

Suggestions from the Task Force on Faculty Governance¹
Brandeis University
January 19, 2018

I. Introduction

The Task Force on Faculty Governance was charged by President Ron Liebowitz with assessing the state of faculty governance at Brandeis. We found much to like in the current overall structure of faculty governance. We also noticed some areas to improve, and have developed proposals outlined in this report. Our initial proposals have been informed by parallel work the Board of Trustees has been doing to ensure that it is a high-functioning board and by the administrative re-organization of the university this fall. We support these efforts, which highlight the central role faculty play in the university, the importance of the academic and co-curricular work of the university being structurally aligned, and the distinct governance roles played by faculty, senior administrators, and the Board of Trustees. As a faculty committee, we are sharing this report simultaneously with the full faculty and the senior administration.

Early in our work, we became aware of many ways faculty have not been included in important decisions historically at Brandeis and the number of current barriers to greater faculty participation. We sought to ensure that going forward, the faculty be clearly engaged in key decisions. We prioritized faculty time such that time devoted to governance will be well spent and effective. In that spirit,

- We propose some new committees.
- We suggest that some existing committees be retired.
- We suggest some committees be streamlined or consolidated.
- We specify how all of these committees relate to one another, what the mandate of each is, and who has decision-making responsibility in each.

With these changes, we aim to maintain all the critical functions that faculty currently serve in the university, increase the influence of faculty in areas central to its responsibilities, and ensure that every committee has an important and clear charge and that all committee work fits clearly into a broader system of authority and decision making.

This report represents our first step toward making formal recommendations. We wanted to pause and share with you details of the conversations we have been having and our initial set of proposals. ***We ask you to read this document carefully, tell us what we are missing, and point out any places in our thinking that you do not think are clear or would not be effective in practice. We will listen to your feedback during the first few months of 2018 at meetings, through online submissions, emails and in one-on-one conversations. We will then revise these proposals and release a revised version of this document in the spring semester.*** In keeping with President Liebowitz's charge (included as Appendix A), we confine our attention to the faculty, particularly focusing on how the faculty share decision making with senior

¹ Members of the Task Force include Sava Berhané; Wendy Cadge (co-chair); Susan Curnan (co-chair); Jody Hoffer Gittel; Adrienne Krstansky; Anne Marando; Michael Randall; Robert Reitano; Gina Turrigiano; Pu Wang; and Bernie Yack.

administrators and the Board of Trustees. We recognize that other university stakeholders have alternative venues for input.

II. Process

To get to the ideas outlined below, we worked together this semester to learn how the faculty practices governance, how we work with the senior administration and the Board, and how we share responsibility with the senior administration and the Board for different decisions. In our discussions, we drew on data gathered in a survey of the faculty in May 2017, a report on peer institutions developed by our consultant Susan Resneck Pierce completed in August 2017, a review of existing governance structures and processes at Brandeis, an examination of various Senate models at other institutions, a literature search on shared governance, and observations made by Susan Pierce during a four day visit to campus in September 2017 during which she met individually and in focus groups with more than 80 faculty and senior administrators.²

We began in September by trying to understand how, based on the university's by-laws and the current Faculty Handbook, the faculty practice governance and make decisions. These documents stipulate that faculty decision-making primarily takes place through:

- Seven standing committees outlined in the Faculty Handbook
 - University Advisory Council
 - Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
 - Committee on Undergraduate Academic Standing
 - University Budget Committee
 - Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid
 - Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities
 - Intellectual Property Review Committee
- School Councils
 - Council/Division for Creative Arts
 - Council/Division for Humanities
 - Council/Division for Sciences
 - Council/Division for Social Sciences
 - Council of the Graduate School of Art & Sciences
 - Council of the Graduate Professional Schools
 - Council of the Rabb School of Continuing Studies
- The Faculty Senate
- Faculty representation to the Board of Trustees, non-voting
 - Four faculty members elected as at-large representatives
 - The Chair of the Faculty Senate, ex-officio.

Some of these efforts are focused on university-wide processes and others on decisions within Arts & Sciences. We also learned early in our work this fall that the Heller School (Heller), the International Business School (IBS), and the Rabb School for Continuing Studies (Rabb) each have documents that outline how some decisions internal to their schools are made. The

² All of these materials and previous updates to the faculty are at: https://www.brandeis.edu/faculty_senate/FacultyGovernanceTaskForce.html.

collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with SEIU Local 509, ratified on May 4, 2017, also stipulates terms (e.g., related to appointments, evaluations, compensation) for part-time contract faculty governed by the CBA.

Believing that institutional form needs to follow function, we first sought to clarify the range of issues for which we think faculty ought to have primary responsibility and those about which they should be consulted so that we could review the committee structure with those roles and responsibilities in mind. Later in this document, we will describe those roles and responsibilities and also the ways we suggest faculty be chosen for committee membership. We suggest clarifying which of these issues should be addressed in a Faculty Handbook that governs all faculty across the university and which are more appropriately addressed in policy handbooks for each school (Arts & Sciences, Heller, IBS and Rabb).

Based on the faculty survey completed in May 2017, we identified the following eight areas as those over which faculty should have primary responsibility. We are aware that in some of these areas, such as tenure and promotion, the faculty recommends to the Deans who then recommends to the Provost who then recommends to the President, and in appropriate cases the President then recommends to the Board. These eight areas are:

1. faculty hiring, after areas are articulated
2. evaluation of faculty, including tenure and promotion
3. the curriculum
4. academic standards and policy
5. the quality of teaching and learning
6. graduate admissions
7. scholarships and awards
8. research priorities

All of these areas are obviously informed by the resources available.

We also made a second list of areas we think faculty should be consulted about *but* about which we thought other groups (mostly the senior administration) should have decision-making authority. This second list includes:

1. undergraduate admissions
2. specifying areas for faculty hiring
3. searching for and appointing senior academic leadership
4. student advising and support
5. community living
6. conflict resolution
7. budgeting, including fundraising
8. the calendar
9. faculty and staff salaries and benefits
10. the physical plant and operational issues as connected to mission.

Once again, in some areas such as the budget, the President recommends to the Board that makes the final decision. In other areas, the administration (ultimately the President) has decision-making responsibility.

