	39.9	40.7	100.0
	Total	150	98.0	100.0	
	Missing	3	2.0		
Total		153	100.0		

Have you ever been a faculty senator?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	41	26.8	27.0	27.0
	No	111	72.5	73.0	100.0
	Total	152	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	1	.7		
Total		153	100.0		

The majority of respondents were in departments of 11 to 20 members, although departments with fewer than 11 members and more than 20 members were also represented in the sample. Half of the respondents had been at CNU for 5 or fewer years, while half of the respondents had

been at CNU 6 or more years. Finally, 41 respondents (27% of the sample) had served as faculty senators.

The following sections report descriptive data on Instructional Faculty opinions of the effectiveness of Faculty Senate communication, adequacy of Faculty Senate representation, and adequacy of Faculty Senate governance structure. Descriptive data are reported for each question, indicating the pattern of response of the Instructional Faculty. For each question, responses were compared for each of the demographic characteristics (department size, time at CNU, and whether faculty respondents had ever served as faculty senators), and any statistically significant differences across these demographic characteristics are reported.

Effectiveness of Communication

1. How frequently do you read the minutes of Faculty Senate meetings?
a) I read all of the minutes (1)
b) I read minutes occasionally (2)
c) I skim minutes occasionally (3)
d) I do not read the minutes (4)

How frequently do you read the minutes?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All	41	26.8	27.0	27.0
	Read occasionally	49	32.0	32.2	59.2
	Skim occasionally	44	28.8	28.9	88.2
	Do not read	18	11.8	11.8	100.0
	Total	152	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	1	.7		
Total		153	100.0		

The majority of respondents reported reading the minutes of Faculty Senate meetings at least occasionally, while only 11.8% of respondents reported not reading the minutes at all. Respondents who had been at CNU for 6 or more years were significantly more likely to read minutes than respondents who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years, $F(3, 146) = 9.65, p < .01$. Additionally, respondents who had been faculty senators were significantly more likely to read the minutes than those who had not been senators, $t(88.77) = 3.71, p < .01$.

2. How do you prefer that minutes of Faculty Senate meetings be distributed?
a) Electronic Format (1)
b) Paper Format (2)
c) No Preference (3)

How do you prefer that minutes be distributed?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Electronic	114	74.5	75.0	75.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Paper	14	9.2	9.2	84.2
	No preference	24	15.7	15.8	100.0
	Total	152	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	1	.7		
Total		153	100.0		

The vast majority of respondents preferred that Faculty Senate minutes be distributed electronically.

3. How frequently do you access the Faculty Senate webpage?
a) I access the webpage frequently. (1)
b) I access the webpage occasionally. (2)
c) I never access the webpage. (3)
d) I was not aware that there is a Faculty Senate webpage. (4)

How frequently do you access the webpage?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Frequently	2	1.3	1.3	1.3
	Occasionally	54	35.3	35.5	36.8
	Never	46	30.1	30.3	67.1
	Not aware	50	32.7	32.9	100.0
	Total	152	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	1	.7		
Total		153	100.0		

Of the respondents who answered this question, approximately one third reported accessing the Faculty Senate webpage occasionally, one third reported never accessing the webpage, and one third were unaware that the Faculty Senate webpage existed. Respondents who had been faculty senators were significantly more likely to access the Faculty Senate webpage than respondents who had never been senators, $t(150) = 2.15, p < .05$.

4. Do you know who your faculty senator(s) are?
a) I can identify more than one senator (1)
b) I can identify at least one senator (2)
c) I have no idea who the faculty senators are (3)

Do you know who your faculty senators are?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	More than 1	99	64.7	65.1	65.1
	At least 1	36	23.5	23.7	88.8
	No idea	17	11.1	11.2	100.0
	Total	152	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	1	.7		
Total		153	100.0		

The majority of respondents reported knowing more than one Faculty Senator, and 88.8% of respondents reported knowing at least one Faculty Senator. Faculty in departments of 11 to 15 members were significantly more likely to know more than one Senator than faculty in departments of 1 to 5 members, $F(4, 145) = 3.67$, $p < .01$. Similarly, faculty who had been at CNU for 8 or more years were significantly more likely to know more than one Senator than faculty who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years, $F(3, 146) = 6.26$, $p < .01$. Finally, respondents who reported having been Senators were significantly more likely to know more than one senator, $t(88) = 2.95$, $p < .01$.

