

Committee on Committees Annual Report 2015-2016

Members: Lael Keiser (chair), Julie Kapp, Luis Polo Parado, Jeannette Pierce, Wendy Sims, Jennifer Berry, Bonnie Gregg, Dan Nicewarmer, Joy Jenkins (Graduate Professional Council), Amos Atibila, Shelby Herr, Darian Hunt (MSA representatives).

Charge:

The charge to the Committee on Committees (CoC) is to review on an annual basis one-third of the standing committees and to make recommendations to the chancellor and Faculty Council on the continuation of the committees and the revision of charges and/or membership to improve the committees' functions. The committee also should follow-up on past recommendations for changes.

Committees under Review:

Campus Recreation Committee
Campus Safety Committee
Concerts Committee
Family Friendly Campus Committee
Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
Lectures Committee
MU Information Technology Committee
Residence for Tuition Purposes Committee
Residential Life Committee
Status of Women Committee
Student Publications Committee

Summary Recommendation:

The CoC reviewed eleven committees. The CoC recommends major reform or termination for the following committees: Campus Recreation Committee, Student Publications Committee, and Family Friendly Campus Committee. The CoC recommends minor reforms for the remaining committees except for Committee on Residence for Tuition Purposes, which needs no reform.

Committee Deliberations:

The CoC held one meeting on November 11th, 2015 and conducted remaining business via email. Members present at the meeting included Lael Keiser, Luis Polo Parada, Jeannette Pierce, Wendy Sims, Julie Kapp, Bonnie Gregg, Joy Jenkins, Linda Kaufman. During the meeting the committee assigned members to evaluate the committees that were under review.

The CoC discussed ways to improve committee evaluations. We discussed the possibility of coordinating our findings with campus strategic plans, as well as inquiring into whether current chairs of committees utilized past evaluations. As a follow-up to this discussion, the chair of CoC discussed the importance of the strategic plan to the review process with Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost, Pat Okker. Provost Okker indicated that connecting the reviews with the strategic plan would not be helpful but that the Provost's office lacked information about committees that did not report directly to the Provost. Consequently CoC members interviewed Cathy Scroggs, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Gary Ward, Vice Chancellor for Operations/Chief Operating Office when reviewing committees that reported to them. The CoC also decided to use manual/email style questionnaire rather than Qualtrics.

Suggestions for Reforming CoC Evaluations:

At the end of the review process, members of the CoC raised some issues and developed several suggestions for improving the evaluation process. These should be discussed next year to develop a consensus for reform. It would also be helpful for Pat Okker to attend this meeting so we can best match the reviews to the needs of the Provost's Office.

- Questions were raised about the way surveys are distributed. One member is concerned that the surveys distributed to committee members are not anonymous because they are returned by email. This should be discussed next year.

The main issue with anonymity is that the CoC members can see the identity of the respondent not that any self-identifying information is ever made publically available. Respondents of the survey did have the option to return the surveys via campus mail, which would protect their identity from the CoC member. Furthermore, the survey responses are anonymous if CoC members save the surveys when they receive them without any identifying information.

However, next year, the CoC should discuss revising the instructions on the survey to better explain how confidentiality is preserved, as well as providing clearer directions to CoC members about how to preserve confidentiality. The email format was preferred because it did not require all of the members to have the ability to use survey software. To switch to a survey software program, one CoC member or staff person would have to be in charge of creating the survey and distributing the results to all of the CoC members. This year no committee member was willing to volunteer to run the survey through a software program. It would be helpful if the staff person assigned to this committee could learn how to conduct the survey this way.

- Include in the survey process or interview process the recommendation to talk with former committee members to generate more candid responses and better perspectives for the effectiveness of the committee as past members will have seen the full cycle.