We then conducted a zero-based committee exercise which allowed us to ask: 1) which university committees are essential and, if essential, what are their charges? 2) which committees might be retired because they are no longer pertinent and/or effective? and 3) would any new or combined committees enable more productive involvement? Our guiding principle here has been that faculty time is precious, and it is important to avoid asking faculty to be involved in service that is not consequential, thereby giving faculty time to be engaged in service that does matter.

III. Current Thinking

Based on our learning and conversations to date, we propose the following:

- **The Faculty Handbook:** Because we realized early in our work that the current Faculty Handbook combines guidelines for governance at the university level and for Arts & Sciences in a way not clearly delineated, we suggest that this be specified and that the standing committees of the Faculty Handbook be divided into two groups. The first group should focus on university level processes and decisions that apply to all faculty members and remain in the Handbook. The second group should focus on decisions internal to Arts & Sciences but which have serious implications for the entire University and therefore it could be argued belong in the Faculty Handbook.
- **Committees – University:** At the university level, we suggest five standing committees of the faculty. We suggest that all have members comprised of elected faculty– one elected from each of the four divisions in Arts & Sciences, one from Heller and one from IBS.
- **Committees – Arts & Sciences:** Within Arts & Sciences, we propose three standing committees served by Arts & Sciences faculty, as outlined below. Two of these committees are elected and one is an administrative committee.³

A. University Committees

1. We suggest that the current University Advisory Council (UAC),⁴ the Integrated Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC),⁵ and the University Budget Committee⁶ be merged into a

³ By administrative committee we mean a committee whose members are appointed by the senior administration, rather than elected by the faculty.

⁴ According to the current Faculty Handbook (approved August 14, 2017):

a. The University Advisory Council is composed of six faculty members appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Council of the Faculty Senate. The Provost, the Academic Deans, the Chief Operating Officer, and the Senior Vice President for Students and Enrollment are members of the Council. The Provost serves as chair. Appointment terms for faculty members will be defined by the Provost. The Provost may invite others to participate in the work of the Council as appropriate.

b. The University Advisory Council advises the Provost and the Deans. The Council provides advice concerning the appointment or reappointment of academic officers, and the establishment or discontinuation of departments, programs, and other academic units. At the request of the academic administration, it provides advice on the formulation and implementation of academic policies; on the review and/or further development of the educational and research activities of the university; on the academic organization of the university; on the university budget; and on other matters of concern to the university community. The Council may, at the request of the academic administration, help formulate legislation for presentation to the Faculty Meeting.

c. In order to carry out its advisory function the University Advisory Council receives the reports produced by all

single new *Committee on Planning and Strategy* with one subcommittee – the *Budget and Priorities Subcommittee*. This committee brings together senior administrators and faculty to plan and make strategic decisions creating a formal role for faculty in these processes, which has not been the case to date.

The Committee on Planning and Strategy would be chaired by the President and charged with advising the President about the annual priorities for the university derived from Board-approved institutional priorities, working through strategic questions about how the institution should be positioned moving forward, and matching those priorities and strategic decisions to budget. This committee makes recommendations to the President who in turn makes recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

We anticipate the Committee on Planning and Strategy would meet at least monthly through the academic year and be comprised of the President, Provost, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Deans (from Arts & Sciences, the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, Heller, IBS and the VP of the Rabb School), possibly other senior administrators, and six elected faculty. One faculty member will be elected from each of the four divisions in Arts & Sciences, one from Heller and one from IBS. Senior administrators might periodically include other administrative staff in these conversations. Any subcommittees this committee appoints will include several of the elected faculty representatives.

We anticipate that the *Budget and Priorities Subcommittee* would meet at least monthly and be comprised of members of the *Committee on Planning and Strategy*, including at least two of the faculty. The Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration will chair the subcommittee and may include additional relevant staff as needed. The subcommittee role is mostly operational. It will be the forum through which each part of the university will put forward its needs and priorities and learn about the needs and priorities of other areas. It will prioritize and share this information with the *Committee on Planning and Strategy*, as well as information related to the budget, to ensure that

standing and special faculty committees.

d. At the request of the Provost, the deliberations of the Council may be confidential.

⁵ The Integrated Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC) is also not a faculty committee. It is a committee chaired by the Provost in close partnership with the Executive Vice President. It includes the senior leadership from across the University: the CFO; SVP-Institutional Advancement; VP for Student Affairs; the VPs for Human Resources, Operations, and Planning and Institutional Research; the academic deans; the faculty chair of the University Budget Committee; and senior administrators in the areas of academic affairs, research, libraries, and information technology. The IPBC is the forum through which each part of the University can put forward its needs and priorities and learn of the needs and priorities of the other areas, enabling frank discussion about budgetary constraints and trade-offs.

⁶ According to the current Faculty Handbook, the University Budget Committee:

a. The Committee consists of the Chief Operating Officer, the Vice President for Budget and Planning, the Provost, the Senior Vice President for Students and Enrollment, and two faculty members appointed by the Provost and two faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate. A member of the faculty selected by the Provost serves as chair. Appointment terms for faculty members will be defined by the Provost.

b. The University Budget Committee reviews the university budget proposal before its submission to the Board of Trustees, provides advice to the administration with respect to faculty interests, and reports to the faculty on its discussions.

strategic decisions are being discussed with clear financial information about the university. Finally, it will review the university budget proposal before its submission to the *Committee on Planning and Strategy*, who will in turn submit it to the Board of Trustees.

2. We suggest that a new *University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy*⁷ be created to help Schools and Divisions more effectively communicate and collaborate. At present, these efforts largely take place in silos with less creative synergy than might be ideal. This committee would serve as a kind of cabinet to the Provost, engaging with the Provost about differences among these Schools that are unique and need to be retained and about points of potential collaboration among them.

This committee would be chaired by the Provost and would coordinate curriculum, streamline the course approval process across schools, coordinate policy manuals across schools, and coordinate and communicate degree and program requirements even while recognizing the differences across units. The group would also address advising issues from a macro level, offer policy guidelines, think creatively about new academic and co-curricular opportunities, and coordinate student support across schools. The committee would review proposals to start new academic program units or conclude current ones. This committee makes recommendations to the Provost who in turn makes recommendations to the President. When appropriate, the President would make recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

We anticipate this committee would meet at least monthly through the academic year. It would include the Deans of Arts & Sciences, the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, Heller, IBS and the Vice President of the Rabb School as well as the four Division Heads in Arts & Sciences, the Head of the Educational Steering Committee at the Heller School, the head of Academic Programs at IBS, the Chair of the Rabb Council,⁸ and six elected faculty. One faculty member will be elected from each of the four divisions in Arts & Sciences, one from Heller and one from IBS. Senior administrators might periodically include other administrative staff in these conversations. Any subcommittees this committee appoints will include several of the elected faculty representatives.