5. Do you (individually) communicate with at least one senator?
a) I know at least one senator and communicate with her or him regularly (1)
b) I know at least one senator and communicate with her or him periodically (2)
c) I can identify at least one faculty senator, but I do not have occasion to communicate with him or her (3)
d) I do not communicate with faculty senators (4)

Do you communicate with at least one senator?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regularly	46	30.1	30.3	30.3
	Periodically	52	34.0	34.2	64.5
	Identify but no communication	25	16.3	16.4	80.9
	No communication	29	19.0	19.1	100.0
	Total	152	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	1	.7		
Total		153	100.0		

The majority of respondents reported communicating with a senator at least periodically. Respondents in departments of 16 or more reported communicating with senators significantly more often than respondents in departments of 1 to 5 faculty, $F(4, 145) = 6.00$, $p < .01$. Faculty who had been at CNU for more than 8 years reported communicating with senators significantly more often than faculty who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years, $F(3, 146) = 3.22$, $p < .05$. Finally, faculty who had been faculty senators were significantly more likely to report communicating with faculty senators, $t(150) = 2.93$, $p < .01$.

6. The Faculty Senate minutes are written at the appropriate level of comprehensiveness and detail.
a) Strongly Agree (1)
b) Agree (2)
c) Neutral (3)
d) Disagree (4)
e) Strongly Disagree (5)
f) I do not read the minutes (6)

The minutes are appropriately comprehensive and detailed.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	46	30.1	30.5	30.5
	Agree	64	41.8	42.4	72.8
	Neutral	20	13.1	13.2	86.1
	Disagree	1	.7	.7	86.8
	Don't read minutes	20	13.1	13.2	100.0
	Total	151	98.7	100.0	
	Missing	2	1.3		
Total		153	100.0		

Most respondents agreed that the Faculty Senate minutes were written at the appropriate level of comprehensiveness and detail, or they were neutral regarding the content of the minutes. Newer faculty (at CNU 0 to 5 years) were more likely to express a position of neutrality regarding the comprehensiveness of the minutes than faculty who had been at CNU for 8 or more years, $F(3, 145) = 9.21$, $p < .01$. Additionally, faculty who had not been senators were significantly more likely to express a position of neutrality regarding the comprehensiveness of the minutes, $t(149) = 5.88$, $p < .01$.

For items 7 to 16, the respondents were instructed to "indicate your agreement or disagreement with these statements by rating them on the following scale:"

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

7. The communication from the Faculty Senate to the Instructional Faculty is adequate.

Communication from Senate to Faculty is adequate.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	1	.7	.7	.7
	Disagree	13	8.5	8.7	9.4
	Neutral	38	24.8	25.5	34.9
	Agree	75	49.0	50.3	85.2
	Strongly agree	22	14.4	14.8	100.0
	Total	149	97.4	100.0	
	Missing	4	2.6		
Total		153	100.0		

The majority of faculty agreed that the communication from the Faculty Senate to the Instructional Faculty was adequate. No group differences emerged for this item.

8. The communication from the Instructional Faculty to the Faculty Senate is adequate.

Communication from Faculty to Senate is adequate.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	6	3.9	4.1	4.1
	Disagree	28	18.3	18.9	23.0
	Neutral	70	45.8	47.3	70.3
	Agree	39	25.5	26.4	96.6
	Strongly agree	5	3.3	3.4	100.0
	Total	148	96.7	100.0	
	Missing	5	3.3		
Total		153	100.0		

The majority of faculty were neutral or agreed that communication from the Instructional Faculty to the Faculty Senate is adequate. However, the most frequent response was "Neutral." No group differences emerged for this item.

Adequacy of Representation

9. My own views are adequately represented by the Faculty Senate.

My own views are adequately represented

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	5	3.3	3.4	3.4
	Disagree	13	8.5	8.8	12.2
	Neutral	70	45.8	47.6	59.9
	Agree	44	28.8	29.9	89.8
	Strongly agree	15	9.8	10.2	100.0
	Total	147	96.1	100.0	
	Missing	6	3.9		
Total		153	100.0		

Most respondents agreed (40.1%) or were neutral (47.7%) regarding the adequacy of the Faculty Senate's representation of the individuals' own views. Faculty in departments of 16 to 20 members were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than individuals in departments of 6 to 15 members, $F(4, 141) = 5.11$, $p < .05$. No differences emerged for individuals in departments of 1 to 5 individuals. Individuals who reported having been senators were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than those who had not been senators, $t(60) = 2.59$, $p < .05$.