- Create a Sharepoint or other similar site for all committees on campus to give CoC members access to information in a central location.
- Provide annual metrics for committees to report against the strategic plan, and require all committees to have internal evaluation surveys. The CoC did discuss the relationship between the strategic plan and the reviews at the meeting but did not reach consensus. The issue was also discussed with Pat Okker (see above).
- Provide a report template for the CoC for its 3-year review, of concepts most important to the Chancellor in decision-making.
- Make sure that CoC reviewers explicitly ask committee chairs about whether they utilize past reviews. This was not done systematically in CoC reviews this year and so this information is not included in the reviews.

Members of the CoC followed the following procedures in conducting the review:

- Interview the committee chair via e-mail.
- Attend a regular committee meeting if possible.
- Circulate questionnaires to all committee members.
- Contact person with direct oversight of committee when that person is not the Provost.
- Write a one to three paragraph summary report.

Committee Evaluations and Recommendations:

Campus Recreation Committee

The charge to the Campus Recreation Committee is to review and recommend policies to the vice chancellor for Student Affairs for each recreational facility on campus. These facilities include the Student Recreation Center, Brewer/Rothwell, the Natatorium, the tennis courts, the Hinkson Creek area and all recreation playing fields. The CoC review revealed that this committee is functioning poorly. Almost all of the responses to the CoC inquiries were negative. Committee members did not feel that the Chancellor's Office was responsive to recommendations, indicated that relationships between faculty on the committee and the recreation center Director/Staff were strained. Committee members did not feel they have a vested interest or that they had the ability to give input. Currently, the committee is not providing input on how to make the recreation experience better for MU students. The CoC makes the following recommendations:

- Disband the committee.
- If the committee continues provide assistance to help the committee interact in a more positive way.
- Revamp the charge and structure of the committee.

- Move meetings to locations outside the Recreation Center.

Concerts Committee

The charge to the Concerts Committee is to make recommendations to the provost and the director of the Concert Series concerning the continued improvement of the Concert Series. Responses to our survey were mixed about whether the committee fulfills this charge. Concerts series staff report to the group four times each year about recent activities and plans for the coming year. Individual responses to these reports are shared during the meetings. However, it is not certain how the individual feedback is used. One member expressed concerns that detailed budget and operational information had not been shared. The Annual Report produced by the committee is the primary vehicle for making recommendations. Representation on the committee is appropriate. Several members of the committee were unclear about individual roles.

The CoC recommends the continuation of this committee with the following recommendation:

- Amend the charge to indicate that the primary role is to help provide campus oversight of the Concert Series by assessing the management and success of the series annually and by making recommendations to the Concert Series Director and the Provost as needed.

Family Friendly Campus Committee

The Family Friendly Committee's charge is to assess and make recommendations to the chancellor regarding the ways in which the MU campus, including physical facilities and educational and employment policies, supports the family responsibilities of students, staff, and faculty members. While the committee has high diversity among membership and good quality dialogue, concerns exist that the charge of the committee is overly broad. Students, staff and faculty have very different needs and issues related to a "family friendly" campus. It is not clear that the recommendations of the committee will be taken seriously by the administration. The CoC recommendations are as follows:

- Revise the committee to focus on student needs and issues.
- Add a representative who reports directly to campus administration as an ex officio member of the committee.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

The charge to the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee is to advise the chancellor and to consult with the director of Intercollegiate Athletics in all matters relating to Intercollegiate Athletics. The review indicated that the committee is working well but has some areas for improvement. This is a large and active committee with a number of

sub-committees. Meetings are well organized, structured and collaborative. Decision-making is data-driven. The CoC recommends the following:

- The IAC develop criteria (various characteristics of key stakeholders, and/or those not involved in sports programs and therefore are unbiased) for who should have a seat on the committee and then ensure representation exists, including diversity of race and ethnicity of faculty, staff, alumni and community members.
- Strengthen the committee's understanding of its charge and its role, and ensure all members are clear on their objectives.

Lectures Committee

The charge to the Lectures Committee is to work with the Office of the Provost to establish and coordinate an annual series of lectures dealing with cultural, scientific and public affairs subject matter. This committee does not meet in person but conducts meetings via email. Overall the committee is functioning very well in terms of reviewing requests from departments to fund speakers. However, the committee is not establishing and coordinating a series of lectures. If that is the purpose, more substantial reform and an increased budget is needed. The Lectures Committee should be continued. The CoC recommends the following:

- There is some disagreement about whether the committee should fund more than one request from a given department and consider equity across departments in decision-making. Guidance should be provided on this issue.