⁷ We suggest that this committee, in part, replaces the University Advisory Council whose charge is described in footnote 3.

⁸ According to the current Faculty Handbook (p. 31)

d. The Council of the Rabb School of Continuing Studies will consist of at least three members of the Arts and Sciences faculty from at least two schools, and at least one faculty member from each of the professional schools, to be appointed by the Provost after consultations with the Council of the Faculty Senate and the Academic Deans. If interested, a graduate student representative may serve on the Council. A member of the faculty will chair the Council.

d. The Council of the Rabb School of Continuing Studies reviews proposals with respect to programs of undergraduate and graduate continuing studies, including their rules and regulations, prior to their submission to the Council of the Graduate Professional Schools, or the Council of the Graduate School (if changes have important consequences for graduate education in Arts and Sciences), or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (if curricular changes have important consequences for undergraduate education) for approval. The Council also recommends the award of degrees in undergraduate and graduate programs of continuing studies.

Presently, only Arts & Sciences has a standing committee of the Faculty Handbook charged with addressing issues of academic standing. We suggest that this committee, currently called the *Committee on Undergraduate Academic Standing* continue as a subcommittee of the *University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy*.

According to the current Faculty Handbook, the committee is charged with,

- Interpreting university regulations as they apply to individual students and makes such exceptions as reason and equity may require.
- Hearing all cases of required withdrawal from, and readmission to the university.
- Recommending to the faculty degrees and honors for undergraduates.⁹

We suggest reducing the number of faculty on this committee to six - one faculty member elected from each of the four Divisions in Arts & Sciences, one from Heller and one from IBS. The Heller and IBS faculty members need to be people who teach undergraduates.

We further suggest that the processes around academic standing for undergraduates be streamlined with those for graduate students through GSAS, Heller, IBS and Rabb and parallel policy committees be set up through GSAS, Heller, IBS and Rabb that can report in to the *University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy* alongside the *Committee on Undergraduate Academic Standing*.

3. Aware of the range of committees and groups working around teaching across the university, we suggest a university level *Committee on Teaching, Learning and Assessment* be created.

This committee will be chaired by the Provost and will coordinate efforts to improve teaching and learning on campus and will mediate between the expectations of accreditation bodies and the norms of faculty. It will provide regular reports to the faculty about what we know about teaching and learning at Brandeis and how it is improving or declining over time. The committee will also foster conversation about teaching and learning efforts in different academic units such as the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Committee for the Support of Teaching, the Experiential Learning Committee, and aspects of the Rabb School's eLearning Division to help facilitate cross-fertilization.

⁹ The full charge in the current Faculty Handbook reads:

- a. The Committee consists of the Dean of Arts and Sciences or his/her designee, who will serve as chair, eight members of the faculty selected by the Dean in consultation with the Council of the Faculty Senate so as to ensure representation of each School, the Dean of Student Life, and the University Registrar.
- b. The Committee on Academic Standing interprets university regulations as they apply to individual students and makes such exceptions as reason and equity may require.
- c. The Committee hears all cases of required withdrawal from, and readmission to the university. It may authorize a subcommittee to carry out other functions. Appeals of decisions by the subcommittee are heard by the full Committee. The Dean of Arts and Sciences may decide to hear appeals of Committee decisions.
- d. The Committee recommends to the faculty degrees and honors for undergraduates.
- e. The annual report of the Committee to the faculty should provide a statistical summary of the cases it has heard and their disposition, and call attention to issues that might usefully be addressed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Faculty.

We anticipate this committee would meet at least twice a semester and would include six elected faculty, and staff members invited by the Provost. One faculty member will be elected from each of the four Divisions in Arts & Sciences, one from Heller and one from IBS. This committee will advise the Provost and will make recommendations to the *University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy* to help inform their work and decision-making.

4. At present, the *Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities* interprets provisions of the handbook. This includes:
 - **Rendering judgments concerning faculty rights and responsibilities (see section VII.A), and appeals arising out of faculty salary grievances (see section VII.B); disciplinary actions (see section VII.C); and appointment, tenure and promotion procedures (see section V.A.4.b.vii).**¹⁰

In addition, we suggest this committee also serve as an appellate body in the event of disagreements between the university and the creator of intellectual property (Current Faculty Handbook, p. 32). In the current Faculty Handbook, this responsibility rests with the Intellectual Property Review Committee. We suggest moving this function to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities because intellectual property is connected to questions of faculty rights.

We suggest that all of the members of the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities be elected by the Divisions and Schools, and that they receive formal training for their work. The chair of the Committee is elected by the Committee from among its tenured members. We suggest that the six members of this committee represent the four Divisions in Arts & Sciences, in addition to Heller and IBS. We suggest that the

¹⁰ The full charge currently states,

- a. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, acting on behalf of the faculty, interprets provisions of the Faculty Handbook. Under the circumstances described herein, it renders judgments concerning faculty rights and responsibilities (see section VII.A, below), and appeals arising out of faculty salary grievances (see section VII.B, below); disciplinary actions (see section VII.C, below); and appointment, tenure and promotion procedures (see section V.A.4.b.vii, above).
- b. The Committee is composed of seven members, five of whom hold tenure at the time of appointment, and three alternates, not more than two of whom hold tenure at the time of appointment.
- c. Four members of the Committee, three of whom hold tenure, are appointed by Faculty Senate. The Provost appoints three members of the Committee, two of whom hold tenure. The Faculty Senate and the Provost together appoint the three alternate members. No department chair or equivalent, incumbent Academic Dean, member of the Faculty Senate Council, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, or member of the University Advisory Council may be appointed to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. Members of the Committee appointed or elected to any of these positions must relinquish their membership on the Committee.
- d. Members of the Committee and their alternates are appointed for terms of not less than two years and not more than five years. Members and their alternates may be reappointed.
- e. No member of the Committee may participate in any proceeding in which he or she has a personal or professional conflict of interest. In the event of the recusal or unavailability of a Committee member for other reasons, an alternate of the Committee will participate as required.
- f. All deliberations of the Committee are confidential.
- g. The chair of the Committee is elected by the Committee from among its tenured members.
- h. The Committee determines rules of procedure not otherwise specified herein.