10. My department's views are adequately represented by the Senate.

My department's views are adequately represented

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	5	3.3	3.4	3.4
	Disagree	16	10.5	10.9	14.3
	Neutral	47	30.7	32.0	46.3
	Agree	51	33.3	34.7	81.0
	Strongly agree	28	18.3	19.0	100.0
	Total	147	96.1	100.0	
	Missing	6	3.9		
Total		153	100.0		

Most respondents agreed (53.7%) or were neutral (32%) regarding whether the Faculty Senate adequately represented their departments' views. Respondents in departments with 16 or more members were significantly more likely to agree with this statement that respondents in departments with 6 to 15 members, $F(4, 141) = 7.85$, $p < .05$. No differences emerged for departments with 1 to 5 members. Faculty who had been at CNU for more than 8 years were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had been at CNU for 0 to 2 years, $F(3, 141) = 2.99$, $p < .05$. Finally, faculty who had been Senators were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had not been Senators, $t(145) = 2.44$, $p < .05$.

11. The views of the Instructional Faculty are adequately represented to the Administration by the Faculty Senate.

The faculty's views are adequately represented

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	5	3.3	3.4	3.4
	Disagree	11	7.2	7.4	10.7
	Neutral	65	42.5	43.6	54.4
	Agree	51	33.3	34.2	88.6
	Strongly agree	17	11.1	11.4	100.0
	Total	149	97.4	100.0	
	Missing	4	2.6		
Total		153	100.0		

Most respondents agreed (45.6%) or were neutral (43.6%) regarding the Faculty Senate's representation of the Instructional Faculty's views. Those in departments of 16 to 20 members were more likely to agree with this statement than those in departments of 11 to 15 members, $F(4, 143) = 4.65$, $p < .01$. No other group differences emerged.

Governance Structure

12. The procedures by which we elect Faculty Senators are adequate.

The election procedures are adequate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	4	2.6	2.7	2.7
	Disagree	18	11.8	12.2	15.0
	Neutral	44	28.8	29.9	44.9
	Agree	57	37.3	38.8	83.7
	Strongly agree	24	15.7	16.3	100.0
	Total	147	96.1	100.0	
	Missing	6	3.9		
Total		153	100.0		

Most respondents agreed (55.1%) that the procedures by which we elect Faculty Senators are adequate, and an additional 29.9% of respondents were neutral regarding the adequacy of election procedures. No group differences emerged for this item.

13. Non-tenured faculty should be allowed to serve on the Faculty Senate (currently, non-tenured faculty can serve on the Senate, and no more than one Senator per area can be non-tenured).

Non-tenured faculty should be allowed on Senate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	27	17.6	18.2	18.2
	Disagree	22	14.4	14.9	33.1
	Neutral	21	13.7	14.2	47.3
	Agree	54	35.3	36.5	83.8
	Strongly agree	24	15.7	16.2	100.0
	Total	148	96.7	100.0	
	Missing	5	3.3		
Total		153	100.0		

A majority of faculty members agreed (52.7%) that non-tenured faculty should be allowed to serve on the Faculty Senate, while one third of respondents disagreed with this statement (few respondents expressed a neutral position). Not surprisingly, faculty who had been at CNU 0 to 2 years were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had been at CNU for more than 8 years, $F(3, 142) = 3.06, p < .05$. Faculty who had been Senators were significantly less likely to agree with this statement than faculty who had not been Senators, $t(58) = 2.83, p < .01$.

14. I am satisfied with the current governance structure. (i.e., 3 senators elected from the School of Business, and 4 senators elected from each of the following areas: Liberal Arts, Science & Technology, and Social Science and Professional Studies)

I am satisfied with the structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	11	7.2	7.4	7.4
	Disagree	26	17.0	17.4	24.8
	Neutral	30	19.6	20.1	45.0
	Agree	56	36.6	37.6	82.6
	Strongly agree	26	17.0	17.4	100.0
	Total	149	97.4	100.0	
	Missing	4	2.6		
Total		153	100.0		

A majority of respondents (55%) expressed agreement with the current governance structure for the faculty senate, an additional 20.1% were neutral on this issue, and 24.8% of respondents expressed disagreement with the current governance structure. Individuals in departments of 6 to 10 members were significantly more likely to express disagreement with the current governance structure than individuals in departments of 16 or more members, $F(4, 143) = 3.89$, $p < .01$. No other group differences emerged.

15. The current governance structure provides adequate representation for my department.

The structure provides adequate representation for my department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	10	6.5	6.8	6.8
	Disagree	17	11.1	11.6	18.5
	Neutral	32	20.9	21.9	40.4
	Agree	62	40.5	42.5	82.9
	Strongly agree	25	16.3	17.1	100.0
	Total	146	95.4	100.0	
	Missing	7	4.6		
Total		153	100.0		

A majority of respondents (59.6%) agreed that the current governance structure provides adequate representation for their departments, 21.9% of respondents were neutral on this issue, and 18.5% disagreed with this statement. Faculty in departments of 6 to 10 members were significantly less likely to agree that the current governance structure provides adequate representation for their departments than individuals in departments of 16 or more members, $F(4, 140) = 5.43$, $p < .05$. No other group differences emerged.

