

To: Tracy Tambascia, Academic Senate President; Academic Senate Executive Board
From: Academic Senate Faculty Council (FC) Taskforce
Date: May 28, 2022

The following summarizes key observations and recommendations of the Academic Senate Faculty Council Taskforce (Exhibit A) – a group finalized in February 2022 and asked to collect “information related to models, structures, or processes that can improve the work of ... [faculty] councils, increase faculty involvement in decision-making in schools, and support the work of FCs overall” (email from Tracy Tambascia, 12/21). The request to collect information was accompanied with the acknowledgment that (1) FCs vary in myriad ways (structure, composition, range of work), as reflected through FC surveys administered every 2-3 years, and (2) FC chairs regularly seeking answers about best practices in Faculty Council / School leadership interactions.

PROCESS

After taskforce membership was finalized, two initial planning meetings were held synchronously (via Zoom) to determine next steps. Extensive prior data were noted as available through past Senate surveys and meetings; in an effort to avoid rework, it was decided that new info would be sought via focus groups with (1) academic leaders at each school (Deans, Vice Deans of Faculty, or similar), and (2) current FC chairs or (elected) presidents (Exhibit B). Protocols were built for these focus groups (Exhibit C), with input requested asynchronously (via Google Docs) from all taskforce members. A schedule of eight focus groups was subsequently assembled and run – encompassing four meetings with school leaders and four with FC representatives. Individuals from all schools on campus were invited to participate in this process, 21 of 22 sending a representative to at least one focus group. Focus groups were typically facilitated by a minimum of two taskforce members, each taking contemporaneous notes. The draft summary report was then shared with all for review, before finalizing the current document.

PHILOSOPHY

In entering this process, taskforce members expressed a strong desire to be productive and constructive, with the goal of providing recommendations based on collected data. The taskforce perspective is shared below, as articulated prior to the start of focus groups.

We define our role as one in which we not solely assess what has happened and is happening, but also make strong recommendations with respect to what we believe should or must happen. In doing so, we retain an optimistic hope that our recommendations will be heard and acted upon. We see our mission as supporting, strengthening, and empowering Faculty Councils – and through them the faculty.

KEY THEMES & OBSERVATIONS:

- **DIFFERENCES:** As noted earlier, USC’s faculty councils are extremely varied across myriad dimensions (e.g., size, composition, structure, scope of responsibility, terms and term length). People see these as driven in substantial part by objective features of the specific schools in which they reside. General consensus seemed to indicate that whole cloth standardization is neither viable nor desirable, though some standardized representation and communication would likely be useful. Terminology used to describe FCs and their leadership (e.g., chair vs. president) also differed; we here use the terms “faculty council” and “chair” regardless of each school’s individual terminology. We note that some Academic Senate documents use the term “president.”

- **SHARED LEADERSHIP**: Many reported that their faculty councils operate with appreciated independence as regards selecting priorities and advising on those, with school leadership often attending meetings and providing honest (but not necessarily candid) answers to important questions. General consensus suggests that shared governance exists within limits (i.e., many voices are encouraged to speak, but substantial gaps persist between words and action). It is also generally agreed that “shared governance” lacks a clear definition as yet at USC. There was a substantial gulf between the perceptions of school administrative leaders and FC chairs in terms of the level of input FCs had over school decisions, with administrative leaders at times signaling more faculty authority and input than FC chairs reported; some FC chairs described a “one-way” relationship in which faculty input depended on faculty having to proactively seek out opportunities to weigh in.

Those familiar with leadership, governance, and/or experience serving at other academic institutions described shared leadership as a model worth serious consideration. Several observed that *advisory* roles require both the opportunity to give advice and receive a constructive response to that advice; this perspective does not require agreement, but does require discussion. It was also noted that only a few FCs participate in salary, performance, and hiring discussions (a fact that may be driven by school size). A recommended reference on shared leadership: Kezar, Adrianna J., and Elizabeth M. Holcombe. 2017. *Shared Leadership in Higher Education: Important Lessons from Research and Practice*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

