

REVISED REPORT ON THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM AND FACULTY MEETINGS

BY THE TASK FORCE ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE:
(Ralph Ciancio, Chair; Erwin L. Levine; Mary C. Lynn, Secretary;
Darnell Rucker; Joanna Zangrando)

14 March 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE

COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

PART I: THE FACULTY MEETING

PART II: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESTRUCTURING THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

1. Guidelines and Rules Pertaining to Elections, Committee Membership, and Conditions of Service
2. Proposals for Forming Two New Major Committees
3. Committees that Shall be Abolished or Transformed
4. Changes in Committee Functions or Compositions
5. Implementation

* Appendix A: Charge to the Task Force on Faculty Governance

* Appendix B: Committees of the Faculty and their Acronyms

* Appendix C: Changes to the Language of the Function and/or Membership of Committees

In December 1986 the faculty resolved to establish a Task Force on Faculty Governance and charged it with the specific responsibility of examining our committee system and faculty meetings and, if deemed appropriate, proposing changes in one area or the other or in both. This report presents the outcome of that charge: recommendations for restructuring the committee system and for clarifying procedures and conditions bearing on the conduct of our meetings.

A word or two about the overall organization and eccentricities of the report would seem in order. The Preamble briefly recounts the way the Task Force pursued its business and what the faculty might reasonably expect to gain by legislating its recommendations. Those pertaining to faculty meetings appear in Part I, those pertaining to the committee system in Part II. We intend to move each as a unitary package, and separately. Yet, the bulk of the report focuses on the committee system, our examination of it having sparked recommendations for change as extensive as they are complicated. The report resists casual reading, that is also to say. Persons new to the faculty will find especially disconcerting our acronymic references to committees they have scarcely had time to become acquainted with by their full names. Thus, we direct your attention first to the materials appended to the report. They are no substitute for an attentive eye and perseverance, but they at least assemble at one's fingertips all of the external documents germane to understanding the report: a statement of our charge in its entirety (A), an alphabetized list of faculty committees and their acronyms (B), and relevant passages from the Faculty Handbook (C) the language of which our recommendations, if approved, would require amending.

PREAMBLE

Our recommendations reflect in great measure information gleaned from numerous sources, beginning with the written observations and strong opinions of the faculty at large, whose counsel the Task Force solicited early last spring, and with annual reports solicited about the same time from committees that produce and file them. Subsequently we conducted interviews with all of our standing committees as composed in 1986-87, usually meeting with them in their full complement but on occasion with only one or two of their representatives. Detailed accounts of those interviews we duly recorded in writing. We also interviewed CGA officers and the following administrators: President Porter and the late President Palamountain, the Provost, the Dean and Associate Dean of the Faculty, the Vice-President of Business Affairs, the Secretary of the College, the Dean and Associate Dean of Student Affairs, the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, the Registrar, the Directors of Admissions and Financial Aid, and the Director and Assistant Director of the University Without Walls. All the materials mentioned above--responses from the faculty at large, annual reports, the content of our interviews--became the springboard to our deliberations. From the day we began collecting information to the day we distributed this report the Task Force has met 37 times, apart from sessions devoted to interviews.

Part I--the section devoted to the faculty meeting--reflects the character of the questions posited in our charge, which are in the main quite specific, discrete, and blessedly few: they call for no lengthy disquisition. Yet we received only a handful of replies from colleagues who took up the questions in earnest, and only a few of these expressed firm preferences, not all of them the same. Our assessment of faculty opinion yielded no clear consensus, in other words, and our debates yielded no compelling reasons for recommending radical departures from the way we conduct our meetings now--thus the brevity of Part I, which sets forth only a few proposals for modest reforms.

In accordance with our charge, we also considered the relationship of college committees to the administration and to each other, as well as the relationship of CAPTS, CAFR, CEPP, and Financial Planning to the Board of Trustees. We have incorporated our conclusions about committee and administrative relationships in Part II. We have little to report on 'the relationship of key faculty committees to the Board other than to remark that the Board altered the relationship when it reorganized its own committee structure several years ago. The old structure paralleled the faculty committee system in areas of common concern, making communication with the Board relatively simple and direct. The new trustee committees do not correspond to CAPTS, CAFR, CEPP, and Financial Planning. Although the faculty has no prerogatives in this matter, we would urge the President to discuss it with the Board.

From the very start, grappling with the committee system proved to be much more complex. We felt justified in interpreting our charge as a mandate for radical thinking. Thus we entertained for a time the merits of installing a system structured on hierarchical or pyramidal lines peaking with a Faculty Senate, but decided finally that such a configuration is more enticing for its symmetry than it is conducive to realizing Skidmore's immediate and foreseeable needs; and that upon second thought, moreover, this faculty, long accustomed to speaking out as individuals, would hardly be disposed to surrendering its will to a single executive body empowered to make autonomous decisions binding on everyone. We then turned outward. We secured from other colleges' descriptions of their committee systems hoping to discover among them models Skidmore might conceivably adopt to its advantage. None leaped forth, to say the least. What we discovered instead proved somewhat daunting, in some instances downright appalling: many of the colleges we consulted have systems as elaborate and amorphous as our own. That experience turned us inward again, plunging us back into our data bank. Shortly thereafter, in accord with the collective preference of the faculty, we set our minds to overhauling our present committee system -- locating and tossing out worn, superfluous, or malfunctioning parts, realigning others and plugging in new ones--so as to make it both more efficient and effective.