16. I would prefer a different governance structure.

I would prefer a different governance structure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly disagree	29	19.0	19.7	19.7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Disagree	39	25.5	26.5	46.3
	Neutral	45	29.4	30.6	76.9
	Agree	22	14.4	15.0	91.8
	Strongly agree	12	7.8	8.2	100.0
	Total	147	96.1	100.0	
	Missing	6	3.9		
Total		153	100.0		

A majority of respondents disagreed (46.3%) or expressed a neutral position (30.6%) when asked if they would prefer a different governance structure. However, 23.1% of individuals agreed that they would prefer a different governance structure. Faculty in departments of 6 to 10 individuals were significantly more likely to prefer a different governance structure than faculty in departments of 16 to 20 individuals, $F(4, 141) = 3.48$, $p < .05$. No other group differences emerged.

17. Several options for Faculty Governance Structures are described below. Please rank them in the order of your preference.

Question 17 provided the following options for governance structures and asked respondents to rank them in order of preference.

_____   **The current model (4 senators from LA, S&T, and SSPS; 3 senators from SOB)**

_____   **A model like the current one, with different groupings of departments (please describe)**

 _____   **One senator per department**

_____   **Other (please describe)**

Of the 153 respondents, 122 (79%) selected a first ranked option for Senate structure, 33.3% made a second choice, 27.7% made a third choice, and 6.5% made a fourth choice. The current model was ranked first or second by 66.3% of respondents. One senator per department was ranked first or second by 30.1% of respondents, a model like the current one with different groupings was ranked first or second by 19% of the respondents, and "other" was ranked first or second by 7.9% of respondents. Faculty suggestions for alternative models and other written comments in response to question 17 are recorded in Appendix A.
.

First ranked structure preference

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Current	70	45.8	57.4	57.4
	Like current with differing groupings	13	8.5	10.7	68.0
	One senator per dept	32	20.9	26.2	94.3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Other	7	4.6	5.7	100.0
	Total	122	79.7	100.0	
	Missing	31	20.3		
Total		153	100.0		

Second ranked structure preference

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Current	16	10.5	31.4	31.4
	Like current but different groupings	16	10.5	31.4	62.7
	One senator	14	9.2	27.5	90.2
	Other	5	3.3	9.8	100.0
	Total	51	33.3	100.0	
	Missing	102	66.7		
Total		153	100.0		

Third ranked structure preference

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Current	11	7.2	26.2	26.2
	Like current with different groupings	16	10.5	38.1	64.3
	One senator	13	8.5	31.0	95.2
	Other	2	1.3	4.8	100.0
	Total	42	27.5	100.0	
	Missing	111	72.5		
Total		153	100.0		

Fourth ranked structure preference

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Current	3	2.0	30.0	30.0
	One senator	5	3.3	50.0	80.0
	Other	2	1.3	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	6.5	100.0	
	Missing	143	93.5		
Total		153	100.0		

Appendix A: Respondents' Suggestions and Comments Regarding Governance Structure

A model like the current one, with different groupings of departments (please describe)

More overall senators.

Humanities, Science & English, Business & Professional Studies, Social Science. (Redistribute departments according to their self described mission.)

SOB becomes 3 distinct departments with 2 senators each, CLAS becomes 4 distinct groups with 4-6 senators each, 1) Arts, 2) Humanities, 3) Social Sciences, 4) Other sciences

4 senators from SOB (2 each dept.)

Business is currently over represented, just 2 please NOTE- proxy voting should be allowed

Don't know, but would like to explore

Perhaps pro-rated by each department

LA: 4, S&T: 4, SSPS: 4, SOB: 4

Proportional representation based on # of faculty in the 4 areas

Proportional representation by department, minimum of one per (department)

Total number of faculty in each division needs to be reassessed to ensure proportionality of representation; very large departments might need more than one representative

Representational model: small departments (1 senator), medium departments (2 senators), large departments (3 senators)

2 senators from school of business, 5 senators from other areas, add "Humanities" for the 5th group

Other (please describe)

The groupings are okay except that 4 and 3 seems out of balance. That is SOB has become quite small and they seem, therefore, to have undue influence, 26 faculty get 3 votes while 200 or so get 4.

