College of Education
Department of Counseling Psychology & Human Services
Internal Governance Policies
Developed by the faculty of the CPHS Department, winter, 2014

➢ *Ratified by CPHS faculty vote: April 16, 2014*
➢ *Modified October, 2014 (based on Feedback from Academic Affairs)*
➢ *Refined and modified for text coherence and consistency with COE Policy and Academic Affairs feedback and new CBA language, October, 2015*

Preamble Note: The policies herein reflect our values as a CPHS department, are consistent with University values and its mission as a major public research university, and to the extent possible concur with the principles and spirit of the University/Union CBA. To every extent possible, this document is consistent with COE policy, the CBA, and with the CBA Governance Implementation Guide from the office of the Provost. Language herein comes from the principles identified in the CBA and in this and other guides from UO/UA collaborative work. See especially "Provost Principles for faculty governance and decision-making".

1. **Policy Convergence and Amendment Clause to this Policy Document**

   All CPHS governance policies will conform to COE and UO governance policies. Where there is a divergence, UO and COE policies will take precedence. This document attempts to comply with and refers to the COE document: ***College of Education (COE) Governance Policy and Process.*** **Amendment Clause:** This document is a working document. As time progresses, some elements may function well and some will need to be modified. The Department of CPHS will conduct an Ad Hoc review of these Internal Governance Policies and provide opportunities for changes and amendments to be made to them on an annual basis and the policies herein will be reviewed at least once annually by the Program Director's Council (PDC) be consistent and commensurate with new and potentially changing COE and UO policies and practices.

2. **Participation in Department Governance**

   Definitions: "Core Faculty": This group consists of Tenure Track Faculty (TTF) and Career Non Tenure Track Faculty (C-NTTF, heretofore referred to as "Career Faculty" for their Career Instructional or Career Research role) who have a significant and substantial role in department, college, and university service and citizenship and who are defined as "Core" by COE Policy. Core faculty designation is reserved for faculty members who have regular and ongoing responsibility for program, department, college, and university service to accompany their teaching and/or research assignment. See COE Policy. Core Faculty status is determined for the upcoming academic year before the start of Fall Term via consultation between the Department Head and his or her Program Directors. Any faculty member may request a review of his or her designated Core Faculty status by the Department Head.

   (*Note:* Time spent by funding contingent faculty members on service to the University, including shared and internal governance, must comply with the terms and conditions of their sponsored project and all federal and state laws and regulations.)

3. **General Solicitation of Feedback**

    A. **Faculty:** Department faculty should provide general input, feedback, and recommendations to Program Directors, Program Coordinators, and the Department Head on policies that affect them, and should respond in a timely way to feedback solicited from Program Directors, Program Coordinators, and the Department Head. All faculty members are empowered to generate, develop, and propose suggested policy changes and provide feedback on suggested policy within the department.

    B. **Staff:** Department Head, Program Directors, and program coordinators will routinely seek input from department staff (this includes "classified staff" and "Officers of Administration") on department matters. Staff feedback will be sought in programs and in the department as a whole, routinely and at *a minimum* on a quarterly basis, through department meetings, program meetings, staff meetings, and ad hoc meetings. Most department business is conducted in our academic programs, so it is important for faculty in each program to seek out, include, and respond to feedback and input from department staff on a wide range of issues affecting the work of the Department.

4. **Voting Rights and Principles**

    Faculty will be accorded voting rights on departmental matters consistent with COE and CBA concurring policies and past decisions, as well as on the following. Where any discrepancies exist, voting rights and principles follow COE policy and procedures:

    A. **Decisions about the academic content of all degree programs** will be determined by a majority vote of Core Faculty in the department (not solely program by program). Voting decisions include decisions about any and all substantive changes to curriculum (such as new degree proposals, major changes to degree programs, additions of new emphasis areas, specializations, minors, etc.); curriculum changes (such as course sequencing and coordination, new courses, course changes, selection of pro-tem faculty, etc.); and may be deferred or delegated to the CPHS departmental Program Directors Council (PDC).