Our recommendations, it follows, do more than tinker with the system. Our aim has been to eliminate needless or excessive faculty involvement, avoid replication of effort, diminish clerical work, and keep administrative

and faculty groups from splintering financial and academic policies, problems, and decisions. To these ends, the recommendations seek to deflate the numerical membership of certain committees, abolish more than a few of them, create a minimal number of new ones, classify as elected or appointed several others, and consolidate or redistribute the functions of several more. We had occasion even to assign new, more apt names to three committees. Part II specifies which committees our recommendations affect. The chart appearing immediately below compresses the overall results, that is, conveys what the system in toto would amount to on paper, though it is not meant to suggest that the results necessarily conduce to a neat schema with leak-proof categories (a hopeless goal the Task Force chased in vain). It should be added that the chart makes no mention of Faculty observers nor reflects the faculty's participation on CGA committees. (Return to the Beginning)

COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

Educational Affairs

CEPP

CURRICULUM

LIBERAL STUDIES (to be dissolved in two years)

UWW

ACC

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT (now Research Grants and Lectures)

CAS

Faculty Governance

CAPTS

CAPTS REVIEW

CAFR

FACULTY GOVERNANCE (now Faculty Council)

College-Wide Concerns

INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING (new)

CO-CURRICULUM POLICY (new)

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

ADMISSIONS

FINANCIAL AID

ATHLETIC COUNCIL

Financial Affairs

COLLEGE BENEFITS

FINANCIAL POLICY AND PLANNING (now Financial Planning)

The chart should arrest the attention of colleagues who have watched with dismay the proliferation of committees over the years: more compact, greatly more manageable, the system envisioned by the Task Force would decrease the number of committees from 36 to 19. One should also be wary of course of quantifying savings in time and energy. Considered by itself, the chart can be deceiving inasmuch as our recommendations would actually expand the current functions of several committees (those of the Curriculum Committee especially) even as it would abolish others, a few of which perform only modest chores and gather together only rarely. However, in the absence of a more accurate measure of efficiency, comparative figures will have to suffice, and they augur appreciable gains in any case, notwithstanding their crude reliability. Perhaps an even more impressive gauge of what our recommendations promise is the number of committee seats, or slots, that must be filled to put the system in gear and keep it humming--now somewhere between 164 and 168 by our count, including 2 Faculty Observers, 6 slots on CGA committees, and the equivalent of 7 more taken up in cross-representation between committees. The new system would require approximately 83 slots--a reduction of roughly 50 percent.

Faculty influence and effective governance being of a piece, the potential hazard in cutting down the number of committees did not escape the Task Force. It seems to us fair to say that, conjuring with both mechanical and inventive means to our end, we have extended and reinforced faculty influence where it counts most. The most obvious examples are the two new major committees we seek to incorporate into the system, the Institutional Planning and the Co-Curricular Policy Committees. Equally important, reflective of a recurring worry among faculty members and administrators alike, our recommendations mandate the presence of more tenured faculty on key committees while allowing space for the integration of the junior faculty. The worry derives from the recent history of elections and committee membership in consequence of which junior faculty members have sometimes had to endure the pressures of premature leadership and the unenviable posture of representing the whole faculty in matters of great academic magnitude.

It is that observation that moves the Task Force, finally, to remark the obvious: the success or failure of faculty governance depends on the spirit underlying and fueling it, a sense of citizenship, the judicious concern of each faculty member for the proper operation of the system as manifested in serving on committees and voting for one's colleagues in the awareness of the specific role of each committee. That service must be weighed thoughtfully, to be sure, in light of one's own career and productivity and continuing growth as a teacher. Still, the point deserves to be stressed: as committee service becomes merely symbolic in the absence of an effective system, faculty members mere laborers in the vineyards rather than true participants in the common purposes of higher education, so the system works best only as persons from every program, every rank, and every stage of longevity bring their diverse perspectives to bear upon the cooperative decisions that shape the activities of the College. Some committees call upon considerable experience, the institutional memory of Skidmore's veterans; others profit from fresh experiences; most need a balance between relative veterans and relative novices.
(Return to the Beginning)

PART I: THE FACULTY MEETING

The faculty has asked the Task Force to examine the faculty meeting with regard to five issues:

1. who shall preside;
2. who shall attend the meeting;
3. who shall vote;

4. when non-voting faculty shall have the privileges of the floor;
5. all procedures and rules used in "legislating."

As part of our examination we carefully read the letters from those few colleagues who addressed themselves to the faculty meeting, explored the faculty governance system of more than a dozen other colleges, and raised the issues listed above in our interviews with administrators. After considerable discussion of our mandate, the Task Force wishes to recommend a few modest reforms.

