

IPPC

The committee has been functioning smoothly, though its agenda is ambitious, and hence many specific bi-weekly agendas are not completed. The linkage with FEC needs work. The committee has been working on the Strategic Action Agenda, which has eaten up as much time this semester as did the Strategic Plan last year. It is a large, unwieldy committee, whose meetings seem to consist of one and a half hours of updating. Many members of the President's cabinet sit on it, and as a result, they come already familiar with, and more knowledgeable about, the items on the agenda. This means that the President often asks faculty and students for input on specific items, but often such input seems to be sought after the decisions have in fact been made. Documents come a few days before hand, and then, in the midst of a busy semester, with classes to teach and other committee service, faculty do not have the time to devote to a serious examination of them. Perhaps the committee will find a way to use its subcommittees more efficiently, and these will begin reporting back regularly to the committee.

Alternatively, perhaps the committee's size could be cut. Are all who sit on the committee as necessary, as either CFG or the President seemed to think, to the functioning of such a committee? Perhaps some members could instead come on an invitational basis.

CAPT

Any year that there is no disagreement between the President and the Committee is a good year. For the first time, CAPT is meeting with the President, Chuck, and Muriel on tenure decisions. This is owing to the transition to the new administrative structure, and to the introduction of the new DOF. Next year, it will be Muriel taking the lead. It appears that that transition will be seamless.

The Handbook revisions were the toughest and most contentious issues this fall for CAPT.

CAPT is having open meetings with faculty who will be going up either for tenure or for promotion, to describe the process, and this has been very successful.

In the spring, CAPT will be focusing much of its attention on the question of interdisciplinary hires, and hopes to have a proposal for revision of the Handbook on this. The goal will be to have a global change, but it may just be a sectional change. CAPT will consider having an open forum on this.

CAPT has also been playing a role in the deliberations over the appointment of the new Associate Dean, discussing individual names with Muriel as they come up. CAPT also anticipates working with Muriel on the selection of a permanent Dean of Studies.

Finally, CAPT has formed a committee for the review of the VPAA. Members of the committee are Mary Crone and Mark Hofmann. CAPT was asked to ensure that this committee review both individual performance and the office(s). The committee members names were forwarded to the President over a month ago, but he has not contacted either of them yet.

CAFR

The committee has been running smoothly. There have, however, been a few instances of members of the administration submitting to the Committee documents—pieces of legislation—and it was unclear just what was expected from the committee: Vetting? Approval? Consultation? Two such cases illustrate the problem. First, DoSA Pat Oles asked CAFR to review changes to the Integrity Board and Appeals Board descriptions. He provided no context for the request, and it was only because a member of CAFR happens to sit on FEC that the committee had any idea of what action was expected from CAFR. Second, the committee was asked to comment on a pq form for Human Resources, with no context. In both cases, subsequent e-mails suggested that the announcements that the committee had received constituted consultation with, or even approval by, the committee, in the eyes of the administrators in question.

It was remarked that this problem relates to the problem attending last year's DOS/DoSA split. What constitutes genuine consultation? This appears to be a recurring problem especially with the DoSA. When he visited FEC

this fall, the committee tried to impress upon him the importance of going through committees, and not relying, as he says he has done in the past, on the VPAA or DOF to do this.

CEPP

Relations between CEPP and the administration have been cordial. However, having both the VPAA and the DoSA at CEPP meetings when the committee was discussing what to do about the DOS/DoSA split, which they had orchestrated, was a very difficult matter. It caused some consultation with FEC about whether there was anything in CEPP's operating code suggesting that it could conduct its business, when necessary, without administrators present. There is not, but perhaps CEPP should consider whether there should be, in cases where administrators should recuse themselves and do not do so.

CEPP has managed to achieve a lot, nonetheless, on the issue of the DoSA/DOS split.

The most serious issue at the moment is that CEPP has three administrators on it, as was agreed to last year, and now one of them---either Chuck or Muriel---has to leave the committee, but each believes that the other should serve on CEPP. The committee itself is of two minds about it, and will be seeking advice from FEC at FEC's meeting of December 16.

It was pointed out that there is tremendous advantage to having Special Programs now under Academic Affairs, and that Special Programs, in its wish for greater legitimacy, welcomes the change. Much of what Special Programs has done has been, to be sure, done with a greater freedom than it has now, but having its programs vetted by faculty committees like CEPP and Curriculum Committee is good for Special Programs and good for the College. There will, however, be some adjustments required on all sides. For example, Special Programs is a "for profit" office, and this will have to be considered.