    B. **Tenure Track faculty** vote on all matters in the department and across programs within the department when a vote is required related to hiring, major curriculum changes, sabbaticals, budgets requiring whole departmental faculty input, etc. This includes TTF who may have lowered or reduced FTE in the Department due to course buyouts of one form or another (grants, administrative roles, etc.).

    C. **Career Non-Tenure Track Faculty and all Core Faculty** members vote on all matters related to the program in which they are primarily assigned, and may vote on departmental matters that affect their particular program in a manner consistent with existing COE policy and that concurs with the CBA. This includes Career Faculty who may have lowered or reduced FTE in the Department due to course buyouts of one form or another (grants, administrative roles, etc.). Program Directors will seek feedback from Pro-Tem faculty about the course taught by the specific Pro-Tem faculty members during and at the end of the term in which the course is taught or supervision or other professional activity is provided/contracted.

    D. **Voting**, when needed, will be conducted electronically when possible and may occur in

department meetings when issues have been vetted and available for review by department faculty members for a minimum of ten (10) calendar days, not including over summer session when 9-month faculty are not on contract. Input and commentary will always be sought through multiple formats (faculty work groups, meetings, email exchanges, *Qualtrics* surveys, PDC meetings, etc.) before issues are brought to a faculty vote. Votes, either electronically or in-person votes in meetings, will always be recorded and part of the record (whether public, such as on a curriculum issue, or confidential, such as in promotion cases).

5. **Voting Domains**

   A. **Policy and Governance:** Will follow all principles for voting outlined in the previous section. Generally, only Core Faculty members vote on policy issues affecting the department and programs within the department. Core Faculty members have the right to vote on matters central to the operations of all programs within the department (that is, voting is not limited to faculty within her/his own primary program). Governance and policy revisions will be conducted in an ongoing manner in the department. If a change is sought on faculty governance process and procedures, proposals must be presented to Core Faculty members in the whole CPHS department and a timeframe indicated for review, input, and eventual vote and ratification for the eventual policy change or modification. All changes in policy will defer to COE, UO, and CBA principles and regulations.

   B. **Tenure and Promotion:** Department Faculty voting rights will concur with COE, UO, and CBA requirements. For instance, all Tenure Track Faculty members at a higher rank and tenured status than the case at hand will vote on the tenure and promotion of more junior faculty members and on all Career Faculty promotion cases; Career Instructional Faculty members may provide input and feedback on Tenure Track faculty members' promotion and pre-tenure reviews when at the same or higher level, but do not vote on TTF cases. Standard University expectation is that only faculty at or above the rank being sought by the candidate will vote. Regarding Career Instructional faculty, Career faculty at the rank of Senior 1 or Senior 2 are eligible to vote on promotions to Senior 1, but only Career faculty at the rank of Senior 2 are eligible to vote on promotions to that level.

   C. **Program Enhancements, Developments, Additions:** All program development ideas and proposals will be generated by all faculty in the department. To ensure program collaboration, enhanced communication, and increase efficiencies, proposals will be reviewed in the Program Directors Council (PDC) prior to being returned to the faculty at large for action related to program enhancements, development, and additions. Process will be similar to the one used to approve new COE Curriculum and Courses. Enhancements and additions will be processed through the COE and UO Curriculum review processes where required.

6. **Department Meeting Protocols**

   The Department Head will set the scheduling of and the agenda for all department meetings. Any faculty member and staff member may submit agenda items for inclusion consideration at a regularly scheduled meeting of the department. Inclusion of these items is at the discretion of the Department Head. The Department Head will provide timely notice of the inclusion of any policy-related agenda items to all members of the faculty.

A. CPHS will have at least one meeting for entire CPHS faculty and staff at least once per year. This includes anyone who has a contract to teach (e.g., Pro-Tem) or supervise in any program during that particular academic year.