We believe that the President should continue to preside over the faculty meetings. The most obvious reasons relate to the President's stature and role as the executive head of the College. No one else's leadership could have as strong an impact on the tone of our meeting, or on the collegiality of the institution. To put it another way, exposure to the President nourishes an essential sense of community and confidence in our collective enterprise, and many if not most faculty members come to experience the quality of the President's leadership only by interacting with the President or by observing presidential interactions in the same public forum with representatives from each area of the College. Otherwise, in the nature of things, our contact with the President might well be limited to ceremonial affairs.

We also argue that the President should preside because presiding creates links between the President and the faculty on crucial issues, helping the President to carry the desires and judgment of the faculty to the Board of Trustees whenever the approval of the Board becomes necessary. Were the President deprived of this opportunity to interact with the entire faculty, we would have to establish some other mechanism for communicating our will to the President. We would also be putting ourselves in the position of having to convince him or her in the first place of the "rightness of the faculty's cause," and this might engage the faculty in an unnecessarily adversarial relationship to the President. Therefore, we prefer to see the President take an active leadership role by presiding at the faculty meetings--though all the while observing protocol, of course: before taking part in debate, for example, the President must vacate the chair.

Our deliberations as to who shall attend the meeting focused on past amendments to the Faculty Handbook gradually permitting more and more diverse groups to attend meetings and prompting the perception among some colleagues that our meetings have become affairs with a "cast of thousands." As recently as the 1982-83 Faculty Handbook, attendance at faculty meetings was limited to full-time teachers, ten administrators specified by title (the President, Provost, Dean of the Faculty, Associate Dean of the Faculty, Dean of Student Affairs, Associate Dean of Student Affairs for Academic Advising, Dean of Special Programs, the Registrar, the Director of Admissions, and the Chaplain), librarians, part-time faculty, and staff members invited by the President on a permanent or temporary basis, and any administrator appointed to the faculty by the Board at the recommendation of the President. By the ninth edition of the Handbook, departmental assistants and administrators without faculty rank had been added, increasing considerably the potential number of persons in attendance. When we enquired into the basis for the presence of administrators beyond the ten specified by title, we discovered that those who attend regularly are, in the main, persons the faculty turns to habitually for information, and that other administrators attend meetings only sporadically--when the agenda seems immediately relevant to the informed execution of their responsibilities, say, or when asked to respond to questions or to make announcements on the faculty floor. We have also been led to believe that most administrators who attend our meetings do so at the invitation of their supervisors. This strikes the Task Force as according perFECTly with our procedures. We suggest, however, that the Dean of the Faculty make a stronger effort to establish the agenda for each faculty meeting several days in advance, and to distribute that agenda at least one day in advance of the meeting. Thereby administrators could know if an item relevant to their particular concerns was likely to be discussed at the meeting, and the faculty could come to meetings prepared for the business at hand.

Perhaps the greater number of administrators now attending faculty meetings has fed the mistaken perception that administrators with the right to vote have also increased in number--who shall vote being the third item the faculty asked us to consider. The Task Force found, to the contrary, that the ten administrators listed in the

1982-83 Faculty Handbook as having faculty status, including the vote, are the same ten cited in the 1986, or ninth, edition: there have been no additions to this list. The only persons who may vote at faculty meetings are full-time members of the teaching faculty, the librarians, and the ten administrators specified in the Faculty Handbook. And since the 1982-83 version reflects the status quo dating back to 1978-79, at least in terms of numbers, it can be fairly said that the list of "eligibles" among administrators has not increased in nine years. What is more, the Task Force learned during its interviews that among administrators eligible to vote, a few actually choose not to do so, "out of respect for the faculty." Thus, the perception that administrative votes have grown appreciably is scarcely true. We advise that the vote at faculty meetings continue to be exercised by members of the full-time teaching faculty, librarians, and those ten administrators already defined as faculty of the College.

The number of administrators with voting power is one thing. Who shall determine which administrators have faculty status is quite another. Hence the Task Force proposes altering the language identifying the voting faculty in both the ninth and the 1982-83 editions of the Faculty Handbook (p. 42 and p. 1, respectively), in particular the statement which permits the Board of Trustees to appoint to the faculty any administrative officer the Board desires, upon the President's request. Though we have been informed that this privilege has never been exercised, the statement exercises some of our colleagues who are chary of the faculty's prerogatives. We recommend that the statement be modified so that it reads as follows: "and such other administrative officers as may be appointed to the Faculty by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the Faculty in consultation with the President."

The fourth item in our charge, the issue of when the non-voting faculty should have the privilege of the floor, involves an interesting question of terminology. The non-voting faculty, strictly defined, includes part-time faculty and departmental assistants. Surely, these members of our community should have access to the floor. But we suspect that those colleagues who drafted our charge had in mind a somewhat broader definition of the faculty, and meant here to include administrators who do not have the vote. Again, the Task Force has taken a liberal position: it seems to us that persons attending faculty meetings, as long as they observe the rules of meetings, should have the privilege of the floor, even if they cannot vote.