Curriculum Committee

The committee has been busy especially with the restructuring of the majors in Geosciences and in English. The committee has also come to see a need to write up, for its operating code, procedures for the function, membership, selection, term of office, etc. of its Self Determined Majors subcommittee. It will be doing so in the spring.

The committee has also had a number of inquiries from the Office of International Programs (OIP) and Special Programs, and it is not yet clear what needs to go through the committee and what does not. With Summer Programs, submission of course proposals has hitherto been more or less on a voluntary basis. This is something the committee may need to discuss with DoSP Paula Newberg; the committee will consider inviting her next semester.

Finally, the committee is anticipating a return to its normal membership when the new Associate Dean is named. At present, Michael Ennis McMillan is sitting in for Sarah Goodwin, whose office has been swamped since last spring, and Michael has served well in that capacity.

Faculty Development Committee

It has been a difficult year of transition for the committee, since most of its members left. Concern about the continuity of the committee is magnified by the change in the College's administrative structure; some of the committee's issues are getting lost in the shuffle of administrative transition, which has seen John Brueggemann and Chris McGill replaced by Sarah Goodwin and Jennifer Narkiewicz as the administrative personnel responsible for working with FDC. Sarah's many duties, too, especially with Middle States, have made it difficult for her to give FDC priority. The concern about continuity has been addressed partially by the change from two-year to three-year terms on the committee, and the chair has expressed a willingness to serve for another three-year term, and will run in the spring election.

The committee worked hard last year on the Dean's Fellowship proposal, i.e., the 80% sabbatical proposal. But while the committee has submitted the proposal to the administration, and has had a meeting with Mike Hall, there has been no word from the President on where the proposal stands at this time.

There is a financial crunch, too, with the Tang Fund. The Fund was set up as a short-term fund financed through President's Discretionary Funds. The Fund was budgeted by former President Studley for four years, but there has been no money in that fund for the past two years. In the previous few years Major Completion Grants were not applied for at the rate they are now, so FDC was able to use some of the Major Completion Grant monies when a grant proposal was made for the Tang Fund. We cannot do so this year. There is only \$30,000 available for Major Project Completion grants, and there are far more proposals than we can fund. Sue Blair has in the past done excellent work for FDC in manipulating the budget so that money can be used where it is most in demand, but the President's Discretionary Fund has not provided adequate funds.

This raises some significant concerns. With rollback in faculty benefits, faculty had been told that this was the place---with major project completion grants, PDF grants, and the increased sabbatical support---that faculty would be able to find funding. The committee cannot recommend projects to the DOF if the funding is not there.

Athletics Council

Athletics Council was invited to the C of C meeting owing to concerns expressed to FEC about the role that it might need to assume now that the Athletics Program has been moved out of an academic department, and out of Academic Affairs to Student Affairs. What will be the interface between Athletics and Academic Affairs? How will new courses, which in the past were approved by CEPP, now be approved? How and by whom will the people who are teaching credit-bearing courses be assessed? The new HR designation of the teachers of these courses is "Academic Professionals." They are now reporting to the Athletic Director and she in turn to the Dean of Student Affairs. Where is the academic oversight of these courses?

And what is the academic oversight of coaches? New Athletic Director Gail Cummings-Danson stepped up well when a conflict came to light between a scheduled game and the First Year student orientation, but the issue goes beyond FYE, to all of our coaches' approach to athletics and academics. The Council has asked Gail to come up with a policy on the matter. In addition, CEPP has now charged a new subcommittee, a physical activities subcommittee, whose membership will shortly be forwarded to FEC, to consider grading options, credit bearing options, etc. One of the issues raised so far is that the previous two athletic directors had faculty status, while Gail does not.

It was noted that these concerns about establishing the right relationship between athletics and academics follow out of another, earlier concern: the move of Athletics from Academic Affairs to Student Affairs was done without sufficient faculty consultation, though there are clearly educational policy matters involved. FEC learned this past October that last year's chair of AC was informed, in a meeting with the President at the beginning of December 2004, that the President was making the move. It was the opinion of last year's chair that while the President listened to concerns raised at that meeting, he had already made up his mind at that time to make the move; the meeting was informational rather than a consultation with one of the appropriate faculty committees that should have been consulted. (AC did discuss the move subsequently, in the spring semester.) The move appears, moreover, to have been made for administrative reasons (i.e., there was a need to make room in Academic Affairs for Special Programs) rather than with a fully informed view of its educational policy ramifications.

