

**COSFL Position Paper on University Governance**  
**Adopted 3/24/01**

The Coalition of Senate and Faculty Leadership (COSFL) endorses the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in 1966 (see AAUP Policy Documents & Reports, 8th Ed. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors, 1995, 179-185).

COSFL believes: that a collegial system of academic governance adds value to higher education; and that collegial governance both sustains and extends the missions of a college or university in teaching, research, and service to the institution and to the wider communities it engages.

Academic governance derives its authority from the institution's mission. It is rooted in the responsibility all members of the academic community bear in achieving the purposes of the college or university. The academic community includes: students, faculty, staff, administrators, members of governing boards and alumni. A collegial system is based upon the participation of all stakeholders, each in their own way, in the discourse from which policy and practice are constructed.

Collegial governance is characterized by:

- the recognition of and respect for the many and varied roles that members of the academic community perform in a complex institution;
- the timely disclosure of information needed to participate meaningfully in the discourse that makes good policy and practice, wherever those conversations take place;
- the opportunity for members of the academic community to provide input before decisions are made;
- the principle of dissent.

In a diverse academic community, the participants will not and should not always be of one voice on matters of policy and practice. It is imperative that dissent from the majority view be respected by all involved.

As a practical matter, collegial governance is seldom exercised in the committee of the whole. Rather, the various authorities in a complex institution speak through groups or offices: governing boards, administrative officers, students, faculty and staff and their representative bodies. Whatever an institution's structure, however, the spirit and practice of collegiality calls for either the election of these people or their appointment with the broadest possible consultation, representing diverse points of view. Moreover, the spirit and practice of collegial governance requires these people, once having been elected or appointed, to maintain their discourse with their institutional constituents. In a spirit of full and open disclosure there is little that should be excluded from community discourse. While, for example, it is the traditional responsibility of a collegiate faculty to establish admission and graduation requirements, to approve academic programs, or to approve changes to program curricula, that faculty best does so when it consults with the students, staff, and administrators. Additionally, the primary responsibilities of administrators can best be accomplished when they consult with other members of the academic community. Since academic institutions are primarily made up of people engaged in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service to the institution and the wider community, no realm is more sensitive to the spirit and practice of collegial discourse than the appointment and review of personnel.

**The following Universities have already endorsed the statement on shared governance adopted by COSFI on March 24, 2001**

University of Kentucky Senate	April 23, 2001
Morehead State University Faculty Senate	April 19, 2001
Kentucky State University Faculty Senate	April 16, 2001
Murray State University Faculty Senate	April 3, 2001

## FACULTY REGENT'S REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE, April 30, 2001

Submitted by Merita Thompson, Faculty Regent

The EKU Board of Regents met on Thursday, April 21, 2001. The agenda was full, and the meeting lasted from 9 am to after 4 pm. The Progress covered this meeting in more depth than usual, but since I don't know what you have read and not read, I will hit some of the highlights, and leave an opportunity to ask questions if you wish.

1. First, all these routine items were approved without any significant comment: promotion and tenure items, Foundation Professors, candidates for degrees, program changes from Academic Affairs, and individuals recommended for faculty emeritus.
2. The Department Chair handbook was endorsed without much comment, with the section on sabbatical leaves to be added later.
3. A special flat tuition rate was approved for a new on-line MS program in Loss Prevention and Safety. That flat fee was \$695 per credit hour, which seemed high to some, but was explained as being in keeping with national averages. We also were told that other KY institutions utilize a flat rate.
4. A request was approved for Model Lab School to apply for an alternate model for school-based decision-making. This would allow Model to have site-based decision-making for p-12, rather than treating the high school and lower grades separately.
5. A strategic plan for improvement and maintenance of residential facilities was approved, and this document included objectives for the next two years.
6. The one thing I think you know about by now is the fact that we passed a mandatory meal plan, to begin with the fall of 2002 for all new full time students and freshmen transfers who are required to live in residence halls. The discussion went on for a long, long time, with Board members asking many questions about flexibility, and accountability regarding service. As a part of this agreement, the upstairs of Powell will be renovated, starting almost immediately, and the Fresh Food Company concept will be expanded to six stations. Much of this section is supposed to be available by the time that Governor's Scholars arrive on campus later in the summer.
7. Honorary degrees were approved for Mr. Louis Freeh, Director of the FBI, and General John M. Keane, Vice Chief of Staff of the US Army, and Mr. Robert Sexton is scheduled as the commencement speaker.

8. An unusual honor was approved at this meeting. The directorship of the Honors program has been endowed by a Board member, and the Board approved naming that endowed directorship after Dr. Bonnie Gray. Dr. Marsden said he thought she might be the only director of a program currently sitting in the position named in her honor.
9. The University budget was approved, and without as much discussion as usual because we had a special meeting in which it was presented in March. We did have quite a bit of discussion of money to address inequities for employees. The budget we passed has \$150,000 for classified staff, none for contract staff, and \$50,000 for faculty. Additional monies are pending in a proposal to the CPE in the Action Agenda.
10. The health insurance program in which you are currently enrolling was approved. The Progress did have an error saying that premiums had increased 19%. Premiums for the single plan did increase, but the University absorbed all of that. Some increase did occur for families, but that varied with the plan. As to what employees would pay in co-pays, drugs, etc., according to Linda Kuhnun, that increase could range from a decrease, to a top increase of about 19%, depending on the plan you were on and what you chose this year. I suppose that is where the reporter got that figure and stated it as premium costs. ONE point to note is that this is an increase for a two year span. Last year we did not have an increase since there was an anticipated savings from Med Ben and also our utilization throughout the year had been less.
11. The last item is the Domestic Partnership proposal. That proposal was postponed, pending review by the new Human Resources director. The motion directed him to verify cost data and review the procedures for implementation. This delay was triggered initially when some question arose about cost data, because most universities we checked ensure same sex only, as does Anthem for its employees. Since our budget is tight and insurance costs have gone up, by the time of the Board meeting, some Board members felt we needed more data from other universities that ensure opposite sex partners as well as same sex, to be sure they didn't see a jump in cost. I checked with <sup>Amendable</sup> the chair of the Senate ad hoc committee that dealt with this issue, and she felt that delaying the proposal for these reasons seemed reasonable.
12. Questions?