Finally, the last item in our charge concerning the faculty meeting has to do with the procedures and rules to be used in legislating. Except that 20 percent of the faculty shall constitute a quorum, this faculty's rules are contained in Robert's Rules of order, and in the Faculty Handbook. Copies of both documents need to be made available to every faculty member. We were discouraged during our deliberations by the length of time it has taken us to come up with a current edition of the Faculty Handbook and by the errors and omissions we found in the ninth "edition. (Return to the Beginning)

PART II: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESTRUCTURING THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Recommendations in this section are categorized as follows: (A) general guidelines and rules pertaining to elections, committee membership, and conditions of service; (B) proposals for forming two new major committees; (C) proposals for abolishing or transforming committees; (D) changes in committee functions and/or membership; and (E) implementation.

A. Guidelines and Rules Pertaining to Elections, Committee Membership, and Conditions of Service

1. Faculty should serve on committees for staggered terms.
2. On general principle cross-representation between committees should be eschewed, though in some instances it has proved to be efficacious and in very rare instances may even be indispensable.

All current cross-representation is to be eliminated.

3. The omnibus ballot should be circulated after all elections have been completed, and the election schedule should allow ample time for its circulation before the end of the year.
4. Special elections should be held for replacements on major committees, such as CAPTS, CAFR, CEPP, and Financial Planning, and efforts made to ensure, when possible, that replacements will have had previous experience on those committees.
5. A junior faculty member who receives tenure while sitting on a committee requiring the presence of one or more tenured faculty shall be counted as one of its tenured members in the next election.
6. All committees should have operating codes and, together with the latest annual report, make them available to new committee members at the beginning of the academic year; and except for committees receiving confidential materials, all should maintain easily accessible files of minutes, which new members are encouraged to read.
7. All committees have the discretion to appoint to their own subcommittees members of the faculty at large, students, or administrators, but all are encouraged to consult the Committee on Faculty Governance beforehand, and all, in any case, must apprise CFG of such appointments.
8. A half-time faculty secretary shall be employed to alleviate the burden of clerical work on all committees but especially that of CAPTS and the Committee on Faculty Governance, and shall be housed in the Dean of the Faculty's office.
9. Contingent upon departmental needs, persons chairing CAPTS, the Curriculum Committee, and CEPP shall have reduced teaching loads. (Return to the Beginning)

B. Proposals for Forming Two New Major Committees

1. The Co-Curricular Policy Committee, chaired by the President, shall be concerned with the cultural and intellectual atmosphere on campus, with co-curricular and recreational activities, and with broader issues having campus-wide, national, and international import. It shall function as a forum for exploring and elevating the quality of life at Skidmore and will set policy for the co-curriculum and for the shaping and scheduling of extracurricular events.

Membership: The President, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Dean of the Faculty, the CGA President, the CGA Vice-President for Co-Curricular Affairs, the Director of Minority and International Students, and three elected faculty members for staggered three-year terms (two tenured, one untenured). If necessary, or if deemed appropriate, the committee shall convene other administrative officers. The Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, the Director of College Events, and the Director of Community Education and Summer Conferences shall serve as the staff of this committee.

Rationale: Just as we have a committee devoted to educational planning and policy, so it behooves the faculty to support a committee devoted to co-curricular planning and policy in recognition of the importance of co-curricular experiences in students' lives and the classroom benefits to be derived from nourishing a rich cultural and intellectual community. In addition to its serving some of the functions Community Council covered in its heyday, we would expect C-CPC to bring to the entire community's attention ethical, social, and political issues that periodically need to be addressed and that indeed periodically threaten to fracture the community--to serve as both catalyst and forum, as both goad and haven. More pressing still, we need to focus the diverse and bountiful activities of the college and the energies of persons and departments responsible for them--athletic events, exhibits, lectures, conferences, concerts, films, and theatrical productions that fill the Skidmore calendar to overflowing. As the calendar takes shape now, many members of the community are torn between conflicting possibilities, between equally attractive events scheduled at the same hour, many of which go unattended in

consequence, even premier events, much to the embarrassment of guest lecturers or performers and their sponsors. In brief, as the hub of informed scheduling and collaborative programming, C-CPC would serve all of us in good stead. The Task Force believes that having the President chair this committee is one of the keys to its success--an appropriate way of acknowledging the President's critical role in generating a lively cultural and intellectual atmosphere and of demonstrating a commitment to Integrating the curricular and co-curricular life of the College. As broader, more sensitive issues arise and must be confronted, such as investment in South Africa, the President can be a potent moral force in this important area, but needs to be in a position to exert leadership, and this of course the President can do if ensconced as Chair of C-CPC.

2. The Institutional Planning Committee, chaired by the President, shall engage in strategic, tactical, and environmental planning for educational, financial, and co-curricular affairs.

Membership: The President, the Provost, the Vice-President for Business Affairs, Chairs of CEPP, Financial Policy Committee, and a faculty representative from C-CPC, two additional faculty members (to be elected), one of whom is tenured, the other not, two students chosen by CGA, the President of CGA, and the Director of institutional Research as the staff of this committee. Since it would be helpful to keep intact the institutional memory of the committee among faculty members, the two elected ones will serve staggered four-year terms.