- **COMMUNICATION**: Many described substantial efforts in soliciting feedback from and distributing updates to faculty – through open meetings, town halls, schoolwide newsletters, emails from Council chairs or departmental representatives, websites, etc. Despite these efforts, many questioned the level of faculty attentiveness to each FC’s work, expressing a shared desire to more effectively generate faculty awareness and engagement. Awareness seems to vary inversely with respect to school size; in larger schools, a larger committee structure reduces per person workload, but also appears to reduce intra-school information sharing.
- **UTILITY**: Those who have served on FCs (both in the FC and the leadership focus groups) reported that FCs are generally viewed as extremely time intensive, with limited visible output or outcomes. For anyone, the perceived opportunity cost of FC participation in this context is substantial – but it was especially noted by those who felt that valuable T/TT participation was in substantial decline for this reason. Several noted that their FC work increased their understanding of the school and its administration, their interest in university governance, and their desire to continue in service to the institution. In most cases, it was acknowledged that FCs are and have the potential to be more useful than is generally recognized.
- **STRUCTURE**: Many acknowledged that USC’s distributed nature is such that many Faculty Council chairs do not meet or naturally interact with another, even when they serve together on the Academic Senate. At multiple points in our focus groups, participants would request a constructive detour to dig deeper into previously unknown or especially intriguing practices raised by others. Similar detours emerged in discussions with school leaders, who seemed to know each other better, but with little shared, practice-driven attention paid to faculty governance.
- **TRUST**: Many spoke of positive relationships between their Faculty Council and their school’s leadership, characterizing emergent frustrations as most often a function of rules, policies, or, perhaps, implied requirements of organizational opacity. Individuals described themselves and others as tending to try their level best to do right by the university, the school, and the people, even in situations where final decisions were not universally supported.

RECOMMENDATIONS

UNIVERSITY LEVEL: CONNECTING OUR CAMPUS

- Establish a FC Chairs Committee with 3 defined meetings per year, as scheduled by Senate personnel (extra meetings scheduled on an *ad hoc* basis by FCs, at their independent discretion).
 - Welcome/Orientation (Fall) FC chairs to foster cross-campus connections, and share anticipated AY priorities.
 - Welcome (Spring) for FC chairs to catch up / discuss ongoing work, successes, etc.
 - End of Year Celebration with outgoing and incoming FC chairs to share about the prior year, start making connections sooner, and support succession.
- Establish a regular review cycle for tracking progress on the recommendations below, perhaps through a small Senate subcommittee or short annual (or semiannual) surveys of FC chairs.

SCHOOL LEVEL: STANDARDIZING SOME REPRESENTATION RULES

- Draft, codify, and publicly post clear FC Election and Representation Bylaws for each school, with rules for faculty-driven bylaws amendment also made available. These bylaws should be collected and held by the Academic Senate, and they should be provided to incoming Deans to ensure consistent awareness across Dean transitions. Some rules meriting consideration:
 - Require representation from all sizable faculty groups at each school – T/TT, RTPC, and PT/Adjunct (a group that is at present included on only a subset of FCs), with attention also given to DEI (as per past survey results, encompassing gender and race).
 - Adopt term number and term length requirements to retain institutional knowledge as FCs change and to facilitate more seamless succession / new representative on-boarding. Stagger appointments to reduce the possibility of too much simultaneous turn over.
 - In schools with Staff Councils, add the chair as a representative to the Faculty Council.
 - Assign FC chairs *ex officio* as representatives for each meeting of the Dean's cabinet or of the equivalent, administration-level organization.
 - Assign an *ex officio* administrator to each FC, but encourage their participation by invitation – ensuring that FCs also meet regularly without any leadership present.

SCHOOL LEVEL: CONNECTING LEADERSHIP, FACULTY, AND STAFF

- Hold a Welcome to Leadership meeting each year, with Deans, VDs, and FCs – a get-together that sets the academic year stage and provides a casual forum to discuss leadership and faculty priorities.
- Improve communication within each school through increased Faculty Council visibility.
 - Invite FCs to help set the agenda for all-faculty meetings, with time given to FC updates, announcements, and impact reporting.
 - Provide all-faculty listserv access to the FC chair, enabling direct communication between FC and faculty without requiring approval from or distribution through the Dean's office. Note: this specific suggestion was made in the 2019 Shared Governance Task Force progress report, but was not implemented.
 - Encourage FCs to meet with all school-level committees at least once per year (perhaps via a single meeting that brings all together), to understand those committees' priorities and establish a relationship that fosters dialogue.
 - Create a confidential channel through which each school's FC can receive faculty, staff, and student suggestions and concerns, such as an email inbox or physical box.

- Maintain a prominent, easily accessible web page that lists FC members, their annual meeting schedule, their meeting minutes, their bylaws, and their contact information.
- Hold FC Office Hours or Town Halls once per semester, using an Ask Me Anything format.