No senate

No more than one senator from a department with some break down similar to current 1 senator per department plus 1 senator for every 4 faculty members in the department, e.g. - Psych gets 1 senator plus 4 more for the 16 members of the department for a total of 5 senators, <--- integrated departments PCSE, BCSE, etc., get to break it down into respective disciplines within the department

The senate model has failed! Return to mass meetings- This will return the university faculty to some influence-Reconstitute the faculty "by-laws" and end subservience to "administration" Requiring all faculty to participate will ensure better decision making and give stronger representation of faculty wishes in administrative decision making! Something has to be done to reduce administrative autocracy and influence more faculty input- It is our university-Let us reinstitute "shared" governance. "*Sic Semper Tyrannis*"

Some consideration needs to be given to size of departments and its impact on who gets elected. It could be more difficult for a candidate for senator from a smaller department to be elected and even more difficult for two senators from the same small department to be elected.

Proportional representation (i.e. 1 senator for each 10 faculty) and at large senators elected within CLAS and SOB to maintain proportional representation.

Current model with 1 senator "at large" (elected by entire faculty)

One per area/discipline

One senator per discipline

Proportional difference should reduce SOB from 3-2 (some dept's alone are as big as SOB)

Some means by which all departments have representation. May require combining of specific small depts.

Institute a bicameral form of faculty governance

(Comment to side) The admin should better heed Faculty Senate initiatives

Require that senators be elected from various departments, no two senators from any one department, but allow all faculty to vote for all candidates.

We need more courage in discussing problems of governance with the President. The Senate abandoned our colleagues in Education and never asked why we were in a "state of emergency" which suspended tenure rules-very bad precedent. Where is Edward R. Murrow when we need him?

As is, some departments dominate the senate simply by tenure or by sheer numbers. Each department's concerns should be represented equally.

Appendix B: Means and Standard Deviations for Responses to Individual Questions by Faculty Groups

Means and Standard Deviations for Responses to Items 1 to 16 by Department Size

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1: How frequently do you read the minutes	1 to 5	8	2.6250	1.06066
	6 to 10	24	2.2500	.98907
	11 to 15	65	2.3385	.94003
	16 to 20	30	1.9000	.99481
	More than 20	23	2.2174	.95139
	Total	150	2.2333	.97221
Q2: How do you prefer that minutes be distributed	1 to 5	8	2.3750	.91613
	6 to 10	24	1.3750	.71094
	11 to 15	65	1.4615	.77211
	16 to 20	30	1.2333	.62606
	More than 20	23	1.2174	.59974
	Total	150	1.4133	.75251
Q3: How frequently do you access the webpage	1 to 5	8	2.7500	.70711
	6 to 10	24	2.8333	.81650
	11 to 15	65	3.0923	.82392
	16 to 20	30	2.6333	.88992
	More than 20	23	3.0435	.92826
	Total	150	2.9333	.85661
Q4: Do you know who your faculty senators are	1 to 5	8	2.0000	1.06904
	6 to 10	24	1.3750	.57578
	11 to 15	65	1.5692	.72821
	16 to 20	30	1.2000	.40684
	More than 20	23	1.2609	.54082
	Total	150	1.4400	.67037
Q5: Do you communicate with a senator	1 to 5	8	3.3750	.74402
	6 to 10	24	2.4167	1.01795
	11 to 15	65	2.3692	1.15338
	16 to 20	30	1.6667	.75810
	More than 20	23	1.9130	.90015
	Total	150	2.2200	1.07360
Q6: The minutes are appropriately comprehensive and detailed	1 to 5	8	3.3750	2.19984
	6 to 10	24	2.3333	1.60615
	11 to 15	64	2.3906	1.44329
	16 to 20	30	2.0667	1.46059
	More than 20	23	2.0870	1.41142