B. CPHS will have at least one meeting of Core Program Faculty once per term. This excludes Pro-Tem faculty by definition, although there may be occasion to invite a specific Pro-Tem or group of Pro-Tempori depending on the content/agenda of the meeting and with approval of the Department Head.

C. CPHS will have bi-weekly meetings of the Program Director's Council (PDC) throughout the academic year, or, generally, four to five (4-5) times per academic quarter, not including summer.

D. Decision-making at the department level, to the extent feasible, will be done via consensus (see Appendix A). Faculty have opportunities for input on decisions prior to, during, and after faculty meetings, with deadlines and voting or decision-making procedures clearly identified for decisions that need to be made and/or which require a faculty vote. The Department Head will publish and announce timeframes for making key decisions and for avenues for providing input on decisions so that the group may reach consensus if possible, and elicit majority and minority opinions on an issue before votes are taken if voting is necessary on a particular issue. Some issues, such as initial approval of student handbooks, shall require formal documentation and shall occur at the program level, while other changes, such as new course offerings and formal curriculum changes, will require the voting authority of the entire department or the PDC as faculty designee. Appointment of instructors to teach courses will be suggested first at the program level, but then processed through a required review at the department level or through the PDC as designee. Voting shall be solicited when needed at the department level on all curriculum and other matters. A suggested model for voting procedures is outlined in Appendix A, and includes a "4-finger" voting model. See Appendix A.

E. All CPHS department decisions are subject to the COE policy on voting authority. Program decisions must be processed through the PDC and approved by the Department Head prior to any required submission to COE level approval or vote.

7. **Department Administrative Meetings**

    A. **Program Meetings:** are held routinely and at the discretion of the particular program or specialization director and faculty/staff. Information about the meetings – including dates and times as well as whether the meeting is open or executive, will be communicated in advance to the whole department Core Faculty so that all department faculty can track meeting times and improve communication among programs. Minutes for program faculty meetings (excluding confidential and executive items) shall be posted publicly for all faculty and staff in the department. Minutes will be taken and drafted by program administrative support staff when possible or by a volunteer in the meeting and submitted to program faculty and staff for review prior to posting.

    B. **Department Core Faculty Meetings:** meets ideally at least quarterly and is overseen by the

Department Head. ***Charge:*** To manage the daily operations of degree programs, non-degree options and programs, and to provide the Department Head and faculty with shared counsel on a wide range of CPHS, COE, and University affairs. Core faculty may come together to vote on curriculum, programmatic, policy, and other issues that require voting input as they arise during the year. Minutes for Core Faculty meetings (excluding confidential and executive items) shall be posted publicly for all faculty and staff in the department.

C. **Program Director's Council (PDC)** consists of the Department Head and the academic Program Directors. The group may also include leaders from non-degree granting programs and specializations. The Department Head or designee provides direct oversight of the PDC. ***Charge:*** As a group responsible for representative governance for faculty members from each program, the Program Directors work in the PDC to manage the resources and assets of the academic programs; to coordinate policy related to the governance of the CPHS programs, and to collaborate with other units, departments, faculty groups, and other governance committees in CPHS and the COE as necessary on matters of common concern. In addition, to maximize communication and collaboration, the PDC will communicate with departmental faculty on matters of common concern across the department, bring forth issues from the programs within the department to the PDC that may be of concern to the department or the college as a whole, and to communicate back to faculty and staff in CPHS on developments and concerns of the PDC. The PDC shall engage in and include consultation and collaboration across Program Directors, including input and suggestions from departmental faculty members and staff on common department concerns. Membership is determined by position in the department (i.e., Program Directors). The Department Head and Program Directors may request additional Ad Hoc attendees when needed as appropriate to the address the needs of the PDC. On frequent occasions, the Director of Business Operations for CPHS will attend this meeting as well. Meeting schedules will be posted. PDC domains related to communication, feedback, and governance include the following areas:

1. ***Curriculum:*** The PDC will handle all curriculum issues and proposals in the department. Programs may invite ad hoc attendees to the PDC when curriculum issues are discussed and the Program Director is not the best person to do so or is not available. Program Directors will solicit evaluating input from faculty in the department at large in making curriculum decisions. The CPHS curriculum review process will parallel the COE curriculum review process and policies, including time-frames for faculty to generate proposals and gather input from other faculty members throughout the curriculum development process.