FEC is asked to look into the question of administrative failure to consult sufficiently with the appropriate committees in this move.

Short Term Programs/Advising Council to International Study/Advisory Council to FYE /Culture-Centered Inquiry Taskforce (Ad hoc committees invited to C of C)

Short Term Programs

There is an inherent tension between Special Programs and the Office of International Programs (OIP). The latter oversees programs that run from September to May. But some of Special Programs offerings now include

international components that run over this time frame, and OIP has not been notified of them. This raises the general question of what the role of Special Programs is in academic affairs.

Advisory Council to International Study

This subcommittee of CEPP serves to provide advice to OIP. The recommendation of CEPP is likely to be that it become a standing committee, serving in much the same way that Honors Council now serves the Honors Forum.

FYE Subcommittee on Proposals

This group of three faculty members has been vetting First Year Seminars before sending them to the Curriculum Committee for approval. It is anticipated that, once the second round of proposals for FY Seminars has been approved, the Advisory Council will be dissolved.

Advisory Council to FYE

The committee serves an important function; it includes 16 to 18 people, including Admissions, Registrar's Office, HEOP, Advancement, DOS, four faculty representatives, etc.

There has been a disagreement between the administrators of the HEOP program, and the Dean of the Faculty and the Director of the FYE. HEOP is delivering a program now that had depended for its success with incoming students on a summer preparation course for LS1. The faculty's decision to replace the LS curriculum with the FYE meant that HEOP would be facing a need to adapt to the new program. The problem has been handled in the short term (i.e., this year) by a cluster of "Human Dilemmas" sections of FY seminars. However, the program cannot sustain this in the long term. The DOF and the FYE director offered a compromise proposal to form a second cluster of FY seminars offered simultaneously with HD sections, either for F06 or F07, that would permit HEOP to develop a second new summer prep course for this additional cluster; although initially the Dean and Associate Dean of Student Affairs accepted this approach, HEOP subsequently rejected this proposal. The process has been time-consuming and enormously frustrating.

Culture Centered Inquiry

The committee is co-chaired by the President and Paty Rubio, and has been working on the search for a Director for Intercultural Studies (in Student Affairs) and a search (on-going) for a line in Human Resources for an EOC position. CAPT has indicated a desire to see the finalists list.

It was noted at this point that CAPT had not been consulted regarding other administrative appointments, especially within Student Affairs. The Handbook requires such consultation.

Addendum, FEC

(Owing to lack of time, FEC was not able to present a report to C of C. This addendum serves in lieu of that report.)

The committee has been extraordinarily busy over the semester, as it takes on its new functions and continues its old. The DOS/DoSA split took a good deal of time and energy, especially over the summer, to sort out, and we are pleased that the Administration has brought the matter to CEPP for review, and that the VPAA is now assuming more responsibility, with the DoSA reporting to him in cases of irresolvable disputes between the DOF and the DoSA. Chuck Joseph worked closely with FEC and CAPT to write changes to the Handbook that resulted from the VPAA/DOF split. (Gove Effinger did more than yeoman service revising the Handbook in accord with the changes to our governance structure, and Dan Curley worked to produce a much improved Part Four.) The Dean of Student Affairs needed more than usual persuasion to submit a new description of his office, and to hammer out a new description of the Integrity and Appeals Boards. FEC has had four very productive meetings with Chuck, two with Muriel. Both have indicated their willingness to continue working closely with FEC. We have a joint committee of FEC and DOF working on bringing transparency and fairness to the distribution of course releases.

Ad hoc committee lists are now being submitted regularly to FEC, so that we can direct their reports to the

appropriate faculty committees, when necessary.

FEC has alerted the administration to the need for full consultation of the Optimal Number subcommittee.

There have been some problems of communication between IPPC and FEC. FEC hopes to have a solution to this in the spring, when FEC will be meeting on Wednesdays, allowing the three IPPC members to join us for each meeting.

The workload of the committee is quite heavy, especially with the need to attend to the Board of Trustees observer function in mid semester. FEC will be reviewing the effectiveness of the new governance structure in the spring. FEC will also be examining our subcommittee structures, with a view to greater transparency and to ensure, as far as possible, that our governance is democratic.