2 of the 3 alternates¹¹ be elected from Arts & Sciences and 1 from either Heller or IBS. We suggest that current guidelines about the fraction of committee members who have tenure and those who hold other university offices remain. See footnote 10, sections b and c, below.

5. We suggest that the Rabb Council be replaced by a university level *Advisory Committee of the Rabb School*.

This committee will be chaired by the VP of the Rabb School and will provide support to the VP and senior staff at the Rabb School by reviewing program proposals, and helping to build bridges between the university and the Rabb School.

We anticipate this committee would meet at least once a semester and would include six elected faculty and Rabb staff members as invited by the VP of the Rabb School. One faculty member will be elected from each of the four Divisions in Arts & Sciences, one from Heller and one from IBS.

In outlining these university committees, we are integrating the work of the University Budget Committee into the Committee on Planning and Strategy and its subcommittees. We are also moving the work of the Intellectual Property Review Committee that requires faculty participation into the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities. We suspect the remaining work of the Intellectual Property Review Committee can be conducted administratively through the Office of the Provost.

B. Arts & Sciences Committees

1. We suggest that the **Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)**¹² be renamed the ***Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee***.

¹¹ From current Faculty Handbook (pg. 31):

No member of the Committee may participate in any proceeding in which he or she has a personal or professional conflict of interest. In the event of the recusal or unavailability of a Committee member for other reasons, an alternate of the Committee will participate as required.

¹² According to the current Faculty Handbook:

- a. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee consists of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, who serves as chair; five faculty chosen for two-year terms in an election at-large conducted by the Faculty Senate; two faculty members appointed for one-year terms by the Dean; three undergraduate students elected by the procedures established by the Student Senate; and one graduate student elected by procedures established by the Graduate Student Association. The Committee may invite chairs of the School Councils to participate in its deliberations as appropriate.
- b. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee oversees the undergraduate educational activities of the university. It reviews the educational and curricular activities of departments, programs, and other academic units contributing to the educational mission of the university, as well as academic rules and regulations, and makes recommendations for action to the Dean of Arts and Sciences, Provost, or Faculty Meeting, as appropriate. It is informed by the Provost of any proposed university action that might affect the educational mission, and advises the faculty on the merits of such action.
- c. The Committee reviews all proposals for new undergraduate educational programs or for the discontinuation of existing programs and submits recommendations to the Faculty Meeting.
- d. Acting on the basis of the recommendations of the School Councils, or the Councils of the Graduate School, the Graduate Professional Schools, or the Rabb School for Continuing Studies, the Committee approves all changes in majors, minors, programs, and other undergraduate academic requirements, as well as proposals for independent

We suggest the *Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee* maintains its current charge (described in the footnote below) responsible for all educational activities of the university that come out of Arts & Sciences. We suggest that the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences chair this committee and work together to build and maintain the strongest curriculum possible.

We suggest that the membership of the Committee include four elected faculty, one member from each of the four Divisions in Arts & Sciences, as well as the four Division Heads.

This committee reports to the *University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy* which then works to coordinate the Arts & Sciences curriculum with other curriculum and policy issues across campus.

2. The current *Tenured Promotions Committee* is a standing committee comprised of seven tenured full professors in Arts and Sciences. **It is charged with voting on whether to award promotion to full professor to cases brought before it. This committee reports their decision to the Dean of Arts & Sciences.** The committee includes at least one member from each of the four Schools within Arts and Sciences, and has no more than two members from any School. Three members are elected by the tenured faculty in Arts & Sciences; the other four are chosen by the Dean of Arts & Sciences in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Division Heads. One member serves as chair, selected each year by the members of the committee. We suggest that the new *Tenured Promotions Committee* continue as a faculty committee but that all of its members be elected from Arts & Sciences through the four Divisions rather than having some members appointed. We also suggest that the expectations for being awarded the status of full professor be clarified to enable this committee to do its work fairly and consistently. At present, the work of this committee only applies to promotions to Full Professor in Arts & Sciences. We support shifting over time to a single Tenured Promotions committee that will serve the entire university, including Heller and IBS, for the sake of consistency and uniformity in decision making processes.

majors. The Dean of Arts and Sciences ensures that changes in the undergraduate curriculum that have important consequences for graduate or professional education are brought to the attention of the Council of the Graduate School or the Graduate Professional Schools for review.

e. The Committee is responsible for overseeing the periodic review of undergraduate academic programs mandated by faculty legislation, and for overseeing other such reviews as requested by the Provost or Dean of Arts and Sciences. The Committee ensures that faculty with appropriate scholarly expertise participate in each program review. The Committee recommends approval of the continuation of existing academic programs, or their discontinuation to the Faculty Meeting.

f. The Committee reviews all proposals for changes in the general education curriculum. Substantial changes to the general education curriculum will be submitted to the Faculty Meeting for its approval. The Dean of Arts and Sciences will determine whether a proposed change must be submitted to the Faculty Meeting.

g. The Committee makes recommendations to the appropriate academic unit or Academic Dean concerning improvements in undergraduate education.

3. At present, the *Committee on Undergraduate Admission and Financial Aid* “provides advice to the Provost and to the Senior Vice-President for Students and Enrollment with respect to the recruitment, admission, and matriculation of undergraduate students, including undergraduate financial aid policies and practices” (Current Faculty Handbook, p. 31).

We suggest that the committee maintain that charge but that it be shifted from a partially elected/partially appointed committee of the faculty to an administrative committee that enables the President in consultation with the Provost and Dean of Arts & Sciences to appoint faculty to the committee interested in engaging around the challenges of admissions and financial aid and liaising with the broader faculty as needed. We suggest that four to six faculty be appointed to this committee representing only those faculty that teach undergraduates. One of these faculty should serve as the chair. We also suggest that this committee regularly report to the *Committee on Planning and Strategy*.

