

Minutes of Committee of Committees Meeting, May 4, 2006. Intercultural Lounge

The meeting began at 3:30. Representatives were present from CAFR, CAPT, CEPP, Curriculum Committee, FEC, FDC, IPPC, the FYE Taskforce, and Athletic Council.

As required by the Faculty Handbook, (Part Two, section II, number 1) the committees' representatives reported their assessments of interactions among member committees and between them and the administration, and discussed ongoing issues and any problems in committee operations.

### **CAFR**

Interaction between the committee and the administration went smoothly. CAFR had a procedural question for the C of C: Why does CAFR report to the Board of Trustees at all each year, if CAFR is a confidential committee and so is unable to speak to the Board about its cases? It was noted that the regular report of CAFR to the Board need not entail more than the annual report that it presents to the faculty, but that there have been occasions in the past in which CAFR has handled cases involving administrators, including Board appointed administrators, and that in such cases CAFR and the Board hold a confidential session so that the Board is apprised of the particulars of the cases.

Since the rationale and procedures of CAFR's annual meeting with the Board are at present not explained in writing, it was recommended that CAFR include them as it updates its operating code this year.

### **CAPT**

Relations with the administration have been excellent this year, and CAPT is delighted about that. Relations with the President, with the VPAA, and with Deans have been cordial and effective. Administrators have felt free to seek advice from CAPT in advance of action, and that is very good.

CAPT is somewhat concerned that a number of issues have arisen late in the semester when there is limited time to address them adequately and when the transition on membership in CAPT is already underway. Another concern is the need for regularity in the procedures for CAPT's meeting with the Board of Trustees. The Handbook calls for the Board and CAPT to discuss the year's work, without the presence of the administration. It also calls for CAPT to report its tenure and promotion recommendations to the Board. CAPT's promotion recommendations are made to the full Academic Affairs committee of the Board in the presence of members of the administration. In the past, a small number of Academic Affairs committee members have met for about forty-five minutes with CAPT members to discuss relationships with the administration. These two meetings have somehow become conflated. Shortly after reporting promotion recommendations the administration will leave so that the entire Committee can then meet briefly with CAPT. CAPT would prefer to return to earlier procedures so that there could be a more effective interchange between a few members of the Academic Affairs committee and CAPT.

### **CEPP**

Relations with the administration have been very good. CEPP has made the shift from having the VPAA as a member of the committee to having the DOF as a member. The membership of the DOF has worked very well. There have been moments when the committee could have benefited from the VPAA's opinion, but the committee can always

seek that opinion as needed. Dean Poston has been a strong voice for the faculty on CEPP.

The committee has had preliminary discussions of Special Programs. With MALS and the UWW becoming, or potentially becoming, important parts of Academic Affairs, CEPP may begin to consider having regular visits from the DoSP, or having the DoSP on the committee.

A question was raised about Special Programs. With the administrative restructuring, is it not the case that all of our special programs should now come under the purview of CEPP, the Curriculum Committee, etc.?

CEPP's chair has had coffee with the DoSP and the VPAA to discuss the matter. The VPAA indicated a need to proceed without haste and with all the necessary deliberation in this matter, and the DoSP indicated that part of her task in this first year has been to attempt to sort out just where and how Special Programs would fit in the new structure. It was also pointed out that the VPAA is hoping that through the search for the VPAA, there will be a better articulation of the administrative structure.

Finally, CEPP had wished to review its charge this year, with a view to limiting its agenda. Tellingly, it ran out of time and was unable to do so.

CEPP is concerned about the lack of willingness of faculty to serve on the committee, and suspects that this is in part caused by the perception of the amount of work that the committee must at present undertake, as indicated by the large number of its subcommittees and task forces.

This prompted a discussion of how the vacancy on CEPP would be filled, and a more general discussion of the dearth of responses to willingness-to-serve calls.

With respect to the vacancy, FEC will be appointing someone to serve on CEPP for the year, in accord with both present Handbook procedures and with the pending Handbook revision of procedures.

With respect to the broader question of boosting the number of volunteers for service, FEC was asked to reconsider increasing the number of elections from three to four, so that there would be more opportunities for faculty to run for a committee. It was pointed out that the task force on course releases was examining the issue of compensation of some sort for service, along the lines suggested in the CFG white paper of 2000. FEC was also urged to gather new data on committee membership, to show distributions by senior/junior faculty and by departments.

### **Curriculum Committee**

Relationships with the administration have been great.

The Committee wrote a new Operating Code for the Self-Determined Majors Subcommittee, with guidelines for election numbers and terms of service over the next four years. Study Abroad guidelines were also drawn up, with CEPP, for short-term study abroad programs.

### **Faculty Development Committee**

Relations with the administration have been pretty good. The Committee has been pushing hard to get 80% funding for full-year sabbaticals. It is in the budget cycle considerations, but it is at the bottom of the list of initiatives this year. The Dean of the Faculty tried to find more funds for some collaborative research grants, and she succeeded. The bad news is that Major Project Completion Grant funding and Tang Grant funding have now dried up; these were funds from the President's Discretionary Fund

and were for a limited number of years, and the time has run out on them. There is a possibility of obtaining funds from donors for other summer grants, technical grants, etc.; the Committee will continue to work on this.

The Committee was asked if it had made any effort to talk with Michael Casey about raising funds in the advancement campaign. Sarah Goodwin has been talking with Barry Pritzker about additional funding.