	Total			
		149	2.3221	1.52133
Q7: Communication from Senate to Faculty is adequate	1 to 5	8	3.6250	.51755
	6 to 10	24	3.5417	.88363
	11 to 15	63	3.5714	.83694
	16 to 20	30	3.9333	.86834
	More than 20	23	4.0435	.63806
	Total	148	3.7162	.82512
Q8: Communication from Faculty to Senate is adequate	1 to 5	8	3.1250	.64087
	6 to 10	23	3.0435	.92826
	11 to 15	63	2.9683	.86076
	16 to 20	30	3.2667	.78492
	More than 20	23	3.1304	.91970
	Total	147	3.0748	.85278
Q9: My own views are adequately represented	1 to 5	8	3.3750	.51755
	6 to 10	23	3.0870	.99604
	11 to 15	63	3.1270	.79295
	16 to 20	29	3.8621	.78940
	More than 20	23	3.6522	.93462
	Total	146	3.3630	.88575
Q10: My department's views are adequately represented	1 to 5	7	3.2857	.75593
	6 to 10	23	3.1304	1.05763
	11 to 15	63	3.2857	.88770
	16 to 20	30	4.1667	.87428
	More than 20	23	4.0870	.99604
	Total	146	3.5685	1.00966
Q11: The faculty's views are adequately represented	1 to 5	8	3.8750	.83452
	6 to 10	24	3.2083	.83297
	11 to 15	63	3.1905	.89546
	16 to 20	30	3.8333	.79148
	More than 20	23	3.7391	.81002
	Total	148	3.4459	.89049
Q12: The election procedures are adequate	1 to 5	8	3.6250	.91613
	6 to 10	24	3.2083	1.06237
	11 to 15	61	3.4754	.94175
	16 to 20	30	3.7000	1.05536
	More than 20	23	3.9130	.79275
	Total	146	3.5548	.97578
Q13: Non-tenured faculty should be allowed on Senate	1 to 5	8	3.6250	.91613
	6 to 10	24	3.0000	1.47442
	11 to 15	62	3.2903	1.31058
	16 to 20	30	3.1000	1.42272
	More than 20	23	2.9130	1.47442

	Total	147	3.1633	1.36513
Q14: I am satisfied with the structure	1 to 5	8	3.5000	.75593
	6 to 10	24	2.7500	1.22474
	11 to 15	63	3.3333	1.13592
	16 to 20	30	3.8667	1.10589
	More than 20	23	3.7391	1.09617
	Total	148	3.4189	1.16650
Q15: The structure provides adequate representation for my department	1 to 5	7	3.5714	.78680
	6 to 10	23	2.8261	1.11405
	11 to 15	63	3.4127	1.11637
	16 to 20	30	4.0667	.78492
	More than 20	22	3.8636	1.08213
	Total	145	3.5310	1.09959
Q16: I would prefer a different governance structure	1 to 5	8	2.8750	.83452
	6 to 10	23	3.3478	1.02730
	11 to 15	63	2.5873	1.21330
	16 to 20	30	2.2000	1.12648
	More than 20	22	2.5455	1.14340
	Total	146	2.6370	1.17960

Means and Standard Deviations for Responses to Items 1 to 16 by Time at CNU

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1: How frequently do you read the minutes	0 to 2 years	51	2.7843	.96569
	3 to 5 years	25	2.2000	1.00000
	6 to 8 years	13	2.0000	1.00000
	More than 8 years	61	1.8852	.77671
	Total	150	2.2533	.97751
Q2: How do you prefer that minutes be distributed	0 to 2 years	51	1.4314	.80635
	3 to 5 years	25	1.2400	.59722
	6 to 8 years	13	1.3846	.76795
	More than 8 years	61	1.4754	.76608
	Total	150	1.4133	.75251
Q3: How frequently do you access the webpage	0 to 2 years	51	3.0588	.90359
	3 to 5 years	25	3.0800	.86217
	6 to 8 years	13	2.6154	.76795
	More than 8 years	61	2.8689	.82614
	Total	150	2.9467	.85755
Q4: Do you know who your faculty senators are	0 to 2 years	51	1.7647	.76389
	3 to 5 years	25	1.4000	.64550
	6 to 8 years	13	1.2308	.43853
	More than 8 years	61	1.2623	.57450