C. Division Heads in Arts & Sciences

The Division Heads in Arts & Sciences (in the Creative Arts, Humanities, Sciences and Social Sciences) were created by a previous Dean of Arts & Sciences.¹³ The information we gathered suggests that most faculty see them as an effective mechanism for conversation and decision-making within the Divisions. In Arts & Sciences, the Division Heads are the Chairs of the School Councils for the Creative Arts, Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences. We recommend standardizing the language to now refer to these four Councils as Divisions that oversee the educational activities of the programs and departments within them. The question of

¹³ According to the current Faculty Handbook, “The Councils of the Schools of Creative Arts, Humanities, Science, and Social Science consist of the chairs of each school's departments and majors, or their designated representatives.” Their functions include:

- a. The Councils of the Schools of Creative Arts, Humanities, Science, and Social Science review proposals from their respective departments and programs regarding the undergraduate curriculum, requirements for majors, and the program in general education. They may also review other matters of shared concern among departments. The Councils also consider other issues as requested by the Dean of Arts and Sciences.
 - i. Each Council evaluates new courses proposed by the departments and interdepartmental programs of its school, and evaluates substantial changes in the requirements of majors associated with its school. Whether changes in the requirements of a departmental or interdepartmental major are substantial is determined in consultations between the chair(s) of the appropriate School Council(s) and the chair of the department or major involved.
 - ii. Each Council evaluates proposals for new majors, minors, and programs within its school, and independent majors that draw upon the offerings in its school. Departments outside the originating school that are affected by such a proposal will be invited to participate in its deliberation. Each Council will attempt to avert unnecessary duplication of faculty effort, and ensure the academic quality of course offerings.
 - iii. Councils may review other curricular issues at the request of the Dean, departments, or programs.
 - iv. Recommendations of the Councils with respect to the curriculum are submitted to the Dean or the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for its consideration, as appropriate.
 - v. The Councils make recommendations on the award of degrees with honors to the Committee on Academic Standing.
 - vi. Councils consider, and recommend action to the Dean on other matters of shared concern, including issues of concern to departments or programs in more than one school.
- e. The Provost and/or Dean of Arts and Sciences will inform the Faculty Senate and Faculty Meeting of recommendations by the School Councils for major change or discontinuation of academic programs sufficiently in advance of their submission to the Board of Trustees for approval to permit deliberation of such recommendations.

which departments or programs belong to which Divisions should be decided in conversation between the Division Heads and the Dean of Arts & Sciences.

The function of the Division Heads would be clearer if the charge for them was articulated formally. As a jumping off point, we suggest that Division Heads be responsible for advising the Dean on matters related to the Divisions, for coordinating curriculum across the Division (including facilitating the new course approval processes at the graduate and undergraduate level in each division) and for coordinating research needs across the Divisions (including but not limited to shared facilities, seminars, etc.). We suggest that the Division Heads be members of the *Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee* and the *Committee on Academic Standards and Policy* to facilitate information exchange across Divisions and Schools.

We also suggest that that Division Heads take a new role in governance by being responsible for electing faculty in the Division to the standing committees of the faculty outlined above as well as to the Senate. Having the Division Heads responsible for organizing the election of members will enable closer working relationships between the Divisions, standing committees, and the Faculty Senate and facilitate greater information exchange. We suggest that each Division Head accept nominations for each committee position and then have a vote of voting-eligible faculty in the Division for each position.

We suggest that the Division Heads be selected by the chairs of each Division in consultation with the Dean of Arts & Sciences to serve terms of three years.

D. Councils of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Graduate Professional Schools, and Rabb School

We believe that the work that these three councils could be done more effectively through different mechanisms.

1. We suggest that the academic work currently being done by the Council of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences be shifted to the Divisions of Creative Arts, Humanities, Sciences, and Social Sciences in Art & Sciences. This will allow for greater integration between undergraduate and graduate curricular needs and standards. We suggest that a new Advisory Committee on Graduate Student Life be created by the Dean of the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences in collaboration with representatives of the graduate programs of Heller and IBS. This advisory committee would meet regularly with the appropriate staff in GSAS and Heller and IBS graduate programs to address the co-curricular needs of graduate students.
2. We suggest the current work of the Council of Graduate and Professional Schools be done by the University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy.
3. We suggest that the Council of the Rabb School be replaced by a standing University committee, the Advisory Committee of the Rabb School as described on pg. 9.

E. Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate has served a range of functions over time at Brandeis. In its current form, the Faculty Senate plays a catch-all role for faculty-related issues. The current language in the handbook states: “The Faculty Senate (or any member of the faculty by writing to the Faculty Senate) may initiate discussion on any issue relevant to the educational and research missions of the university or the provisions of this Handbook, including but not limited to academic freedom;

the rights, responsibilities, work schedule, salary, and benefits of faculty members; university policies regarding faculty appointments, tenure, promotion, and dismissal; and university rules and regulations as they affect faculty.”¹⁴

We identified the current expected role of the Faculty Senate as hearing and communicating the needs of the faculty, helping to coordinate the work of the various faculty committees, and working with the President and Provost to determine the agendas of faculty meetings such that faculty concerns are front and center. Our sense is that the academic work of the university is best conducted through the standing committees outlined above and that the Faculty Senate does its best work when it is in a communications role – operating as an intake and referral body – and when it is in an agenda-shaping role – advising senior administrators about faculty concerns. With this in mind, we have four proposals regarding the role of the Faculty Senate.

1. We recommend that the Faculty Senate continue to have responsibility for working with the President and Provost on the agenda for Faculty meetings, introducing issues and formulating legislation or proposals for other actions for consideration by the Faculty Meeting.

2. We recommend that the Council of the Faculty Senate continue as it has representing the Senate in discussions with the President, Provost, Academic Deans, and other members of the university community. We suggest that the Council advises the President, Provost, and the Deans, and be involved in forming search committees for open administrative positions and giving feedback on search processes. We request that faculty be involved in searches for the President and members of the senior administration in addition to searches for the Deans and Provost. We suggest that the Council of the Faculty Senate include representatives of at least three schools or Divisions.