SCHOOL LEVEL: EMPOWERING FACULTY COUNCILS & RECRUITING PARTICIPANTS

- Establish and publish clear guidelines (i.e., create clear rules of engagement) that distinguish between what FCs are expected to do (i.e., what they control), where and how FCs provide input, what FCs are to be informed about, and what is beyond FC purview. (In the 2019 Shared Governance Task Force report, a “Faculty Authority Matrix” was recommended; this approach may still be fruitful to help codify FC guidelines. Then, ensure that those guidelines are followed.)
- As related to the above, map decision-making pathways, so those outside of FCs know where to go to seek counsel and provide input, who is informed about what, and who makes decisions.
- Create a formal forum through which FCs and others not involved in salary, performance, and hiring (typically those at larger schools) can better understand and communicate these critical aspects of faculty life to those affected.
- Create specific ways for FC membership to be visibly helpful to their peers and secure objective, reportable wins (for example, allow FCs to award 1-3 RTPC sabbaticals per year, to receive incentives for pedagogical innovation, etc.).
- Introduce incentives to attract talented members of each school’s community to join or take on leadership roles within FCs (for example, some schools provide course release to FC chairs).

Exhibit A: Taskforce Membership

Name	School	Designation
Andy Campbell	Roski	TT
Melinda Finberg	SDA	RTPC
Larry Gross	Annenberg	TT
Elissa Grossman (co-chair)	Marshall	RTPC
Sandeep Gupta	Viterbi	TT
Lisa Klerman	Gould	RTPC
Lavonna Lewis	Price	RTPC
Karen Lincoln	Dworak-Peck	TT
Eugenia Mora-Flores	Rossier	RTPC
Morgan Polikoff (co-chair)	Rossier	TT
Tammie Ton	Dentistry	RTPC
Emily Zeamer	Dornsife	RTPC

Exhibit B: Focus Group Participants

School		Administration		Faculty Council
Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism	✓	Academic Dean, Faculty		
Bovard College	✓	Chief Academic Officer	✓	FC Chair
Davis School for Gerontology	✓	Executive Vice Dean		
Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences	✓	Vice Dean	✓	FC Chair
Dworak-Peck School of Social Work	✓	Executive Vice Dean	✓	<i>Also on Taskforce</i>
Gould School of Law	✓	Assistant Dean, Faculty	✓	FC Chair, <i>Also on Taskforce</i>
Irvine and Young Academy				
Keck School of Medicine	✓	Sr. Associate Dean	✓	FC Chair
Libraries	✓	Dean, Assoc. Dean Fac.Aff.	✓	FC Chair
Marshall School of Business / Leventhal School of Accounting	✓	Dean	✓	FC Chair
Ostrow School of Dentistry	✓	Associate Dean, Acad Affairs		
Price School of Public Policy			✓	FC Chair
Rossier School of Education	✓	Associate Dean, Faculty	✓	<i>Also on Taskforce</i>
Roski School of Art & Design	✓	Dean	✓	FC Chair
School of Architecture	✓	Associate Dean, Acad Affairs		
School of Cinematic Arts	✓	Vice Dean	✓	FC Chair
School of Dramatic Arts	✓	Vice Dean	✓	FC Chair
School of Pharmacy	✓	Vice Dean	✓	FC Chair
Thornton School of Music / Glorya Kaufman School of Dance	✓	Vice Dean	✓	FC Chair
Viterbi School of Engineering	✓	Dean	✓	FC Chair