2. ***Budget:*** Per the Department Head role, the PDC will help manage, review and attend to budget issues and share budget information among programs. The PDC will communicate about program budgets across the department.

3. ***Hiring Authority and Consultation***: The Department Head approves of all staff hiring and personnel decisions (such as hiring Career and Pro-Tem faculty, GTFs, Pre-Doc and Post-Doc faculty/fellows, staff members, etc.). The Department Head is responsible for approving all GTF hires that are recommended by programs within the department. Budget requests from programs, for new faculty FTE of existing faculty, new faculty members, hiring of Pro-Tems, and all new GTFs mid-year must

be proposed by the program and presented to the Program Directors Council (PDC). After discussion and input from the PDC, final budget decisions related to requests will be made by the Department Head.

D. **Large Department Meetings ("All-in Meetings"):** meets at least once per year and is overseen by the Department Head. *Charge:* To communicate broadly about the daily operations of degree programs, non-degree options and programs, staff needs, department orientation and functioning, and to provide all staff, core faculty, Pro-Tems, and the Department Head with shared counsel on a wide range of CPHS, COE, and University affairs. CPHS Faculty and Staff come together to discuss curriculum and programmatic changes, COE and UO concerns, and other issues that require input and information exchange for the department throughout the year. Minutes or the agenda and presentation information for "All-In Meetings" (excluding confidential and executive items) shall be posted publicly for all faculty and staff in the department.

E. **Department Committees Types:** Two types of committees may be established within the Department: (1) Standing Committees, and (2) *Ad Hoc* Committees. The definitions of these committees, and committee membership, configuration, and processes will follow all policies and procedures for committee membership in the COE governance document.

F. **Tenure-Track Faculty Search Committee Policy**: *(see COE policy)* The College of Education (COE) has clear policies and procedures on hiring faculty. COE searches for *TTF* positions will adhere to the following guidelines:

1. *Chair of the Search Committee:* In conjunction with the Dean, the relevant Department Head will select the chair for a TTF search committee. The committee chair should be a tenured associate or full professor. The search committee chair will use methods of his or her choice to formally document input from all committee members and other participants in the search process and include that input in the recommendation submitted to the Department Head and the Dean for extending invitations for campus interviews.

2. *Faculty Composition of the Search Committee:* In conjunction with the Dean and the Department Head the Search Committee Chair will select members of the search committee. The committee should consist of four to five (4-5) members including the chair. Two members should be TTF members from the department, and one should be a TTF from a COE department other than the one in which the position is to be located. For Career Instructional Faculty searches, one member of the search committee may be a Career Faculty member from the department. If the opening is for a senior TTF, at least two of the committee members should be at the rank of full professor. Each of the 4-5 committee members will have the right to vote on the committee's recommendation(s) for invitation for campus interviews.

3. *Additional Members of the Search Committee:* For some searches it may make sense to include an additional member who brings additional relevant experience or perspective to the search process. This member does not need to be part of the faculty, and will have input into the search and selection process, but will not vote on the committee's final recommendation. A community professional with

relationship to the program in which the position is to be located is an example of an additional member.

8.   **Selection and Appointment of Leadership Roles within the Department**

A.   **Department Head: All core faculty** (Tenure Track and Career Instructional Faculty) in the CPHS department may nominate candidates or self-nominate to serve as DH every 3 years, or upon request by the Dean, following all COE governance procedures.

B.   **Program Directors**: Program Directors are nominated by core faculty members within each program and may be Core Tenure Track or Core Career Instructional Faculty in the particular program. Program Director selection is made in consultation with the Department Head. If the Department Head does not approve of a particular selection of a Program Director, the Department Head will communicate to that program faculty in a meeting the rationale for not supporting the nomination. The Department Head and program faculty will discuss any difference of opinion and attempt to come to a consensus on approval of the incoming Program Director. Final approval of Program Director rests with the Department Head.