Rationale: We now have a committee dedicated solely to educational planning, and another dedicated solely to financial planning; we have a task force on long-range planning, and have had, until recently, an Institutional Planning Group (Group, not Committee). Yet most observers of the college agree that lack of planning has been and continues to be one of our major weaknesses as an institution, so that too often we find ourselves pitched back on our heels and reacting to change instead of anticipating it. The diversity of planning groups has also often resulted in fragmentation: educational plans being formulated without sufficient attention to financial issues, on the one hand, and financial plans being formulated without thought to their co-curricular or educational implications, on the other hand. The artificial separation of long- and short-term planning has made long-term plans either impossible or so vague as to be meaningless, whereas short-term plans tend to turn inward, without eyes for the larger context of institutional goals.

We propose to centralize planning in one important Institutional Planning Committee, and to seat representatives from three main policy committees (CEPP, C-CPC, and FPC) on it. The new committee will engage in both short- and long-term planning, and will do so with the interests of all three areas--educational, co-curricular, and financial--in mind. Although IPC will not make financial, co-curricular, or educational policy, it will provide a forum for timely discussions of policy, discussions which will recognize and enforce the impact of each policy area upon the others. In the language of CLRP's last annual report, such a new committee would not only command the information and resources to formulate strategic plans; it would also have a "heightened" perspective of the College's needs and the instrumentalities necessary to achieve them. It is also worth remarking that IPC would continue the work of the Commission on the '90s, which intends to produce a "white paper" that could lift IPC off the ground even as the commission expires.

It also seems to us self-evident that space allocation and issues bearing on campus environment must be looked upon as an integral parts of institutional planning, and not merely as isolated stages to be taken up any time during or at either end of the planning process. We therefore recommend that IPC appoint a subcommittee which will subsume the combined obligations of the Campus Environment Committee and the Space Task Force. The subcommittee chair shall be one of the faculty members elected to IPC, and shall appoint to the subcommittee another faculty member, from the Biology or Geology or Chemistry and Physics Departments, for his or her environmental expertise. (Return to the Beginning)

C. Committees that Shall be Abolished or Transformed

Standing faculty and CGA committees falling into this category conveniently subdivide as follows: (1) those that shall be eliminated entirely; (2) those whose present role and/or functions shall be subsumed by other committees; and (3) those that shall be converted into subcommittees.

1. COMMITTEES TO BE ELIMINATED ENTIRELY

- a. Committee on Academic Prizes and Fellowships: Criteria for new academic prizes having been established, it no longer seems necessary to have a formal committee to evaluate such prizes. If a new prize is proposed, CEPP can simply review the proposal to make sure it conforms to the criteria now in place. Helping students secure graduate fellowships seems to us best accomplished by having the Associate Dean of Student Affairs for Academic Advising appoint specific faculty members with relevant interests and experience as "Fulbright advisor," etc., or by relying on Academic Advising to continue maintaining files of Information and to track applications. Obviously, all departments should have some mechanism for advising students considering graduate study, and we already have pre-law and pre-med advisors. We do not really need another committee to do this.
- b. The Health Professions Advisory Committee and the Teacher Education Coordinating Committee: Judging from their infrequent meetings and their narrowly restricted duties, these committees do not need to be regular faculty committees. HPAC can function as an interdepartmental committee, chaired and assembled as needed by the Chair of Biology or of Chemistry and Physics. The Dean of the Faculty shall chair and assemble TECC when necessary for altering teacher education programs.
- c. Performing Arts Committee: In December 1987 PAC met for the first-time in a year and a half, only to learn that it has no budget for 1988-89, and its budget has been its raison d'etre. The Task Force champions its purpose but not its existence; it makes more sense to us, and also to the Dean of the Faculty, to tap into the College Lectures Budget and allocate monies directly to the four or five departments responsible for bringing performing artists to campus.
- d. Religious Life Committee: It seems pointless to maintain a committee that, beyond a pro forma gathering at the beginning of the academic year, has had no occasion to meet since 1975. Instead, the Chaplain shall have access to the Co-Curricular Policy Committee, a singularly congenial assembly for addressing emergencies or, if need be, bringing to our attention problems bearing on the religious life of the community.
- e. Honor Code Commission: Many faculty members believe that honor code would be more effective were students to assume full responsibility for the operation of the system. We suggest just that -- turning the system over to the students and encouraging them either to design an effective mechanism for an honor code or to abandon the code entirely.
- f. Library Committee: The faculty stands more to gain by permitting librarians to make decisions on their own in areas calling for expertise in the field than by sitting on a committee that chiefly reacts to the Head Librarian's initiatives. Brought together almost randomly, having no special knowledge in library administration except perhaps by happenstance, faculty members have little advice to offer librarians toward conceiving and realizing nuts-and-bolts plans for redesigning space, say, or expanding library facilities. Some such matters should go before the Institutional Planning Committee to begin with, once that committee is in place; and larger questions of policy should go to CEPP. This is not to overlook the faculty's vested interest in joining forces with the library staff toward building up acquisitions. In the Task Force's view, a more enlightened and direct way of satisfying that interest is to appoint liaisons to the library along lines paralleling departmental liaisons now plugged into and drawing upon computer services--that is, to appoint a colleague who shall be responsible for keeping abreast of acquisitions and of apprising the library staff of his or her department's shifting or projected needs as they develop. What is more, the present structure of assignments among reference librarians--each oversees the needs of a specific group of departments--lends itself happily to routinizing meetings with departmental liaisons by way of ensuring a continued high level of service.

g. Orientation Committee: In effect this committee no longer exists, though it remains on our roster. The Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and staff are willing to handle Skidmore's orientation program on their own, and have already showed they are perFEtly capable of doing so.