Exhibit C: Interview Protocols

Questions for Deans, Vice Deans, Associate Deans, & Similar
In what ways, if any, is the administrative leadership of the school (dean, associate deans) involved in the appointment of faculty council members or the faculty council chair?
In what ways, if any, is the administrative leadership of the school (dean, associate deans) involved in the appointment of faculty council members or the faculty council chair?
How does the administrative leadership interact with the FC and the FC chair? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How often do you and/or the Dean you meet with the FC? ● What are some of the things that are typically discussed during meetings with the FC? ● How often does the administrative leadership meet with the chair independently of the FC? ● What are some things the administrative leadership typically does or discusses during meetings with the FC chair?
How would you describe the quality of the relationships between the administrative leadership of the school and the FC? What would you say are the main roles and responsibilities of the FC or faculty committees appointed by the FC? For example, does the FC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Facilitate the annual merit review process? ● Review curriculum or course approvals? ● Review the school's budget? ● Review department or program based policies? ● Any other activities (explain)?
What is the relationship between the FC and any other school-level committees that address these core academic issues? What kind of leadership role do these committees take in regards to curriculum, pedagogy, research, or other school functions?
Are there changes planned or underway now with regard to the role of the faculty council? If so, what are these? What are the biggest points of tension with regard to the FC right now?
Is there anything else about the FC we should know about but haven't asked about?
Questions for FC Chairs / Presidents
Tell me about how the Faculty Council interacts with the school's administrative leadership. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How often does the FC or chair meet with the administration? ● What sorts of topics are included in these interactions? ● How would you describe the quality of the relationship between the FC and the administrative leadership? ● To what extent does the Dean/admin listen to recommendations put forth by the FC/chair?
Tell me about communication between FC and the faculty who do not serve on the council?. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How often is there communication? ● Can the FC communicate directly with faculty via email? ● How would you describe the quality of the relationship between the FC and the non-council faculty in the school? ● To what extend do concerns/issues raised by faculty get addressed by the FC?
What are the main roles and responsibilities of the FC or committees appointed by the FC? For example does the FC:? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● facilitate the annual merit review process? ● review curriculum or course approvals? ● review or advise on elements of the school's budget or financial allocations? For example, is the FC involved in reviewing faculty salary allocations, or in salary benchmarking? ● review department or program-based policies?
Any other activities (please explain)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What is the relationship between the FC and other school-level committees that address these core academic issues? ● What kind of leadership role do these committees take as re: curriculum, pedagogy, research, or other school functions? ● Has experience on the FC encouraged reps to take other leadership or governance roles at the school or university? ● Are there changes planned or underway now with regard to the role of the FC? If so, what are these?
What are the biggest points of tension with regard to the FC right now?
Is there anything else about the FC that I should know about, but haven't asked about?

Exhibit D: Findings from 2021 Faculty Council survey

- Many units are trying to improve the representativeness of their FC, specifically in terms of faculty tracks, gender, race.
- While most FC Chairs are regular participants in the standing meetings of their school's senior administration, one-third are not.
- While most FC Chairs are "mostly" or "very" satisfied with access to their school's senior administration, one-quarter are only "somewhat satisfied".
- About half the FC Chairs reported experiencing challenges with their school's senior administration making unilateral decisions on important issues. These challenges relate most frequently to budgets; hiring; strategic planning; and curriculum.
 - There are only 4 schools where the FC regularly sees the school budget and where the Chair reports their FC's input is taken seriously.
- FC Chairs would like most to see greater FC influence in the following areas: (a) senior administration appointments in the school; (b) school budget; (c) strategic planning; (d) promotion policies and decisions; (e) curriculum; and (f) merit increase policies and decisions.
- Some notable suggestions for ways FCs could be more effective in school governance include:
 - More authority and stronger partnership with deans
 - More access to financial data
 - Clearer guidance regarding expectations
 - Better communication with faculty
- We will explore how we can pursue some of your suggestions for how the Senate or Executive Board can help FCs become more effective:
 - Advocate for and enhance shared governance
 - Advocate for and enhance transparency
 - Identify shared initiatives and goals
 - Assure more professionalism and collegiality in the Senate

Exhibit E: Recommendations from 2019 Shared Governance Progress Report

Faculty Councils should serve as the main framework for shared governance at the school level. To strengthen Faculty Councils, efforts should be made to enhance the relationship between Faculty Councils and the Academic Senate, as this will serve to empower Faculty Councils and allow better oversight of School affairs.

A. Description of the Faculty Councils: A survey was sent to all Faculty Council chairs early in the academic year to better understand the make-up, structure and function of the Faculty Councils at each school (every Faculty council responded). Tremendous variability in Faculty Council organization and functioning was evident from these surveys. These results, as well as further discussions regarding the roles of faculty in governance at the school level, made it clear that many faculty did not understand the role of Faculty Councils, including the Faculty Council members and Chairs themselves. The Task Force sought to understand where and how a unified description of Faculty Councils could be developed in light of the tremendous differences across Schools in terms of faculty size and role in governance. The President, Academic Vice President and Immediate Past President of the Academic Senate held two meetings with Faculty Council chairs to better understand their challenges. Both the Task Force and the Faculty Council chairs discussed potential wording changes to the Faculty Handbook that would serve to describe the role and obligations of Faculty Councils (See Appendix A). We anticipate consensus being reached between faculty and the administration as to the appropriate language to be used and then asking the Senate to vote on using this language in the Faculty Handbook in the Fall of 2019.

