

Minutes for CEPP Meeting February 15

Present: Sandy Baum (Chair), John Brueggemann, Pat Fehling, Frank Gonzalez (minutes), Doug Humphrey, Charles Joseph (Dean), Mike Meguerdichian, Pat Oles, Janet Sorenson, Linda Simon

The meeting began with the approval of minutes for earlier meetings. The question was raised of why the minutes for the meetings last Fall are not on the CEPP web page. This is currently being looking into.

The first major topic of discussion was the operating code. Sandy Baum asked why the code should state that CEPP discussions are confidential when usually they are not: we post our minutes on the web, communicate with colleagues, etc. It was decided that it would be more accurate for the code to state that *some* conversations may be confidential.

The next topic was new faculty lines. Chuck Joseph reported that several groups had already been consulted on this issue, such as President's Staff and Academic Staff. He gave 10-15 as the ball-park figure for the number of new faculty lines needed to meet current and projected needs; the low end of this range would be needed simply to "stop the bleeding." Chuck added that some of these lines may not be completely new positions, but may instead simply involve converting current part-time or adjunct positions into tenure-track lines.

It was agreed that the plan would need to stipulate a specific number of lines and that of these some would be immediate or near-future lines while others would be projected over the next ten years. The question was raised of whether the goal should be an ambitious one. While it was agreed that an ambitious goal is desirable in the plan, it was also agreed that in this case the faculty must be made to understand that such a goal is not a promise.

The issue of costs arose and was discussed for some time. Several of those present expressed the need for clear numbers concerning cost projections if we are to make in an informed way the hard choice between faculty lines and other priorities. The idea was suggested of some kind of table tabulating the relative costs of several options. While Chuck agreed that something like this would be useful, he also suggested that CEPP should not set its goals based only on what it thinks can be afforded.

As for the state of the plan, Chuck reported that a new draft had been completed by the IPC sub-committee (Sandy Baum, Grace Burton, and Mary Crone), with input from himself and the President. This draft will be presented to IPC, and then to Academic Staff and CEPP.

Chuck asked a question regarding the layout of the plan: is a narrative followed by specific goals the most effective way of presenting the argument? The general response was that it might be more effective to incorporate the rationale offered by the narrative into the presentation of the specific goals, rather than have it stand apart at the beginning. It was

suggested that the long preamble to the writing group's plan mainly had the function of addressing the deficiencies in the first draft of the plan and that it might therefore not be necessary in the new draft of the plan. It was asked whether dropping such a narrative was consistent with the faculty's vote last term to approve the writing group's plan. Frank replied that much of the narrative of the writing group's plan contained rationale and that as long as that rationale was worked into the new draft somewhere, the new draft would be consistent with the faculty's vote.

Towards the end of the meeting John Brueggemann raised the issue of new buildings in relation to the scheduling problems faced by the athletics program.