2. COMMITTEES WHOSE FUNCTIONS SHALL BE SUBSUMED BY OTHER COMMITTEES

- a. College Events Committee: The functions now carried out by CEC shall become the responsibilities of the new Co-Curricular Policy Committee, on which the Director of College Events (as part of the staff) shall sit.
- b. Committee on Long-Range Planning: on the testimony of annual reports, CLRP has largely been "spinning wheels" over the years, in its 1985 incarnation no less than in its original form. Obliquely we have attempted to explain why above, in our rationale for creating a new Institutional Planning Committee: long-range planning is difficult to define, owing to its relatively abstract vagaries, and even more difficult to sustain in face of short-term exigencies; and the simultaneous yet independent existence of the Institutional Planning Group, an administrative body which, having more authority in final, overall college planning, has subtracted from CLRP's role as an initiator of plans. Combining forces, so to speak, the new Institutional Planning Committee will replace both CLRP and IPG and ensure faculty representation at the highest level of strategic planning.
- c. Community Council: By all accounts--that of faculty members, administrators, and students alike--Community Council in recent years has spent its time on pets and parking, unable, for various good reasons, to address itself to more meaningful pursuits. Hoping to revive it under the aegis of the Co-Curricular Policy Committee, we will move a constitutional amendment to replace it, an idea we have discussed with CGA officers.
- d. Programs Abroad Committee: This most recent addition to the community system originated, in part, because of the different standards being applied to students seeking admission to Skidmore and non-Skidmore programs abroad. One of its main goals has been to arrive at some sort of uniform standard, to ensure equity as well as to preserve the strengths and uniqueness of our own programs abroad. That should be accomplished soon, or in any case before the new committee system could be inaugurated. The other major function of this committee is to have oversight over the courses of study offered abroad, a function the Curriculum Committee can perform. Thus we propose to continue PAC until it has established a uniform standard, and then "sunset it," shifting Its functions to the Curriculum Committee.
- e. Schedule and Calendar Committee: SCC's tasks will be divided between two committees, CEPP and the new Co-Curricular Policy Committee. CEPP will delegate a representative to design the calendar, in consultation with the Registrar and the Dean of Special Programs, and bring it back to the full committee for further refining before CEPP presents It to the faculty as a whole. C-CPC will be in a happy position to schedule events on campus since it will be staffed by the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs as well as by the Director of College Events.

3. COMMITTEES THAT SHALL BE CONVERTED INTO SUBCOMMITTEES

- a. Campus Environment Committee and Space Task Force: The important functions executed by these two committees will become the responsibility of the institutional Planning Committee, as indicated above. Their functions are to be fused, the two committees becoming a single subcommittee of IPC, the right home for them inasmuch as IPC will represent, appropriately, all the constituencies of the College. Moreover, the merger will strengthen the faculty's hand: now on its own, operating independently, the Campus Environment Committee, repeatedly ignored or circumvented, has suffered one frustration after another. By integrating environmental issues into the responsibilities of IPC, we expect that those issues will receive the consideration they deserve.
- b. Self-Determined Majors Committee: S-DMC shall become a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee, which as the authority at the college level on majors and minors is singularly prepared to shepherd students with

self-determined majors through a regimen of studies. CC shall make certain that one of its elected members will chair this subcommittee, and that it will consist of other appointed members whose disciplines differ. Ideally, their disciplines should also be wide-ranging. (Return to the Beginning)

D. Changes in Committee Functions or Compositions

1. Affirmative Action Committee

Proposal: Membership

The following description of membership shall replace the current description.

Two members of the faculty, two students, two administrators, and two members of the support staff, to be appointed by the President for two-year terms. Normally a committee member may serve only two successive terms.

Rationale:

This change is intended to balance representation among segments of the College and to streamline the committee for easier functioning.

2. Athletic Council

Proposal: Function

The phrase "to the Co-Curricular Policy Committee" shall be substituted for "to the Athletic Director and, through the Athletic Director to the President ,..." in the description of Athletic Council's functions.

Rationale:

The new Co-Curricular Policy Committee is to be charged with policy oversight of all co-curricular activities.

3. Animal Care Committee

Membership:

This committee is mandated by New York State. Since it has little business and applies to only two departments, the Dean of the Faculty shall chair and be responsible for assembling the committee in accordance with the law.

4. Committee on Academic Standing

Proposal: Membership

The following addition to the description of membership is to be inserted between "the CAFR," and "appointed... ":

and at least one of whom is tenured.