B. Faculty Authority Matrix: The concept of a Faculty Authority Matrix was developed at the Marshall School of Business. This document is a table that includes various types of decisions made at a school and the expected role of Faculty Councils, other Faculty Committees, and the Faculty more broadly in these decisions. This document has served as an important starting point for discussions with both Deans and Faculty Councils towards improved collaboration between Faculty and Administration at the school level. During the meeting between the Senate Executive Board officers and the Faculty Council Chairs (discussed above), the possibility of generating such a matrix for each School was explored. Members of the Task Force also met with a group of Deans to discuss the possibility of drafting and discussing this kind of Faculty Authority Matrix with the Faculty Councils at their schools. As a result of those meetings, many of the Faculty Councils have already begun to generate a matrix for their schools (as well as changing their Faculty Council Guidelines) with this new approach to shared governance in mind.

C. Basic expectations for Faculty Councils: To function successfully in a shared governance structure, Faculty Councils need to function independently of their School's administrative bodies. Certain "basic rights" must be afforded to the Councils in order for them to maintain this independence, including the following:

1. Email lists – Faculty Council must be able to email their faculty broadly (and have access to faculty email lists). While this is already the case in many Schools, administration at some schools have raised concerns regarding whether access to email lists will result in some schools being inundated with inappropriate emails. Most believe this concern is unfounded, and in a worse-case scenario, the Academic Senate can determine (and act to address the issue) if inappropriate use of email lists occurs.

2. Budget for administrative functions. A limited budget may be required for the administrative functions of a Faculty Council, and when available, that budget is currently paid directly by the respective school's Dean's office. Although this relationship functions appropriately at many schools, there is some concern that if any given Faculty Council's funding is at the discretion of their Dean, it could potentially impair the independence of the council, especially in cases of strained relationships. One way to prevent this would be to mandate that Faculty Council budgets could not be changed unless approved at the Senate / Provost level. Another model would place the funding for Faculty Councils in the Academic Senate budget (with the funding to be paid by all the Deans and then distributed from a single Academic Senate account). In this model, the Senate would oversee the funding of each Council

to help ensure each council's independence. If this model were used, the Senate could potentially hire additional administrative staff (or possibly student workers) to help support the work of the individual Faculty Councils, Consensus was not reached by the Task Force regarding the desirability of this kind of centralization of Faculty Council budgets.

D. Dean Appointments, Re-appointments and Termination: The important role for Faculty in decisions regarding Dean's appointments, re-appointments and terminations was raised throughout the Task Force discussions.

1. Dean Appointments: Search Committees involving faculty members are often created in appointments of Deans. This has not always been the case, however, and we encourage the creation of such faculty-centered committees in all dean searches going forward. In addition, we encourage these committees to have wide access to information regarding the candidates (including confidential information that could prove to be of paramount importance in appointment decisions).

2. Dean Re-Appointments: Re-appointment decisions have traditionally sought the voice of Faculty Councils and other faculty members from the School, but limited feedback or transparency had occurred. In close discussions with Provost Michael Quick and the Provost office, a new process is being developed to assure both that the voice of faculty within the school is heard, and that a faculty voice (including from outside the school on confidential matters) is included in the final decision, with complete access to reviewable data. The current mechanism being developed (and partly implemented in the law school dean re-appointment process) includes two levels of faculty involvement and consultation. First, the Faculty Council is responsible for collecting feedback from faculty within the school, using survey questions and other methods. The feedback collected (with a summary created by the Faculty Council), as well as other confidential reports (including related to budgetary spending, information from the Office of Equity and Diversity, information from the Compliance Office, and other confidential information) will be provided to a group of three faculty members, chosen jointly by the Provost and the Senate President, and including: 1) one faculty member selected by the Faculty Council – potentially an ex-chair of the Faculty Council at that School; 2) one Past President of the Academic Senate; and 3) one faculty member from the Committee on Professional Responsibilities. This three-member group would evaluate all of the available data and advise the University President on re-appointment decisions. While there was not complete agreement by the Task Force members that having only one faculty member from inside the school and only a total of three faculty members was sufficient for this reviewing body, limiting the number of members is intended to take into account the need for absolute confidentiality in these processes and a desire for an independent review from neutral faculty who are mostly from outside of the involved school.