C.   **Program Coordinators:** (of Emphasis Areas, Certifications, Minors, etc.): Coordinators are nominated by core faculty within the program unit (TTF and Career faculty in the program), in which the emphasis area, specialization, etc. resides, in consultation with the Department Head. If the Department Head does not approve of a selection of a program coordinator, the Department Head will communicate to that program faculty in a meeting the rationale for not supporting the nomination. Final approval of program coordinators rests with the Department Head and the Program Director of the housing program.

Appendix A

CONDUCT OF MEETING

1. Agenda items are sometimes reviewed for priority if time is short.

2. For most items it is suggested that the briefing materials be presented in some mode and that the facilitator briefly restate the subject and action desired and ask for questions or discussion issues.

3. Facilitation by the chair should include one of the following temperature-taking methods:
   - Asking each person in turn to give their opinion
   - Asking for a show of level of support by the 4 finger method: 4 enthusiastic support, 3 substantial support, 2 favor it enough not to become an obstacle to carrying it out, 1 can't support it.
   - Items where anyone uses 1 finger requires more discussion, before moving to a formal vote if the individual was still at 1 finger after the discussion.
   - Other facilitation tools include writing key points of decision on the board, brain storming, etc.

4. Issues to be resolved, and next steps, including a timetable, should be identified as necessary for items.

5. When delegating to a sub-committee, the committees should be clearly chartered with a timetable, parameters, expectations for outcomes, communications (including when to communicate back to the Program Director and Department Head), and expectations of the committee. Sub-committee members should be chosen and a chair identified. A committee charter should be chosen if appropriate.

CONSENSUS

Consensus building approaches are the goal with voting used as necessary. The goal is to achieve well-researched, well-crafted decisions, to consider all perspectives, and to reach a high-quality solution that is the best for the future of the organization (and hopefully the most satisfactory to all points of view). Agreement by consensus implies that you feel you can live with the solution (although it is not necessarily your preferred choice).

Each group member should be able to make the following statements:

   - I've heard your position, interests, and perspectives.
   - I believe you've heard my position, interests, and perspectives.
   - I've asked for help or accommodation.
   - I can support the proposed decision.

Procedures are as follows:

Chair (or member) suggests when group seems ready to make a decision. In many cases it is clear that enough questions have been raised that there is a decision to do further work on the proposal outside of the meeting (e.g., in committee) and bring it back at a later meeting. Otherwise, four finger consensus may be used for the decision (unless full consensus is already clear). If any member is still at 2 or 1 fingers, ask them if there is any reasonable modification or accommodation they would like.

1. Consensus is achieved if everyone is at 2-4 fingers. If this occurs, this is clearly noted in the minutes. If not, then unless the item is dropped altogether for some reason, a simple majority vote will be taken at a later time – usually the next meeting – but not at the meeting where consensus was not achieved. Work should be done by the appointed leadership to attempt to reach consensus before the next meeting and to make sure that everyone's thoughts and concerns are fully heard and considered.

2. When the action taken differs from the proposal send to the Council before the meeting, an e-vote will be taken, even though there may have been a consensus of those present at the meeting.

GROUP ETHICS

Both free and open discussion of ideas during decision making **and** being supportive of final decisions are crucial components of decision making.

There is standing agreement among members to strive to meet the following:

➢ Be respectful to all faculty, administrators, and staff within the organization and in our various partner organizations
➢ Set a positive example and encourage constructive decision making
➢ Do not undermine decisions or individuals by words or actions
➢ Be forgiving as everyone makes mistakes
➢ Be mindful of comments, and strive for useful feedback rather than criticisms or attacks
➢ Use open and direct communication about decisions and differences
➢ Once the decision making process is completed, present decisions positively and constructively to staff