Rationale:

The decisions made by CAS often affect the lives of students in important respects. Therefore, it seems advisable that an experienced faculty perspective be available in such cases.

5. Committee on Appointments, Promotions, Tenure, and Sabbaticals

Proposal: Functions

The first sentences describing CAPTS' functions shall be revised as follows:

To represent the faculty on administrative appointments and reviews and on faculty appointments, promotions, tenure, sabbaticals, and termination of service, and to make recommendations on these matters to the appropriate administrative officer. The administration shall consult CAPTS to determine which administrative personnel decisions the committee judges to require faculty representation.

Rationale:

The present system for reviewing major administrators was worked out by CAPTS in conjunction with administrative officers. The present description does not make reference to administrative reviews (nor does it coincide with what CAPTS actually does). Also, CAPTS has been called upon to interview a growing number of candidates for administrative appointment. It is the sense of the recent members of the committee that the administration should consult with CAPTS in advance to determine which appointments the committee should be involved in.

6. Committee on Educational Policy and Planning

Proposal: Functions

The following sentences shall be inserted in the description of functions between "practices and goals." and "CEPP meets...": CEPP shall exchange minutes of meetings with the Admissions Committee, Curriculum Committee, and the UWW Committee; and the chairs of any of these committees may be invited to sit or request to sit with CEPP when consultation is desirable. The chair of CEPP also shall sit on the Institutional Planning Committee.

Membership

The following description of membership shall replace the current description:

Six faculty members, each from a different department, elected to serve three-year terms, two of whom must be tenured; the Provost, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, and two students selected by CGA. CEPP may appoint such subcommittees from among its members or from the College community at large as it deems helpful to facilitate its work.

Rationale:

The aim here is to eliminate cross-representation between CEPP and the Admissions and the Curriculum Committees and CEPP's participation on the UWW committee. The burden of serving on CEPP itself has been quite heavy, and the required attendance of some CEPP members on other active committees has measurably increased that burden. Communication with closely related committees can be achieved by exchanging minutes and by conversing with committee chairs when needed. On the other hand, the representation of CEPP by its chair on the institutional Planning Committee seems an obvious need for the proper functioning of that body. Problems arising over sensitive issues when CEPP was composed entirely of untenured faculty have prompted

the revision in membership. It seems wise to institute a formal requirement for tenured members on this vitally important committee, even though more tenured faculty have been running for CEPP in recent years.

7. Committee on Faculty Governance

Proposal:

That the name of Faculty Council be changed to the Committee on Faculty Governance.

Functions

The following description of functions shall replace the current description: To act as a committee on committees for the faculty, coordinating committee work and promoting cooperation among members of the college community; to conduct nominations and elections for and make appointments to faculty committees; to oversee faculty appointments to administrative and trustee committees; to keep up-to-date a survey of the distribution of faculty members on all committees with the purpose of furthering democratic representation and committee efficiency; to encourage faculty to run for committees when there is a shortfall of candidates; to convene the Committee of Committees (CAFR, CAPTS, CEPP, the Curriculum Committee, Co-Curricular Policy, CFG, Financial Policy, and IPC) at least three times a year to discuss ongoing issues and any special problems in committee operations; to review operating codes of all faculty committees, maintain files of annual committee reports, supervise the orientation of new committee members, and otherwise administer the faculty governance system; to act as faculty watchdog in seeing that the language of the Faculty Handbook appears precisely as it was approved by the faculty and that the language thereafter remains intact.

Membership

The following description of membership shall replace the current description: Six faculty members elected to serve three-year terms, at least two of whom are tenured and all of whom have had experience on one of the committees Included in the Committee of Committees.

Rationale:

It is envisioned that this committee will replace the Task Force on Faculty Governance. The new name is more descriptive of the functions of the committee than is the present name. The more extensive description of functions spells out the tasks involved in overseeing the entire faculty governance system and relieves the committee of the burden of rewriting The Faculty Handbook and of entering new legislation into it, although retaining its responsibility as guardian of the Handbook.

The Dean of the Faculty has agreed to supply CFG with secretarial help for the burdensome work of running elections and maintaining files in view of which it becomes feasible to reduce the size of the committee for more efficient operation. And with the extensive governance responsibilities of this committee, it seems advisable that its members bring some committee experience with them, and hence the need to include two tenured members.

8. Curriculum Committee

Proposal: Functions

The following description of functions shall replace the current description:

To act for the faculty in reviewing curricular matters including those which implement educational policy concerning all-college requirements; to generate recommendations concerning immediate and long-range

curricular matters; to administer the self-determined majors program; to make recommendations to the faculty concerning other curriculum matters brought before it by the faculty, students, and the administration.

Membership

The following membership description shall replace the current description: Six faculty members, each from a different department, at least two of whom are tenured, elected to serve three-year terms; the Associate Dean of the Faculty; and two students selected by CGA. Non-voting members of the committee are the Registrar and the Associate Dean of Student Affairs. An elected member of the committee shall chair a self-determined majors subcommittee, composed of other members appointed by the Curriculum Committee to represent a reasonable range of academic disciplines.

