

4 February 2006

Dr. Brady Deaton
Chancellor, University of Missouri
105 Jesse Hall

Dear Dr. Deaton:

As the Chair of the Committee on Committees, it is one of my responsibilities to “follow up on past recommendations for changes” made in last year’s final report. I am writing you now for that purpose. For your convenience, I have included a copy of last year’s report with this letter. While most of the committees reviewed in 2004 – 05 were found to be functioning effectively within the scope of their respective charges, there were several specific recommendations that came out of the process that merit further attention. Given the number of these, I have organized the list in order to focus on those that seem to be the most pressing and/or actionable.

The first of these recommendations concerns the timing of the appointment of committee membership and is contained in the section of the 2004-05 report under the heading “General Issues Related to Campus Standing Committees”. Currently, committee chairs and members are often not in place at the beginning of the academic year. This inhibits the functioning of committees and prevents them from initiating their work in a timely fashion. It can also have a detrimental effect on the continuity of committee leadership. Two recommendations were made to deal with this problem:

Assign Chairs for Standing Committees by the end of April of the previous academic year.

Appoint new members to Standing Committees by the end of the previous academic year.

Since these two recommendations involve all standing committees, it was felt that they deserve particular attention now that the winter semester has begun. In order to implement them, it was suggested that Staff Advisory Council, Faculty Council, MSA and GPC submit their nominations by December in order to have committee appointments completed by the following April.

In the section of the final report headed “Summary of Individual Committee Reviews” several recommendations were made relating to the functioning of specific committees. It was suggested that three of the committees reviewed in 2004 – 05 be discontinued pending review.

Admissions Review Committee: Discontinue due to inactivity and replace with policy for an Ad Hoc committee when needed.

Campus Health Oversight Committee: Discontinue due to inactivity and allow other, existing committees to absorb its functions.

Retiree Advisory Committee: Discontinue and allow MURA to absorb its functions.

Other recommendations contained in the report involve adjusting the ratio of staff, student and faculty positions within individual committees.

Campus Mediation Committee: Include the director of the Campus Mediation Service as an ex-officio member and increase the number of staff positions by two because the great majority of mediation cases involve staff.

Student Fee Capital Review Committee: Rebalance membership between faculty, staff and students through the elimination of one faculty position.

Traffic Appeals Committee: Increase Graduate Student membership by one.

Campus Safety Committee: Increase ex-officio membership by one.

Admittedly, these individual recommendations would increase the committee burden on the MU community through the addition of four positions (Add 5 and eliminate 1). However, when the elimination of the three committees mentioned in the preceding section is taken into consideration, the overall effect would be a reduction in committee membership.

Finally, the Chair of the Hearnnes Center Committee, though not scheduled for formal review, requested that we consider the possibility of broadening the charge to that committee to include oversight of the new arena and the newly renovated athletic center. This request resulted in the following recommendation:

Hearnnes Center Committee: Re-name this committee and re-evaluate its charge in order to broaden its functions and establish oversight of Athletic Facilities as a whole.

As stated earlier, I have stressed those recommendations in last year's report that seemed most pressing. I have also tightened up vague language when appropriate. For instance, it was recommended that the Traffic Appeals Committee graduate student membership be increased by "1 or 2". I chose the lesser number because it represented a smaller increase in committee appointments while adding specificity to the recommendation. Another example of this process of focusing vague language is found in the report on the Student Fees Capital Improvements Committee. The original report described this committee as being "top heavy" with faculty and recommended "rebalancing" the membership. I took the liberty of interpreting the phrase "rebalancing" to mean the elimination of one faculty position rather than the addition of student positions since the committee was described as being too large already. Hopefully, I have not strayed too far from the spirit of last

year's recommendations but it would be entirely appropriate to check the original document prior to implementing any changes.

Since the status of these recommendations is unknown to me at this time, the changes outlined in this letter might be old business. However, if further action on my part is required to help implement them, please have someone on your staff contact me and advise me how to proceed.

Respectfully submitted,

James Calvin
Chair, Committee on Committees
calvinjh@missouri.edu