	Total	150	1.4533	.68136
Q5: Do you communicate with a senator	0 to 2 years	51	2.6078	1.05978
	3 to 5 years	25	2.0400	1.09848
	6 to 8 years	13	2.0000	1.15470
	More than 8 years	61	2.0492	1.02349
	Total	150	2.2333	1.08323
Q6: The minutes are appropriately comprehensive and detailed	0 to 2 years	51	3.0196	1.79433
	3 to 5 years	25	2.8000	1.75594
	6 to 8 years	13	1.9231	1.32045
	More than 8 years	60	1.6833	.85354
	Total	149	2.3490	1.55062
Q7: Communication from Senate to Faculty is adequate	0 to 2 years	48	3.5208	.77156
	3 to 5 years	25	3.4800	.82260
	6 to 8 years	13	3.9231	.86232
	More than 8 years	61	3.9180	.82250
	Total	147	3.7143	.82761
Q8: Communication from Faculty to Senate is adequate	0 to 2 years	48	3.2500	.72932
	3 to 5 years	25	3.0800	.70238
	6 to 8 years	13	2.8462	1.14354
	More than 8 years	60	2.9667	.91996
	Total	146	3.0685	.85224
Q9: My own views are adequately represented	0 to 2 years	47	3.1489	.80700
	3 to 5 years	25	3.0400	.67577
	6 to 8 years	13	3.6923	.94733
	More than 8 years	60	3.5833	.94406
	Total	145	3.3586	.88722
Q10: My department's views are adequately represented	0 to 2 years	48	3.3125	1.01387
	3 to 5 years	25	3.3600	.95219
	6 to 8 years	12	3.7500	.86603
	More than 8 years	60	3.8333	1.01124
	Total	145	3.5724	1.01204
Q11: The faculty's views are adequately represented	0 to 2 years	48	3.3542	.81187
	3 to 5 years	25	3.2400	.96954
	6 to 8 years	13	3.8462	.80064
	More than 8 years	61	3.5246	.92388
	Total	147	3.4490	.89277
Q12: The election procedures are adequate	0 to 2 years	48	3.3750	.84110
	3 to 5 years	24	3.2917	.85867
	6 to 8 years	13	3.8462	.98710
	More than 8 years	60	3.7500	1.08339
	Total	145	3.5586	.97806
Q13: Non-tenured faculty should be allowed on Senate	0 to 2 years	48	3.5833	1.06857

	3 to 5 years	25	3.2400	1.33167
	6 to 8 years	13	3.1538	1.67562
	More than 8 years	60	2.8000	1.45905
	Total	146	3.1644	1.36976
Q14: I am satisfied with the structure	0 to 2 years	48	3.4583	1.00970
	3 to 5 years	25	3.1600	1.14310
	6 to 8 years	13	3.3846	1.38675
	More than 8 years	61	3.5082	1.25993
	Total	147	3.4218	1.16997
Q15: The structure provides adequate representation for my department	0 to 2 years	46	3.3913	1.10510
	3 to 5 years	25	3.3600	1.11355
	6 to 8 years	13	3.4615	1.26592
	More than 8 years	60	3.7333	1.05552
	Total	144	3.5347	1.10253
Q16: I would prefer a different governance structure	0 to 2 years	47	2.6809	.93498
	3 to 5 years	25	2.9200	1.11505
	6 to 8 years	12	2.6667	1.55700
	More than 8 years	61	2.4754	1.29880
	Total	145	2.6345	1.18330

Means and Standard Deviations for Responses to Items 1 to 16 by Whether Faculty Had Served as Senators

	Ever been a faculty senator?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1: How frequently do you read the minutes	Yes	41	1.8293	.80319
	No	111	2.4144	1.00425
Q2: How do you prefer that minutes be distributed	Yes	41	1.4878	.77852
	No	111	1.3784	.73921
Q3: How frequently do you access the webpage	Yes	41	2.7073	.84392
	No	111	3.0360	.85203
Q4: Do you know who your faculty senators are	Yes	41	1.2195	.57062
	No	111	1.5495	.71017
Q5: Do you communicate with a senator	Yes	41	1.8293	1.02231
	No	111	2.3964	1.07263
Q6: The minutes are appropriately comprehensive and detailed	Yes	40	1.5500	.63851
	No	111	2.6667	1.69670
Q7: Communication from Senate to Faculty is adequate	Yes	41	3.7317	1.00061
	No	108	3.6852	.79306
Q8: Communication from Faculty to Senate is adequate	Yes	41	2.8293	.99756
	No	107	3.1495	.79863
Q9: My own views are adequately represented	Yes	41	3.6829	1.03535
	No	106	3.2170	.81655

Q10: My department's views are adequately represented	Yes	41	3.8780	1.07692
	No	106	3.4245	.98511
Q11: The faculty's views are adequately represented	Yes	41	3.5366	1.02707
	No	108	3.3889	.86287
Q12: The election procedures are adequate	Yes	41	3.7073	1.24988
	No	106	3.4717	.87513
Q13: Non-tenured faculty should be allowed on Senate	Yes	41	2.6098	1.61056
	No	107	3.3925	1.20343
Q14: I am satisfied with the structure	Yes	41	3.5854	1.26443
	No	108	3.3333	1.14386
Q15: The structure provides adequate representation for my department	Yes	41	3.7073	1.20921
	No	105	3.4381	1.07349
Q16: I would prefer a different governance structure	Yes	41	2.4878	1.39861
	No	106	2.7170	1.10199

