

3-26-1992

SR-91-92-104 (SF)

Marshall University

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/fs_recommendations

Recommended Citation

Marshall University, "SR-91-92-104 (SF)" (1992). *Recommendations*. 1342.
http://mds.marshall.edu/fs_recommendations/1342

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Recommendations by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu, martj@marshall.edu.

FACULTY SENATE
Recommendation
(from the Senate Floor)

SR-91-92-104 (SF)

That the Faculty Senate of Marshall University goes on record as supporting Dr. Joe Simoni's letter of March 24, 1992 concerning the Board Initiatives that were adopted March 11, 1992, and that Dr. Charles Lloyd, as Marshall University's Advisory Council of Faculty representative, convey our support to Dr. Simoni.

FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT:

APPROVED
BY SENATE: Robert Sawrey DATE: 3.26-92

DISAPPROVED
BY SENATE: _____ DATE: _____

UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

READ: [Signature] DATE: 3-30-92

COMMENTS:

CHARLES
LOWE
696-333

MAR. 25 1992

NOTE: I would like ACF Reps. to review this draft and give me some feedback this week. I would like to send the memo next week.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

March 24, 1992

TO: Chancellor Charles Manning and
The Board of Trustees

From: Joe Simoni
Chair, Advisory Council of Faculty

Re: Board Initiatives Adopted March 11

The Advisory Council asked me to convey faculty concerns related to the Board's adoption of specific initiatives on March 11. Major concerns are four:

(1) The Board's action reflects an obvious lack of respect for the role of faculty in the governance process. The content of the initiatives were never even discussed by the Board or its major committees, and faculty were left completely out.

(2) Specific initiatives reflect a lack of understanding of the complexity of academic program planning and an ignorance of the day-to-day administrative demands of the various institutions.

(3) The adopted initiatives conflict with the Board's own governance policy of delegating authority to the individual institutions. The Board not only identified areas of focus, but dictated how campuses should specifically conduct institutional business in those areas.

(4) The Advisory Council wonders if this Board action represents a "cave in" to political pressures, and if the Board is willing to lead an effort to secure increased state funding for higher education.

Faculty are disappointed and demoralized by recent actions of the Chancellor and the Board regarding these initiatives. We would welcome opportunities to further discuss our concerns with you.