3. Early Terminations of Deans: Tensions regarding the processes around dean-termination decisions developed over the year among certain faculty after the early termination of Dean James Ellis at the Marshall School of Business. Although consensus has not been reached on this issue, the Task Force has advocated for the USC President to consult with a similar group of three faculty members (i.e. similar in membership and function to the three-person group described above) about early termination decisions. However, there is concern that early termination decisions create an even greater need for absolute confidentiality, including the need to keep the names of the three individuals being consulted confidential to prevent any form of retaliation or attempts to influence their decisions. This could perhaps necessitate not releasing any information about the creation of the group or that the review was occurring. We anticipate further discussions concerning this possible model with the incoming administration.

Exhibit F: Relevant policies from the Faculty Handbook and Academic Senate Constitution

Faculty Handbook:

2-B (2)(c) [Academic Senate] Members

Voting members of the Academic Senate are the President of each Faculty Council, any additional delegates from the Councils as specified by the Senate Bylaws, the executive officers of the faculty, and members at large of the Executive Board. Non-voting members are the chairs of faculty committees and, if authorized by the Bylaws, representatives of other university organizations.

2-B (3) Faculty Councils

The faculty of each school have established an elected council to participate in the governance of the unit and the University. The elected faculty President of each school's Faculty Council represents it as a member of the Academic Senate, as do additional delegates as designated by the Senate Bylaws with regard to the size of the academic unit.

See the Constitution of the Academic Senate, Article II, Purposes and Roles, and Article V, School Faculty Councils. (<https://academicsenate.usc.edu/documents/constitution/>)

Academic Senate Constitution:

ARTICLE I: Faculty Governance.

Section 1. The University faculty at large constitutes the Faculty Assembly (Article III Section 1) , which may act through a General Meeting or a referendum, or through representative bodies. Each school has an elected faculty council. Presidents or one other elected member of the school councils, additional delegates from the larger schools, and the university-wide faculty officers and Executive Board members make up the Academic Senate.

Section 2. All members of the Faculty Assembly (Article III, Section 1) are eligible to participate in faculty governance including in the Academic Senate and faculty committees. Each School's Faculty Council will determine how best to include Part-time faculty in the School's governance mechanisms.

ARTICLE II: Purposes and Roles.

Section 2. The Faculty Assembly, the Academic Senate, and the school faculty councils, are centers of independent initiative in investigating issues, recommending policies, and disseminating information. They are also fact-finding, deliberative, and consultative bodies, with authority to make studies, reports, and recommendations on all matters which have a significant bearing upon the work of the faculty.

ARTICLE IV: The Academic Senate

Section 2. The voting members of the Academic Senate are: (a) the elected president or one other elected member of the faculty council in each school, the College, and each Division in the College (or the closest equivalent elected faculty officer, by whatever title); (b) additional delegates from the school faculty councils, selected as provided in Section 4...

Section 4. The faculty of each school, by referendum, will decide how the additional delegates from that school to the Academic Senate will be selected. Unless a school decides otherwise, they will be selected from among those the faculty elects to the school's faculty council. If a school does not decide otherwise, its additional delegates will be the members of the school's faculty council who received the highest number of votes when elected. Members who decline to serve, or are unable to attend regularly, will be replaced in the same manner.

ARTICLE V: School Faculty Councils

Section 1. The faculty of each school shall have an elected faculty council to participate in the governance of that unit, whose basic purposes and roles are stated in Article II.

Section 2. The faculty council in each school is established in accordance with the will of the faculty as determined by a vote of the faculty by secret ballot, as provided in the Bylaws.

Section 3. If the dean and faculty of any school cannot reach agreement on the establishment and role of the faculty council, either may seek the assistance of the Academic Senate.

Section 4. The elected faculty president of each school's elected faculty council shall be a member of the Academic Senate. If a school is entitled to additional delegates on the Academic Senate, they shall be chosen as provided in Article IV, Section 4. A school may choose to have another elected faculty council member serve as a Senator in the President's place.

Section 5. The Academic Senate, through an election committee, shall act to ensure that each school has a democratic and fair nomination and election process. There must be opportunity for open nominations, at least two candidates for every seat, and secret, written ballots counted by neutral teller. If election procedures or results are questioned, the election committee shall investigate and report its findings to the Academic Senate, which may take appropriate action. The Academic Senate may set standards for the manner, time, and details of elections. The Bylaws shall provide for reports to the Senate, for each school, of the names of its members of the Faculty Assembly, the member of its school faculty council, and its members in the Academic Senate.