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1. The meeting was convened at 8:30AM.
2. Meeting summary of March 19, 2012 Minutes was approved without objection as drafted.
3. Discussion focused on goals for what the group wants to and can reasonably accomplish and communicate to stakeholder groups by the end of this academic year regarding the workgroup’s progress. Points discussed included:
   a. The possibility of agreeing on language that would state principles and values in common across the four stakeholder groups with respect to shared governance. Such a statement would help demonstrate progress of the effort so far this year.
   b. The need to take the time necessary to formulate a consensus statement.
   c. The time constraints that everyone is under in the final weeks of the academic year.
   d. Two main options emerged in the course of the conversation:
      i. Creating a declaration-style statement in the near term that describes the general principle(s) of shared governance as the workgroup understands it. This statement could be shared with the members of the stakeholder groups as a way to indicate that progress is being made toward the goal of a more specific constitution-style document that describes the mechanisms and processes by which shared governance happens. This type of statement would also allow for a reaffirmation of all the ways existing processes and mechanisms on campus already using shared governance in a meaningful way.
      ii. Undertaking an “environmental scan” of the university’s decision making processes to determine where and how shared governance happens currently and where gaps or opportunities for improvement exist. The consensus was that this is a far more involved and time-intensive exercise that would not be feasible before the end of this academic year.
   e. Some of the initial language in the draft discussion document circulated by Faculty Senate in November seems to contain some general language for definitions, concepts, and principles that tracks closely with what we see ourselves already doing (this feeling was reaffirmed by the outcome of the March 19 mapping exercise).
4. Action Items/Goals for the Next Meeting:

One more meeting will happen this year. At that meeting we will come prepared to accomplish the following.

**Action 1**: come to consensus on a ca. one-page statement about the definition of shared governance, its purpose, and general principles related to shared governance. The first two sections of the November Discussion document will serve as a basis for this statement, while also drawing from the principles in the UF 2006 document, pp. 9-10. If consensus is possible only on parts but not all elements (i.e. agreement is clear on a definition but not on other aspects), there is value in identifying those elements on which agreement exists.

**Action #2**: Each constituent group will bring any inventories, maps, or diagrams that describe or otherwise delineate how shared governance processes and workflow happen within that stakeholder group. These will inform a discussion at our next meeting about how to conceive of the more sustained work required in Fall 2012 to create the environmental scan of shared governance on campus, and produce a timeline of future activities necessary to produce a more thorough process and implementation of shared governance.

**Adjournment**: Meeting adjourned at 9:09 AM.