

Draft for discussion  
Revised 2/24/16

Date: January 29, 2016

To: Dean Hess and School of Education (SoE) Academic Planning Council (APC)

From: Kimber Wilkerson, Fong Chan and Ann Fillback-Watt  
APC Restructuring ad-hoc sub-committee

Re: Recommendations for APC membership configurations

This report contains a brief summary of requirements for APC membership and function as articulated in Faculty Policies and Procedures (FP&P). Following that summary are three recommended configurations for selection of faculty for the SoE APC that comply with these requirements. (Note: Selection of academic staff will follow a separate process and the Dean will also appoint additional members.) The 3 recommended configurations are offered for review and discussion by APC. The SoE APC will nominate one or more membership configuration options that will then be presented to the entire SoE faculty for approval during the latter part of the spring 2016 semester.

We recommend APC membership be linked to three-year terms, regardless of the configuration selected. Initially, members will be selected to different length terms (e.g., 2, 3, and 4 years). Details regarding implementation of the chosen APC configuration(s) will need be determined at a later point.

#### **APC Membership requirements per FP&P**

1. Dean is an ex-officio member
2. All elected or appointed members shall be:
  - a) faculty
  - b) academic staff (whose primary responsibilities are instruction, outreach and/or research), or
  - c) academic associate deans
3. At least 2/3s of the members shall be faculty, elected by the school or college faculty, who hold no substantial administrative appointment beyond the department level.
4. As least one member shall be academic staff from the school or college.
5. Selection process should foster representation of the major divisions of study with the school.

#### **APC Function**

The primary function of APC is to provide counsel and advice to the Dean. This advisory board should reflect the opinions and perspectives of faculty and academic staff broadly.

## **Recommended APC membership configurations for elected members**

**Configuration 1:** Each department elects one member.

10 elected faculty + 2 Acad Staff + 1 Dean Appointee  
13 voting members, 77% faculty

Pros:

- This configuration is the most similar to the one used in the recent past – and thus represents the least amount of change.
- If each department elects one member – then each department is assured a voice on this advisory board.

Cons:

- This configuration results in the largest APC of the 3 options, which could limit productive/efficient discussion.
- Electing members from each department allows the possibility for APC members to serve as department representatives rather than taking the broader view of what is best for the SoE. (Clear guidance on this issue would be warranted.)
- Increases administrative burden on departments – with disproportionate impact on small departments.
- Departments with few faculty have equal voice in discussions to faculty with many faculty.
- Duplicates, to some degree, the existing Chairs meeting with the Dean.

**Configuration 2:** Members are elected from departmental clusters. Clusters below are offered as an example.

Clusters 1-3 each elect ONE APC rep

Cluster 1 - Counseling Psych & ELPA (22 faculty)

Cluster 2 - Kinesiology & RPSE (29 faculty)

Cluster 3 - Ed Psych (21 faculty)

Clusters 4 & 5 each elect TWO APC reps

Cluster 4 - Art, Dance, Theatre & Drama (47 faculty)

Cluster 5 - C&I & EPS (47 faculty)

7 elected faculty + 2 Acad Staff + 1 Dean appointee  
10 voting members, 70% elected faculty members

Pros:

- Representation of faculty voice is proportionate across departments.
- Would encourage faculty interaction and communication across departmental lines.

Cons:

- Constructing clusters based on faculty number may preclude thematically cohesive clusters. This, in turn, may limit the ability of the APC to represent fully all key aspects of SoE function.
- Not all departments will have a representative on APC at all times.

**Configuration 3:** Members are elected from among all SoE faculty.

Eight faculty members would be elected from the entire SoE faculty regardless of departmental affiliation, **with limit on number of members affiliated with any single department serving at the same time**. Recommended that the Dean ensure that the APC is comprised of members who represent the broad array of SoE programs, by appointing additional members when necessary.

8 elected faculty + 2 Acad Staff + 1 Dean appointee  
11 voting members, 72% elected faculty

Pros:

- Detaching APC membership from departmental affiliation may encourage faculty to provide advice to the Dean from a broad SoE perspective and encourage contemplation of SoE and campus issues for the good of the whole.
- Would allow for the APC to be constructed at a size deemed optimal (e.g., the proposed 8 elected faculty **and 2 elected academic staff** could easily be changed to a larger or smaller number before this membership policy is finalized).
- Increases likelihood that faculty members who serve are doing so because they are interested in participation in this governance body, rather than doing so because their department is expected to put a name forward.

Cons:

- May be difficult to find members willing to participate if elected from the entire SoE rather than being elected by a department.
- Opening up the election process to all faculty may limit the ability of the APC to represent fully all key aspects of SoE function.
- Not all departments will have a representative on APC.

**Academic Staff representatives**

**Option 1:** Two (or three) representatives be elected from CASI on staggered terms.

**Option 2:** One representative be elected from CASI; additional representative(s) to be elected from the broad SoE community on staggered terms.