

Minutes of the Faculty Executive Committee

FEC 6

Wednesday, April 2, 2008, 9:30-11:00

Scribner Library 437

Present: Lisa Aronson, John Brueggemann, Dan Curley (Chair), Viviana Rangil, Mason Stokes (scribe)

1) Minutes of February 27, 2008, approved with changes (correction of the date; striking the second sentence of item #4).

2) Dan announced that he will make a motion about the membership of CEPP at Friday's meeting (an item discussed by FEC at the March 19th meeting).

3) Dan suggested making a motion at Friday's meeting concerning whether or not the Faculty Handbook will be distributed in hard copies in the future. Discussion ensued. It was agreed that Dan will circulate a motion to the committee in which he moves that the Handbook become primarily an electronic document, with hard copies going to certain populations (new faculty, departments, department chairs, committee heads, etc.). The plan is to move this at Friday's meeting, though we want to keep an eye on how clotted the agenda is for the April 25th meeting.

4) We continued to hone the Service Survey, with Dan and Lisa noting changes. This discussion was interrupted by the arrival of Jim Kennelly (Interim Director, UWW—see item 5 below). We agreed that Dan and Lisa would meet next week to iron out the final changes to the survey; they will then circulate the document once more to the committee.

5) Jim Kennelly met with the committee about the proposed timeline for faculty action on Susan Kress's recommendation to close UWW. His concerns are as follows:

- He's very concerned about the quick pace of the process and is worried that our proposed plan won't allow for a full airing of the issues. For example:
 - What does faculty engagement mean? What faculty are we talking about (tenured and tenure-track, or also adjuncts)?
 - What does engagement mean?
 - What do we mean by academic rigor? Is this code for the credit-hours issue?
 - Jim pointed out that it will take time to compile the data that would allow us to address these issues fully and honestly.
- Model I does represent Jim's ideas for a streamlined version of UWW, but with two exceptions:
 - Model I doesn't include the possibility of merging UWW and MALS, a possibility that Jim supports.
 - This assumed merging is why Jim didn't allow for a Director position in his budgeting.
- Jim is concerned about the lack of data in the SPSG report.
- Jim pointed out that Model I isn't a fully fleshed out model, and he would like the opportunity to provide something with more detail.

- Jim thinks it's possible to come up with such a plan by the end of May.
- He doesn't, however, think that he can provide the information called for in our email to Susan, Jeff, and Jim within the potential time constraints spelled out there.
- Jim also reminded us that UWW was recently flooded out of their offices, which has made data gathering more difficult than normal. He did point out, though, that data gathering is never easy with UWW.

Following Jim's departure, the Committee discussed potential next steps:

- The committee found Jim's concerns significant and persuasive, though we haven't yet decided what changes, if any, to make in the process.
- We should meet with Susan and Jeff; such a meeting is being arranged for 9:00 a.m., this Friday, April 4th.
- We feel that we can still go forward with Deb's announcement at Friday's faculty meeting that CEPP has received a recommendation to close UWW. We don't, however, have a more specific timetable to announce (at least at the moment—this could change, theoretically, after we meet with Susan and Jeff on Friday).
- A possible revision in our tentative timetable could allow for Jim's plan to be finished by the end of May; a motion to be made by CEPP at the September meeting; and a discussion and vote to occur at the October meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 11:10

Respectfully submitted,

Mason Stokes