Appendix C: Overview of Senate Actions and their Outcomes 2001-2005

date item brought to floor	issue/resolution	3. initiated by **col.3**: S = senate, C = standing committee, G = SGA, A - admin, O - other	4. passed by senate? Y/N (include date)	5. outcome 1 - policy implemented/accepted by admin, 2 - implemented with modification, 3 - rejected by Provost, 4 - rejected by Pres./Board, 5 - pending, 6 - not enough information to determine
2/23/2001	WI courses	C	Y 2/23	1
2/23/2001	Academic Status policies - catalog	C	Y 2/23	1
2/23/2001	Fac Dev Grant procedures	S	Y 4/20	?
3/23/2001	Emertus status (4)	S/O	Y 3/23	1
3/23/2001	Gen Ed Committee charter	?	?	
4/20/2001	Standing Comm. Nominations SCHEV award nomination	S	Y 4/20 Y 4/20	
4/20/2001	Summer Stipend awards	S	Y 4/20	1 (?)
3/1/02	SR 2002-04: Reorganization of the Senate	S	Y	
3/1/02	SR 2002-05: Re-evaluate BAC	S	Y	
3/1/02	Passage of Acceptance of Academic Status Report	S	Y	
3/1/02	Only 5 W's	S	N	
3/1/02	Policy for medical withdrawal	S	Y	
3/1/02	Policy on temporary grade limits	S	Y	
3/1/02	Policy on Incompletes	S	N	
3/1/02	Permission to take an Overload	S	Y	
3/1/02	Statement on the death of President's Trible's mother	S	Y	
3/1/02	SR 2002-06: Withdrawal from Courses	S	Y	
3/22/02	Amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution	S	Y	
3/22/02	SR 2002-07: Gen. Ed. Requirement	S	Y	
3/22/02	SR 2002-08: Consolidation of the GEC and ACE	C	Y	
3/22/02	SR 2002-09: Approval of UCC recommendations	C	Y	
3/22/02	SR 2002-10: Approval of UCC recommendations	C	Y	
3/22/02	Acceptance of Emeriti	A	Y	
4/12/02	Assessment of Summerville and Mottilla	S	Y	
4/26/02	SR 2002-14: Violation of post-tenure review in Handbook	S	Y	
4/26/02	SR 2002-15: School of Business reps on UCC	S	Y	
9/5/03	Res. 1, faculty attendance at formal	S		5

Date	Description			
	ceremonies to be no less that 50%			
9/5/03	Res. 1?, creation of academic computing			
	technology committee	S		5
9/5/03	Res. 5, all continuing faculty deemed		Y	
	equally meritorious for present eval cycle	S		5
9/5/03	Res. 3, creation of institutional animal			
	care and use committee	S		5
9/5/03	Res. 2, change to university			
	non-discrimination policy for SGA	G	Y	5
	to include sexual orientation			
?	Res. 6, faculty mentoring program	S	Y	5
10/3/03	Res. 5?, Handbook change, 7 not 8	S	Y	5
	members elected.			
10/3/03	Res. 4, formation of Academic Computing	S		5
	Advisory Committee (see res. 1 above)			
	2004-05-01: Time in Rank	S	n	
	2004-05-02: Faculty Preparedness in	s	y	1 & 5
	Responding to Student Depression			
	2004-05-03: Textbook Royalties	s	n	
	2004-05-04: Lea Pellett Emeritus	o	y	1
	2004-05-05: Faculty Broadcasting Email	s	y	1
	2004-05-06: Renumber MATH 105	o	y	1
	2004-05-07: Scheduling Getting Started	s		5
	Week			
	2004-05-08: Buck Miller Emeritus	o	y	1
	2004-05-09: David Bankes Emeritus	o	y	1
	2004-05-10: SoB Accreditation	s	y	1
	Commendation			
	2004-05-11: Electronic Submission of	s	y	1
	Materials to Senate			

	2004-05-12: Shifting Class-drop Period	s	n	
	2004-05-13: Faculty Hiring Policies	s	y	6
	2004-05-14: Duskin/Pinkard Commendation	s	y	1
	2004-05-15: Academic Advising Steering Committee	s	y	1
	2004-05-16: Schweig Commendation	s	y	1
	2004-05-17: Carlson Commendation	s	y	1
	2004-05-18: Ford Grant	s	y	1
	Curriculum Issues	c		
	2.a. Foreign Language Courses		y	2
	2.b. Chemistry Degree		y	1
	2.c. Areas of Inquiry: Program Descriptions		y	1
	2.d.i Pre-/Co-requisites for 3-400 level Area of Inquiry classes		y	6
	2.d.ii Global/Multicultural, Natural World, Creative Expression		y	1
	2.d.iii Formal and Informal Reasoning		y	1
	2.d.iv Identities, Institutions and Society		y	6
	2.d.v Western Traditions		y	6