3. Currently, disputes¹⁵ between or among faculty often come to the Faculty Senate for adjudication (those matters that go to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities are those which require a determination of the Faculty Handbook in relationship to these disputes,

¹⁴ Additional language on p. 30 of the current Faculty Handbook stipulates that The Faculty Senate

- i. introduces issues and formulates legislation or proposals for other actions for consideration by the Faculty Meeting;
- ii. reviews proposed legislation before its submission to the Faculty Meeting and contemplated changes in university rules and regulations that affect faculty, and makes appropriate recommendations to the sponsors thereof and to the Faculty Meeting;
- iii. reviews the activities of standing and special faculty committees on an annual basis and makes appropriate recommendations for the improvement thereof;
- iv. conducts faculty elections called for in this Handbook;
- v. considers proposals to establish new schools, departments, or undergraduate interdepartmental programs;
- vi. considers other matters brought to its attention by members of the faculty or academic administration and recommends appropriate action; and
- vii. calls special meetings of the Faculty as appropriate.

c. The Faculty Senate determines, via electronic poll or other means, the issues of greatest concern to the faculty and ensures their consideration by the Faculty Meeting or appropriate academic administrative bodies.

d. The Council of the Faculty Senate may represent the Senate in discussions with the President, Provost, Academic Deans, and other members of the university community.

e. As specified in this Handbook, the Council of the Faculty Senate

- i. advises the President, Provost, and the Dean;
- ii. nominates candidates for faculty committees; and
- iii. provides informal mediation of disputes involving faculty members.

f. Minutes of all Senate meetings are distributed to the faculty, electronically or in writing.

¹⁵ See p. 33 of the Faculty Handbook

but often that determination does not resolve the particular dispute). The Task Force is concerned that it is not in the best interests of the university to have *ad hoc* committees of faculty and perhaps staff members resolve such disputes since these individuals often have not had appropriate training to do so. We invite conversation about how to best address such disputes between and among faculty members if guidance beyond the appropriate academic administrator is required. Options include a standing faculty committee, an *ad hoc* committee, professionals who have specific training in such matters, such as staff members in Human Resources, the Title IX office or the University Ombuds office, or some combination.

4. Finally, for the Faculty Senate to do its work well, we believe it should represent faculty in all of the Schools and Divisions within the university.¹⁶ In that spirit, we propose dropping the at-large seats on the Senate, except the seat for an Emeritus faculty member, which will reduce the number of Senators to 13. As has been the practice, the Senators will nominate and vote on a chair from within their ranks. We suggest that membership on the Senate Council be revised slightly to require that members represent at least three of the Schools. We suggest that Heller, IBS and the four Divisions in Arts & Sciences elect its representatives (2 per unit) and that one person from the Rabb School be elected to sit on the Senate in a non-voting capacity to facilitate information exchange. We suggest maintaining the seat recently added for one Emeritus faculty member elected at-large. We suggest that voting for these positions and the standing committees outlined above be the responsibility of the Provost's office. We think that a smaller Senate will be more representative of the faculty and more effective – enabling more focused and robust discussions. We also suggest that the parliamentarian to the Faculty Meeting be elected by the voting faculty and responsible for working with the Chair of the Faculty Senate to chair the Faculty Meetings.

F. Faculty Representatives to the Board of Trustees

While Brandeis is an outlier among its peers in the number of elected faculty members it has as non-voting members to the university's Board of Trustees (four plus the chair of the Faculty Senate *ex-officio*), we suggest that this practice be continued for the foreseeable future.¹⁷ Faculty Representatives to the Board help to educate the Board about the work of faculty on campus and help faculty understand what the Board does and where there are points of overlap and difference in the responsibilities of faculty and Board members around shared governance.

¹⁶ The current structure of the Faculty Senate is as follows:

a. The members of the Faculty Senate are elected as follows:

i. Each School of the College of Arts and Sciences elects two members, each professional school elects two, six are elected at-large, and one member is elected by the emeritae/emeriti faculty from their ranks.

ii. To be eligible for election, a candidate must be a member of the faculty within the tenure structure or on a multi-year contract and have been a member of the faculty for at least one year before election, if tenured, or for at least two years, if non-tenured. All emeritae/emeriti faculty members are eligible to run for the emeritae/emeriti seat.

iii. Senators are elected for three-year terms. A Senator may not serve for more than six consecutive years.

¹⁷ The current handbook specifies that:

a. The faculty elects at-large four members, who serve as representatives of faculty views and interests to the Board of Trustees. The representatives serve for staggered three-year terms.

b. The Faculty Representatives report to the Faculty Senate, and to the faculty as a whole at the Faculty Meeting, on matters that come before the Board, which are of particular interest to the faculty.

c. Elections of Faculty Representatives are conducted by the Faculty Senate according to the same procedure used for election of Senators.

We suggest that the faculty representatives regularly report on the work of the Board to the Faculty Senate and annually prepare a written report to the entire faculty to help to build trust across the institution, make the work of the Board more transparent to the faculty, and help to educate the Board on the work of the institution. We suggest that the Provost's Office oversee the elections of the Faculty Representatives. Because their role and responsibilities as representatives to the Board are within the province of the Board, we suggest that they receive a more formal orientation to their roles, particularly related to what information shared with them is and is not confidential.

IV. Related Issues

For the proposed changes to be effective, we identified a number of related issues to be addressed.

A. A Charge for Work on Faculty Policies

Right now, the Faculty Handbook includes various policies and procedures pertaining to Arts & Sciences whereas similar policies and procedures for IBS, Heller, Rabb, Centers and Institutes reside in various documents outside of the Handbook. Although some of these policies and procedures speak to institutional rather than more localized practices, they often are inconsistent with one another. Such inconsistencies conceivably could create legal problems for Brandeis, when the matter in question represents an institutional rather than, for example a school commitment. Variable policies and practices also at times present structural barriers to interdisciplinary or other programs requiring collaboration among specific units.

As an administrative matter, we request that the President ask the Provost with support from the Executive Vice President to gather all of the policies and policy manuals that apply to faculty and review them to identify points of conflict and spaces where clarification is needed. Working with the Deans and representative faculty, we suggest that the Provost develop a process for standardizing, not the content across schools, but the areas that are addressed. This includes developing a policy manual that includes policies for all faculty which is distinct from the policy manuals for Schools that address school specific policies. Based on our review to date, we suspect that the following topics need be addressed in these manuals: faculty recruiting practices, workload expectations, how faculty are evaluated, how professional development happens, details about the conduct of classes, grading, etc., resources and policies related to student issues, faculty compensation, how the schools do governance as distinct from the full faculty, policies around faculty leaves, and expectations around advising.