A question was raised concerning how the ball was dropped on the PDF funds; the Committee finds that the ball was never picked up, i.e., in the past, Chris McGill had done so splendid a job in informing the Committee of what funds were available from what sources, that with the end of her secretarial service for the Committee, its members have had to investigate to discover just what funds were where, what amounts were available, etc. Fortunately, there is now a bit more transparency developing on this score, as there needs to be in the absence of Chris.

A revealing and important discussion about collaborative research ensued. A member of the Committee from the humanities noted that there appears to be a big push from the administration for more collaborative research, but that most genuine or serious work in the humanities does not lend itself to collaborative research, as does work in the sciences, which are accordingly receiving more opportunities for funds than faculty in the humanities. The observation concerning the difficulty of collaborative research in the humanities was widely seconded by faculty in the humanities. That the sciences lend themselves more to collaborative research was, however, disputed by a faculty member from the sciences, who noted that advanced research in the sciences is likewise not something that lends

itself to collaboration with students, and that when scientists engage in collaborative research, they typically do so almost strictly for the sake of pedagogy or mentoring, not for the sake of their research, which often does not profit, in fact, from collaborative research, but is delayed by it. Another faculty member from the sciences noted that when faculty-student collaborative research does result in publication it is widely celebrated, perhaps leading to the false impression that such joint publication routinely happens. In sum, collaborative research appears to assist faculty in neither the humanities nor the sciences to the extent that is sometimes portrayed, and may actually be impeding it. Its value is largely pedagogical, i.e., it is of profit to the students, not to the faculty. The hope was expressed that faculty research funding be made available that is *not* directed to collaborative research. In addition, the C of C encouraged the FDC to determine the allocation of funds to the humanities, sciences, pre-professional, and social sciences areas to determine whether disciplines whose pedagogy does not stress collaborative research methods may be receiving less funding. And the FDC noted that it is embarking on a study of the history of collaborative-research grants, to determine their effectiveness.

### **IPPC**

The faculty representatives on IPPC have had good relations with the administration. The vice-chair meets regularly with the President, prior to each meeting. The Committee has had a busy year with the Middle States Review, optimization, the budget, and the Master Plan for the campus. Faculty input into the budget-making process occurred in the optimization discussions, in the Budget and Finance subcommittee, and through faculty

representation on IPPC, where much of the discussion took place. It was informed by statements made at the Faculty-only meeting, and by email responses to Bill Lewis's March e-mail.

The Committee has need of an operating code. Mark Huibregtse has been asked informally by the President to work on one this summer. One of the items that will have to be addressed in the code is the level of confidentiality in the Committee, especially with respect to the budget. There is some concern that if confidentiality is too broad, this will restrict the effectiveness of faculty representation, since it will impede the ability of representatives to discuss matters with the faculty. The faculty representatives, willing to serve on a non-confidential committee, find themselves asked to keep matters confidential. It was pointed out that non-confidential committees sometimes require confidentiality, and that by Robert's Rules the chair in such cases asks members to agree to an in-camera session. But IPPC would stand to benefit if the extent and occasions for such sessions were spelled out in the operating code. IPPC is aware of a need to address and will be addressing in the operating code the level of confidentiality that is appropriate in the Committee.

The one important agenda item that IPPC has not been able to get to this year was cost sharing for retiree health care benefits, which will be discussed next year.

The Committee is also resolved to have the budget planning cycle come to the Committee much earlier in the year.

### **First Year Experience Taskforce**

Relations with the administration have been excellent. There has been no change since December in the situation with HEOP.

### **Athletic Council**

Relationships with the Athletic Director and the Dean of Student Affairs have been very good. The major focus of the Committee has been on the question of what to do about credit-bearing courses in Athletics. A subcommittee was formed with the Athletic Director to undertake an examination of the issue, and the Athletic Council has accepted the subcommittee's recommendation to oversee such courses. That is, the Council will be acting as would an academic department in oversight of courses and in personnel reviews.

### **Faculty Executive Committee**

FEC sought the C of C's advice on a proposed revision to the way elections are run. A suggestion had been made to FEC that, in the interest of greater transparency and democratic governance, the names of those who have expressed a willingness to serve be made public each day during the willingness to serve period, so that faculty are aware of the candidates before the ballot comes out. It was pointed out that the present practice is likely traceable to the logistic difficulties that would have been involved when elections were done by paper ballot; electronic media have overcome those difficulties. It was also pointed out that the proposed change might well encourage more people to express a willingness to serve. While a concern about a possible encouragement of "campaigning" was expressed, the overwhelming consensus was that the proposed change would be worth a try. FEC will therefore adopt this practice for next year, and amend its operating code accordingly.

The Committee's interactions with the administration have been fine. It has had productive and informative meetings with the VPAA, the DoF, the Associate DoF, and the DoSP, and they have sought FEC's direction on which committees need to be consulted on various matters, including Middle States, Study Abroad, etc. The Committee worked with CAPT in setting up the Search Committee for the VPAA and establishing its charge, which will include an examination and clarification of the actual functions of the VPAA office.

There has been a problem with the President's recent expressed reluctance to have the SGA President on the IPPC agenda for an item that extends beyond a report; this is still being worked out, and a meeting with the Chair of FEC, the SGA President, and the IPPC chairs is likely. (Note: this meeting took place on May 11, and the matter has been satisfactorily resolved.)

FEC and the Dean of the Faculty have struck a subcommittee to examine present course release practices with a view to greater transparency and fairness than we have at present. While the subcommittee has received documents, it has not yet met. It was recommended that that chair of the subcommittee be more proactive in seeking to expedite the subcommittee's work. (Note: the subcommittee has now met and has a schedule of planned meetings; it is still aiming to finish its work by the end of June.)