MU Information Technology Committee

The charge to the MU Information Technology Committee is to advise the chancellor, provost and Faculty Council on issues involving computer and information technology through oversight of those entities responsible for computer and IT services on the MU campus. The MU Information Technology Committee meets monthly from September to May. Budget has been a big item for this committee, especially in the last year. This is an important committee, one that should continue to meet on a regular basis and with a mix of faculty, staff, administration and student voting representatives and non-voting ex-officio and support representatives. Faculty and administration serve staggered terms; this provides needed continuity. The CoC recommends the committee be continued with the following recommendations:

- The number of staff representatives should be increased to two or three so that staff also could serve staggered terms.
- Involve undergraduate and graduate students earlier in the academic year and maybe change their terms from one year to two years so they could also have staggered representation.

Residence for Tuition Purposes

The charge to the Committee on Residence for Tuition Purposes is to act on cases referred by the Registrar or Cashier, or appealed by a student, with respect to liability for tuition customarily charged a nonresident of the state. Recommendations are made on resident status for tuition purposes only and have no bearing on matters of admission. The CoC review was very positive and the committee does not need further changes at this time.

Residential Life

The charge to the Residential Life Committee is to advise the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs on the enhancement and promotion of student learning through communities such as Freshman Interest Groups, Residential Colleges and other learning communities. It also serves to advise the vice chancellor on programs, services and policies regarding the residence halls and other University-recognized residences. The committee works well with Residential Life and Dining Services leaders and provides information and input rather than resolving problems. The input is helpful to the people to whom the committee reports. The committee should be continued. The CoC makes the following recommendations:

- Take into account committee members' teaching times when scheduling meetings to maximize participation.
- Increase involvement of student representatives and make sure the meeting is scheduled when they can attend.
- Provide minutes from meetings.

Campus Safety Committee

The charge to the Campus Safety Committee is to recommend to the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services policies and procedures relating to the safety and elimination of campus hazards. Committee members felt that it is fulfilling its charge very effectively this year. This is an improvement from prior years. Members attributed this to the efforts of the current chair. Members also felt that committee membership provides different perspectives and areas of expertise. One problem area that was identified by members of this committee was that this year MU created an ad hoc committee to address some safety issues on campus but communication was poor between this committee and the Campus Safety Committee. A second problem identified was that the undergraduate student representatives, who are voting members of the committee, seldom showed up for meetings and therefore lacked full understandings of issues. This committee should be continued. The CoC makes the following recommendations:

- Assign someone to coordinate with other committees that work on safety issues.
- Provide an orientation for undergraduate student representatives so they understand their responsibilities.

Status of Women Committee

The charge to the Status of Women Committee is to assess and to make recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Inclusion, Diversity and Equity regarding the status and education concerns of women. Overall this committee is working very well and is productive. The CoC recommends this committee be continued with the following recommendations for change:

- Add a graduate student representative.
- Add administrative support to help the committee continue its current work and move into a new area of research on gender equity in faculty service.
- Encourage all members to attend meetings to ensure fresh ideas.
- Continue its interaction with other committees focused on diversity and inclusion.

Student Publications Committee

The charge to the Student Publications Committee is to recommend to the vice chancellor for Student Affairs policies and regulations regarding the publication of the *Maneater*. The committee is currently in a state of flux. The committee is not currently able to provide useful information up the line. The following recommendations were made:

- Disband the committee and move oversight of the *Maneater* to a different committee such as the Student Organizations Committee.
- If not, the committee needs substantial reform:
 - the *Savitar* should be removed from the committee's charge, as it no longer exists.
 - Hold a "state of the union" meeting with the *Maneater* staff once a year.
 - Liaison or combine with another committee to reflect the changing nature of student journalism.