B. Who Counts as Faculty and Counting Faculty

According to the current Faculty Handbook, a range of individuals with a wide range of titles are counted as faculty at Brandeis. We suggest that the Provost working with appropriate deans and other administrators, such as Division Heads, department chairs or directors of Centers and Institutes, along with representative faculty, review the definitions currently in the Faculty Handbook (included as Appendix B) to assess the extent to which they are applied consistently across schools. We recommend that this group clarify who is involved in academic instruction at Brandeis versus in research and confirm that these titles are being used uniformly across Schools

and Divisions. Based on this empirical analysis, we suggest further conversation among the faculty about who counts as faculty. This analysis would include clarifying the governance of Centers and Institutes and specifying the process for appointments, renewals, tenure, and promotions in the Centers and Institutes.

The Faculty Handbook further stipulates that the following faculty and academic administrators have the right to vote:

- All faculty holding appointments in the tenure structure
- All faculty outside the tenure structure who hold at least half-time appointments and have held such appointments for at least two semesters;
- The President, Provost, Dean of Arts & Sciences, and the Deans of the professional schools
- the University Librarian, and
- the University Registrar.

We suggest that the faculty have a robust conversation to determine which administrators vote and why in order to develop clear decision rules for new administrative hires. For the sake of consistency with other academic deans, we suggest that the VP of the Rabb School be considered a voting member of the faculty. We further suggest that individuals with half-time appointments be required to hold those appointments for two semesters concurrently in order to vote. We suggest that the Provost or Office of Institutional Research provide yearly reports to the faculty about who counts as faculty and the fraction that are eligible to vote divided by Schools and Divisions.

C. Internal Communication and Data Sharing

For any system of governance to be effective and transparent at Brandeis, the faculty need clear and consistent ways to communicate with one another. In addition to the structural changes we are thinking about, we request that the Office of Planning and Institutional Research maintain up-to-date lists including name and email address for all faculty at Brandeis, all voting faculty, and all voting faculty for any of the categories listed here (i.e. Heller voting only, IBS voting only, each of the Divisions voting only, Rabb, all full professors, all associate professors, all assistant professors, etc.). Because membership on these lists change each semester, we suggest that a provision be made in a revised Faculty Handbook which stipulates that updated lists be available to the Schools, Division Heads and Faculty Senate by the drop-add deadline each semester. We suggest that faculty for each committee be elected in the spring of each year so that full committees are ready to go in the fall.

D. Recognition of Service Work

While we recognize that all faculty at the university are expected to perform service we note that some such as the Division Heads, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the chairs of some large committees perform extraordinary service. We request that individuals doing this kind of extraordinary service be compensated for their work in a standard and transparent way which enables them to do this service in lieu of another university responsibility rather than in addition.

V. Next Steps

We expect this report has raised many questions and hope that our faculty colleagues will engage with us in a conversation about our current thinking. While many of the changes proposed are within the jurisdiction of the faculty some are not and so we also invite conversation with our senior administrative colleagues about these issues. We will be attending meetings of the Faculty Senate, Department chairs, Divisions, Schools, and the full faculty in January, February, and March of 2018. A full list of these meetings is on our website, and we are open to invitations from other groups. We aim to have a revised version of this document for the faculty by the end of the spring semester with suggestions about next steps. Finally, we encourage the Provost and each of the Deans to engage in a zero-committee exercise as we did here and assess the extent to which committees they oversee have charges, are fulfilling those charges, and are doing their work in an organizationally effective way as connected to the structure we outline here.

Appendix A. Charge to the Task Force on Faculty Governance

From:

"Ron Liebowitz" <rdlreply@brandeis.edu>

Date: April 26, 2017 at 2:48:38 PM EDT

Subject: Task Force on Faculty Governance

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing to encourage you to join our colleagues Susan Curnan, Wendy Cadge, Provost Lisa Lynch and me in an ongoing and important conversation about the faculty's role in governance at Brandeis. This conversation began in January when the Faculty Senate hosted a retreat – open to all faculty – and attended by about forty faculty as well as the Provost and me. Organized by Susan Curnan, the faculty who gathered brainstormed about the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches to the faculty's role in governance and began to articulate ideas for better integrating faculty in decision-making across the university.

Subsequent informal conversations – including a second meeting open to all faculty last month hosted by the Faculty Senate – identified gaps and points of ambiguity in current faculty governance. To bring more members of the faculty into this conversation and be sure that we have robust structures for including faculty in institutional governance, I have asked Susan Curnan and Wendy Cadge to chair a Task Force on Faculty Governance.

This Task Force – comprised of six to eight faculty nominated by their peers – will assess the state of governance at Brandeis, focusing both on how the faculty practices governance in those areas that are its primary responsibility and in terms of the faculty's role in relationship to the administration and in some instances to the Board as they related to shared governance—a concept that will require a common understanding on the part of the Board and faculty. The Task Force will also compare Brandeis' approach to that of peer institutions, pay particular attention to best practices, and draft a set of recommendations for faculty and shared governance at Brandeis. These recommendations will turn into proposals for amending the Faculty Handbook that will be presented at Faculty meetings as outlined in the processes for amending the Handbook. The specific outcomes of this process are open – the Task Force may recommend more committees and structures than we have now or fewer depending on what they learn along the way.

The Task Force will be comprised of one faculty representative from each of the Divisions (Science, Social Science, Humanities and Creative Arts) as well as one faculty representative from IBS, one from Heller, and one from Rabb. To assure a group that is as diverse as possible along all dimensions, we are asking the Division heads (John Burt, Sarah Lamb, John Wardle, Jonathan Unglaub) as well as representatives from Heller (Cindy Thomas and Darren Zinner), IBS (Katy Graddy) and Rabb (Karen Muncaster) to nominate two to three people that might serve. If you are interested in serving, please contact one of these individuals to be nominated by **May 5th**. We are committed to having at least one tenure-track faculty member on the committee and at least one-contract faculty member. The committee will be selected from the nominations by Susan Curnan and Wendy Cadge in consultation with Lisa Lynch and me.

