**MEMO**

To: Provost Stephen Scheck, Office of Academic Affairs

From: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Date; July 10, 2015

Re: Faculty Senate SWOT report 2014 - 2015

**STRENGTHS**

* Good representation exists across academic units, including Library and Media Services, at Faculty Senate.
* Conversations and opinions are heard at Faculty Senate and a fairly unified faculty voice has been heard on key issues (LEAP, Bylaws, Tobacco Free WOU, and Curriculum).
* The shared governance process has demonstrated positive collaborations between Faculty Senate and administration

**WEAKNESSES**

* There are several Faculty Senate subcommittees without proper support; their chairs have a big job but no service compensation. For example, IRB has reassignment for the IRB chair, but the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee chair has no reassignment for their extensive duties.
* Not all members of all Faculty Senate subcommittees are clear on the charge and processes of the committee.
* Communication among committees.
* Not all Faculty Senate subcommittees have good representation from all academic units.
* Not all faculty units have a good method of disseminating Faculty Senate business items.
* Curriculum processes for large package proposals are often cumbersome.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

* With the LEAP outcomes and value rubrics adoption, we have a holistic framework for moving forward.
* With the institution of Wordpress, committees can reimagine their web presence.

**THREATS**

* Lack of clarity on process of shared governance