MEMORANDUM

TO: Committee on Faculty Affairs

FROM: Steering Committee

RE: Review of MUSE policies

DATE: March 5, 2014

Background:
In Fall 2011 the MUSE program was brought into the governance process with the creation of the Faculty-Student Collaboration Program Council (FSCPC). FSCPC reports jointly to CAP and CFA.

As of Spring 2013, MUSE policies, including the Request for Proposals (RFP), had not yet gone through public review. Prof. Benny Chan, the director of Faculty-Student Scholarly and Creative Collaborative Activity, asked Steering about procedures for review of the RFP. Following its March 6, 2013 meeting, Steering replied to Prof. Chan as follows:

> The Steering Committee has decided that, in part because of the heavy workload of both CAP and CFA (the committees to which FSCPC reports), FSCPC should be solely responsible for the composition and review of the MUSE RFP.

Steering has concluded that this decision was a mistake, and we wish to rescind it.

The immediate impetus for a review of our earlier decision was the Faculty Senate Executive Board memo to Steering of November 15, 2013, which is attached to this charge. This memo suggests that FSCPC, as a program council reporting to CAP and CFA, is not the appropriate body to create policy for the program.

When it made its decision in March 2013, Steering failed to consult either CAP or CFA. When Steering consulted in November 2013 with the current CFA chair, Prof. Regina Morin, she pointed out that the MUSE program is parallel to the SOSA and Sabbaticals programs. Both those committees report to CFA, which uses public testimony as specified in the Governance Document to periodically review their policies and RFP. Prof. Morin noted that for the sake of consistency, MUSE policies and its RFP should be handled the in the same way as SOSA and Sabbatical policies and RFPs.

Charge:
CFA should undertake a review of MUSE policies and its RFP. It may limit public testimony to the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large.

Timeline:
CFA should complete its review early in Fall 2014 so that the director of Faculty-Student Scholarly and Creative Collaborative Activity, working with FSCPC and CFA, can revise the RFP for 2015-16.

TCNJ Governance Processes

Step #1 -- Identifying and reporting the problem: When a Standing Committee receives a charge from the Steering Committee, the first responsibility is to clearly articulate and report the problem to the campus community. The problem may have been set out clearly in the charge received from the Steering Committee, or it may be necessary for the Standing Committee to frame a problem statement. The problem statement should indicate the difficulties or uncertainties that need to be addressed through new or revised policy, procedure, or program. The problem statement should be broadly stated and should include a context such as existing policy or practice. Problem statements may include solution parameters but should not suggest any specific solutions. Clearly stated problems will lead to better recommendations.

Step #2 -- Preparing a preliminary recommendation: Once the campus community has received the problem statement, committees can begin to collect data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. Committees should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community through regular updates and the Governance website. At this point, committees typically receive input or testimony through committee membership, formal testimony, and open comment from affected individuals and all stakeholder groups. Committees must be proactive in inviting stakeholder groups (including Student Government, Staff Senate and Faculty Senate) to provide formal testimony. In cases where testimony results in significant and substantive changes to the preliminary recommendation, the new recommendation will be considered to be in step #2.

Step #3 -- Making a final recommendation: Committees must use sound judgment to give the campus adequate time to review the preliminary recommendation before making their final recommendation. Again, committees are expected to be proactive in receiving feedback on the preliminary recommendation. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must resubmit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When, in the best judgment of the committee, the campus community has responded to the proposed resolution of the issue, the committee shall send its final recommendation (with documentation) to the Steering Committee. That final recommendation should include a suggested implementation date. Accompanying the final recommendation shall be a report of how testimony was gathered, the nature of that testimony, and how the Committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

Testimony

The presenting of testimony, prior to both the preliminary and final recommendations, is central to the concept of shared governance. All stakeholder groups will have an opportunity to provide input into governance issues through direct membership as well as invited testimony. Individuals appointed or elected to the governance system are expected to take a broad institutional perspective relative to issues being considered. In contrast, invited testimony will reflect the stakeholder perspective on the issue being considered. Committees are expected to be proactive in inviting stakeholder groups to provide testimony at both steps # 2 and #3 of the process. Committees need to identify stakeholder groups that are interested in each particular issue and invite their testimony at scheduled Committee meetings or hearings. Committees should report in their transmittal memos which groups were targeted as stakeholders, how testimony was invited, the form of the testimony (written, oral, etc.), and the substantive content of the testimony.

To see the Steering Committee's guidelines for gathering testimony and making a final recommendation, see the "Governance Toolbox" at http://academicaffairs.pages.tcnj.edu/college-governance/a-governance-toolbox/

To: Steering Committee

From: Faculty Senate Executive Board

Date: November 15, 2013

Subject: Review of MUSE policy

Over the past four years the Senate has heard concerns, raised both formally and informally, concerning the criteria used for the selection of MUSE participants. Four years ago our response to faculty was that we were working to bring MUSE oversight into governance; until this was done we had no formal route to request a review. With the governance review, FSCPC was created, and we began to tell faculty that we anticipated a full review of the program now that oversight was in place.

We understand that the concept for MUSE and the criteria for projects were developed by a small group of interested faculty, primarily from the School of Science. Eventually more faculty were added to the oversight body, initially by invitation and since Fall, 2011 by Senate appointment in consultation with the Director of Faculty-Student Scholarly and Creative Collaborative. The RFP has presumably been edited by this body over the years, but no campus discussion of the purpose of the program or of the criteria for project selection has ever occurred.

On November 8, at the direction of Steering, FSCPC requested input via qualtrics regarding specifics (timeline, electronic submission, etc.) of the application process. This survey included a final, open-ended question asking for recommendations regarding changes to the RFP or to the MUSE program. We appreciate this opportunity for faculty to provide suggestions to the committee. However we do not feel that this provides an adequate opportunity for campus discussion of the purpose of the program or the criteria for project selection. Further, we do not feel that FSCPC, as a program council reporting to both CAP and CFA, is the appropriate body to create policy for the program.

The Faculty Senate Executive Board asks Steering to initiate a full review of the purpose of the program and the criteria for project selection. Since project selection is a competitive faculty process, we suggest that CFA is the proper body for conducting this review. We recognize that this review will not happen in time to direct this year's RFP, but we hope that it will occur prior to the issuance of next year's RFP.