We hope to announce the members of this Task Force in early May. A short survey will also be distributed in May to gather feedback from all faculty seeking opinions on the strengths and weaknesses in the current approach to faculty governance. Susan Curnan and Wendy Cadge will work with a consultant, Susan Resneck Pierce, who is President Emerita of the University of Puget Sound and author of a recent book pertinent to our work, *Governance Reconsidered: How Boards, Presidents, Administrators and Faculty Can Help Their Colleges Thrive* (Jossey-Bass, 2014), to analyze these data and gather information about peer institutions through the summer. The committee will do the bulk of its work in the fall and will present progress reports along the way. They will share their thinking through what they hope will be regular conversation with the faculty in the form of open meetings and presentations

at regular faculty meetings. The information gathered about peer institutions will be made public as will a summary of findings from the survey at Brandeis. The Task Force will also be in conversation with the Board of Trustees primarily through two members of the Academy Committee, Meyer Koplow and Dan Jick.

I appreciate your attention to this process and encourage you to nominate faculty colleagues to the Task Force. If you have questions about any of this, please don't hesitate to contact me, Lisa Lynch, Susan Curnan, or Wendy Cadge.

Best regards,

Ron

Appendix B. Definition of the Faculty currently in the Faculty Handbook

III. THE FACULTY

A. Functions

Faculty carry out the educational and research missions of the university. Faculty functions include teaching, advising, scholarship, research and creative work, as well as service to the university. Faculty participate in university governance through legislative and other acts of the Faculty Meeting, the Faculty Senate, faculty committees, academic departments and other academic units.

B. Membership

Members of the faculty may hold appointments within the tenure structure or outside the tenure structure. Appointments outside the tenure structure are made to fulfill the special teaching and research needs of the graduate professional schools and graduate professional programs, and to augment the teaching and research activities of the Arts and Sciences faculty in the tenure structure. Faculty consist of those holding the following ranks:

1. Ranks within the Tenure Structure

a. full-time appointments

i. Instructor

ii. Assistant Professor

iii. Associate Professor

iv. Professor

v. University Professor

b. part-time appointments

i. Part-time appointments within the tenure structure may be authorized by the Provost.

ii. Such appointments are made in accordance with the standards and procedures established by this Handbook for full-time appointments.

iii. Full-time faculty may reduce their appointment to part-time status on the basis of a written agreement with the Provost.

2. Ranks outside the Tenure Structure

a. instructor

i. An instructor may be appointed for a fixed term not to exceed five years for either full-time or part-time service.

ii. Appointments as instructor may be renewed.

b. lecturer, senior lecturer

i. A Lecturer or Senior Lecturer may be appointed for a fixed term not to exceed five years for either full-time or part-time service.

ii. Appointments as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer may be renewed.

c. visiting faculty

A Visiting Faculty member may be appointed for a specified period of time not to exceed two years for full-time or part-time service at a rank commensurate with previous experience.

d. in-residence status

i. A person possessing special qualifications or professional experience (e.g., Scholar, Artist, Writer, Diplomat) may be given an in-residence appointment with a title reflecting his or her special qualifications.

ii. Such appointments should not exceed three years in length.”

e. associate professor of the practice, professor of the practice

i. Where there is educational need, a practitioner-educator may be awarded the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice or Professor of the Practice.

f. adjunct appointment

i. A person whose primary employment is outside the university may be appointed to an adjunct position at a rank commensurate with the person’s professional experience.

ii. Adjunct appointments are made for a specified term on a part-time basis.

g. assistant research professor, associate research professor or research professor

i. Individuals whose primary responsibility is the conduct of externally funded research and publication may be appointed Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, or Research Professor.

ii. The responsibilities of faculty holding research appointments with respect to university and departmental service will be determined by the appropriate Academic Dean, in consultation with the Provost and the relevant departments, and defined in a written agreement with the faculty member.

h. assistant professor, associate professor, or professor outside the tenure structure

i. In exceptional circumstances, individuals may be appointed by the Provost to the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor outside the tenure structure.

j. appointments, reappointments, and promotions outside the tenure structure

Appointments, reappointments, and promotions outside the tenure structure are made in accordance with the provisions of this Handbook (see section V.A.5. and V.A.6, below).

k. emeritus/a status

Upon retirement, a member of the faculty may be designated Emeritus/a at the rank held at retirement upon recommendation of the Provost.

l. The term “professor” is reserved for faculty appointments.

Appendix C. Outline of current and proposed faculty responsibility and decision-making authority

Topic	Current Model	Proposed in Revised Model
Hiring of faculty	Conducted at the Department/Program level.	Policies and practices at different schools to be compared by EVP, Provost, and Deans.
Evaluation of faculty	Procedures outlined in the current faculty handbook.	Policies and practices at different schools to be compared by Provost and Deans and changes proposed as part of policy manual review.
Tenure and Promotion	Procedures outlined in the current faculty handbook.	No change. For cases of promotion to Full Professor in Arts & Sciences, Tenured Promotions Committee. All members elected. Expectations for promotion to full professor clarified in the revised handbook.
Curriculum	School Councils, Grad Council, Heller's Education Steering Committee, Several IBS Committees, UCC, UAC, Faculty Senate each involved with the Deans and Provost depending on the question.	At the university level, University Committee on Academic Standards and Policy. At the Schools level, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A&S Curriculum Committee – for all of A&S and GSAS • Heller School Educational Steering Committee • IBS Curriculum Committee • Advisory Committee to the Rabb School.
Academic Standards and Policy	UAC, UCC, Committee on Undergraduate Academic Standing.	At the university level, Committee on Academic Standards and Policy. At the Schools level, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee • Proposed policy committees at GSAS, Heller, IBS & Rabb.
Quality of Teaching and Learning	Not addressed in the current handbook.	Committee on Teaching, Learning & Assessment
Graduate Admissions	Conducted at the Department/Program level.	No change. Procedures to be reviewed by Provost and Deans and outlined in new policy manuals.
Scholarships and awards	No standard approach.	No change. Procedures to be outlined in new policy manuals.
Research priorities	Research Steering Committee at Heller, Faculty Research Committee at IBS, individualized approaches at Centers and Institutes.	No change.