Rationale:

The description of functions has been restored to the general charge stated in the 1982-83 Faculty Handbook, which lost a crucial phrase in the transition to the ninth edition, whose language would restrict the committee to reviewing only those curricular matters concerned with all-college requirements. The new language restores the committee's power to act for the faculty iii reviewing other curricular matters, such as new courses, major and minor requirements, etc. In addition, the self-determined majors program has been brought under the authority of the committee.

The presence of more experienced faculty on this committee has been a felt need for a number of years; hence the requirement of at least two tenured members. Cross-representation on other committees now required is seen by many members as an unnecessary additional burden for one of our busiest faculty committees, particularly as information from other committees can be readily had by exchanging minutes and the chairs of the Curriculum Committee and CEPP may confer on matters of mutual interest as they see fit.

9. Faculty Development Committee

Proposal:

That the name of the Research Grants and Lectures Committee be changed to the Faculty Development Committee, in keeping with the following descriptions of functions and membership:

Functions

To advise the Dean of the Faculty an faculty development policies; to initiate ideas for faculty growth and improvement, including programs to support both scholarly and professional activity and the improvement of teaching; to allocate such research funds as the Dean shall designate for committee decision; and to select the annual Edwin M. Moseley Faculty Research Lecturer.

Membership

The Associate Dean of the Faculty; four faculty members, two of whom are tenured and two untenured, one each from the areas of the humanities, the natural sciences, the professional programs, and the social sciences each member to be appointed for two-year terms.

Rationale:

There is a growing sense in the College of the importance of faculty development, as evidenced by programs now being implemented or considered--sabbaticals for junior faculty, new kinds of support for research and

creative work, faculty exchanges, opportunities for enhancing one's teaching effectiveness. The Research Grants and Lectures Committee, under a new name, seems the obvious group to promote and oversee the institution of such programs.

10. Financial Policy and Planning Committee

Proposal:

That the name of the Financial Planning Committee be changed to the Financial Policy and Planning Committee.

Membership

The following description of membership shall replace the current description: Four faculty members, at least two of whom are tenured, elected to serve four-year terms; two students selected by CGA; the Provost; and the Vice President for Business Affairs.

Rationale:

The proposed name reflects the felt need of the faculty to be involved in ongoing policy decisions on financial matters in addition to planning. The planning stage of our collective enterprise will preoccupy faculty on the new institutional Planning Committee. The purpose in changing the composition of the committee is to strengthen the voice of the faculty on this important committee.

11. Institutional Review Board

Membership:

This committee also is mandated by New York State. Like ACC, it has narrow functions that do not affect the college as a whole. The Dean of the Faculty shall chair and assemble the committee in accordance with state requirements.

12. Liberal Studies Committee

Proposal:

That the Liberal Studies Committee be dissolved two years after the implementation of the new governance system. The Curriculum Committee then will assume the responsibility for reviewing new course proposals and other reforms in Liberal Studies as it does now for the rest of the curriculum.

Membership

The following description of membership shall replace the current description for the remaining two years:

Three faculty members, each representing a different category in the Liberal Studies sequence (LS 11, III, or IV), appointed annually by the faculty who will teach in that category in the next academic year or who have taught in that category in the current academic year; two additional members from the faculty at large appointed by CFG for two-year terms; two students selected by CGA for one-year terms; the Associate Dean of the Faculty; the Associate Dean of Student Affairs; the Director of Liberal Studies and the Coordinator of Liberal Studies I; The representatives of LS 11, 111, and IV serve also as coordinators of their respective categories.

Rationale:

The Liberal Studies Program will be well established within two or three more years, at which time it seems fitting that it fall under the all-college review procedures of the Curriculum committee. The appointment of faculty members to this committee during its final two years seems the simplest method to ensure balanced representation.

13. University Without Walls Committee

Proposal: Membership

The following description of membership shall replace the current description:

Six faculty members elected to serve two-year terms; the Dean of Special Programs; and the Director and Academic Advisors of UWW.

Rationale:

The UWW Committee now consists of four cross-representatives and four elected faculty members. Since cross-representation from other committees is to be eliminated in order to reduce the workloads of members of busy committees, it seems advisable to add two elected faculty members, for a total of six. The chairs of CEPP and the Curriculum Committee may be consulted by directors of the UWW Committee or may be invited to attend UWW meetings when necessary. (Return to the Beginning)

E. Implementation

Given the extensiveness of our recommendations, not to mention their interconnections, it is obvious that the new committee system could not be implemented before the 1989-90 academic year. Toward effecting the most expeditious transition, we propose that Faculty Council conduct an election this spring to establish by the end of the semester the first Committee on Faculty Governance. The newly elected members of that committee will work with the six members who will remain on Faculty Council during the 1988-1989 academic year to oversee the functioning of our current system of governance and to fashion a timetable for soliciting nominations, conducting elections, and making appointments to committees by the end of the 1989 spring semester. We recognize of course that present members of Faculty Council may be elected to the Committee on Faculty Governance and thus serve a dual role. (Return to the Beginning)