Skidmore College
Faculty Executive Committee
Minutes of May 16, 2006 Meeting

Present: Paty Rubio, Tim Burns (chair), Mark Huibregtse, Gove Effinger, Dan Curley, William Lewis (scribe), Joanna Zangrando

1. Revisions suggested to minutes of 05/10/06, minutes are currently under revision.

2. Report on May 12th IPPC meeting delivered by Mark Huibregtse and William Lewis.

3. Approved one year extension of term for HF Director Phil Boshoff.

4. Discussion of Proposal for Resolution on Compensation and Optimization.

   -Committee as a whole discussed whether a proposal on compensation and the Fiscal Year 2007 Budget was appropriate. Two points were raised. These were:

   1. whether we as a committee have the authority to draft such a resolution, especially given the fact that we were not directly asked to comment on the FY 07 Budget.
   2. the fact that there has been no official announcement to the faculty of the proposed FY 07 Budget.

   -regarding point #1, Tim Burns [TB] pointed out that FEC drafted the original resolution on compensation and that it seems appropriate to follow it up. The committee agreed.

   -regarding point #2, it was remarked by many on the committee that both the timing and the format of the budget announcement were unfortunate because it was not an official announcement, many faculty could not attend the meeting, and no minutes of the community meeting discussion were taken. WL mentioned that it was clear from the May 12th IPPC meeting that there would be an official announcement at this Wednesday's (May 15th) Faculty Meeting of the budget proposal. Given this, the committee decided that it was appropriate to present a resolution on compensation and the budget.

   -WL distributed a draft resolution that was amended and improved by the committee and that will be on the agenda of the May 15h Faculty Meeting.

5. SGA and IPPC

-TB gave a report of the meeting between the President, Petria Fleming, Denise Smith, Pat Oles, and himself, noting that the President had agreed at this meeting that the SGA President would have a place on the IPPC agenda for discussion rather than for a mere report, and that both the President and the DoSA agreed that while the Student Affairs subcommittee of IPPC is the appropriate place for some SGA business, it could not be a substitute for the ACC, and hence that the SGA President needed to be able to bring some matters directly to IPPC. TB also noted that IPPC co-chair Denise Smith expressed the opinion that she did not understand why this matter had become so contentious. TB responded that the reason was that the President had blamed the SGA chair for not working with the DoSA and had been insisting that she do so, and had expressed his opinion that he was “deeply troubled” that she had not done so. In fact, she had been attempting to work with the DoSA all year on this matter. TB further clarified at the meeting that neither SGA President Fleming nor FEC was seeking any contention here, but was responding to the President’s position. The President agreed that his emails could have been taken as blaming the SGA President, and regretted this. TB also noted that the President had been rather dismissive of his presence at the meeting, suggesting by his opening remarks that he didn’t see any reason for the FEC chair to be there at all. TB also noted that the President at this meeting had expressed a desire to conduct a “broad conversation” with the community about problems that he had with operating codes and that he had found it problematic that TB would be talking with Mark Huibregtse in an effort to bring the new FEC operating code into sync with the new IPPC operating code.

6. FEC and IPPC: Review of structure and current issues

   a. intention of the structure
   b. appointment of chair
   c. representation
   d. operating codes
   e. community meeting
   f.

A general discussion of these related items occurred:

-TB remarked that there appear to be some structural and communications problems between IPPC and FEC. The intent of the committee structure is that the Faculty as a whole be represented on IPPC through FEC. At times, this year, it has seemed that faculty representatives on IPPC (and particularly the co-chair) has not adequately consult ed with FEC. In addition, when FEC is consulted—the IPPC Co-chair sometimes communicates positions to IPPC and to the President that are not those of FEC. Effectively, this allows the President to dismiss or ignore the opinions of FEC while feeling that he has consulted the Faculty. The link between the Faculty as a whole and IPPC is thereby severed. Multiple examples of this communication and consultation problem were given. Among these were that of the process for the appointment of next year's IPPC co-chair and communication of FEC's opinion regarding SGA's right to a place on IPPC's agenda. Regarding the former, WL clarified that, though he had inquired about the issue, it had never been his position that he did not want to serve as IPPC co-chair because, as a junior faculty member, he was afraid to be in this position. In a related matter, he added that IPPC at its last meeting had discussed how to make the process of co-chair appointment transparent. The committee as a whole agreed that that it should not be the President's prerogative to appoint a co-chair but that IPPC as a whole as well as FEC should be consulted regarding this appointment.

Gove Effinger [GE] remarked that it was the intent of the new committee structure to have the FEC Chair, the IPPC co-chair and the President all meet together and that this would go a long way to solving the problem of mis- or failed communication. The committee agreed with GE that this seemed a good remedy. WL suggested that we codify this procedure clear in the operating code of IPPC as that committee works on a new operating code over the summer.

Dan Curley [DC] suggested that this might also need to go into the handbook. WL again brought up the fact that only two minutes of IPPC minutes had been released this year and that communication between IPPC and FEC would be greatly improved if minutes were regularly taken and if these were distributed to FEC. TB mentioned that we should also discuss whether or not FEC needs to be more involved in the budget discussion than it has been. This would allow that IPPC Faculty representatives to better represent the Faculty perspective on IPPC.

7. (no # 7 on agenda)

8. Committee of Committees Minutes and Report (see attachment to Tim's email of 05/14, 5:47 p.m.)

   -discussion of TB's draft report. Mark Huibregtse [MH] suggested that the last ¶ of the report regarding the FEC/Administration relationship seemed harsh but that he was not aware of many of the examples cited in the paragraph and he wondered if this was really FEC's opinion. The Committee as a whole agreed that there should be recognition in this ¶ that FEC's actions in this regard could also be improved and to recognize that this structure is still very new and that we are "ironing out the kinks." See also discussion regarding agenda items 4, 5, and 6 above. Having heard these discussions, MH indicated that he understood the reasons for the language in the final ¶ of the report.

9. Approved final draft of FEC Operating Code