

Minutes of the Faculty Executive Committee

FEC-9

Friday, September 7

12:00 - 1:30 p.m.

Scribner Library 437

Present: Sue Bender, John Brueggemann, Dan Curley (scribe), Mark Huibregste, Mehmet Odekon, Viviana Rangil, Paty Rubio, Mason Stokes.

1. Approval of minutes, FEC-9, April 25, 2007.

Deferred until such time as these minutes are located.

2. Welcome; the FEC Operating Code, 2007-2008.

Hardcopies of the 2007-2008 Operating Code were distributed. Dan encouraged all members of FEC to review the Code, since it outlines the procedures for the Committee's routine business. Either Mason or John, in keeping with current practices on major committees, will be chair next year; with Mason declaring his intent to go on sabbatical, it looked as if the mantle of leadership would pass to John by default.

3. Updates and agenda for the year.

Dan provided updates on the FEC Service Project, revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*, and the Committee of Committees.

On the Service Project, Dan met last term with the VPAA and DOF, who made suggestions on the then-current draft of the Framework (version 1.1). Dan hopes to coordinate with Muriel for a presentation at an upcoming Chairs/Program Directors Meeting, at which he would introduce the Project and hopefully receive feedback on how best to gather data. Sue suggested that Academic Staff overall might be a good venue for the project.

On revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*, a summer working group, consisting of himself (for FEC), Mary Lynn (CAPT), Dick Hihn (CAFR), Barbara Beck (HR), Herb Crossman (ADEWD) Barbara Krause (PresOff), Muriel Poston (DOF) and Susan Kress (VPAA) has been working on revisions to Part 6 of the *Handbook*, which has needed updating for three years. Progress has been made on balancing tenets of academic freedom with the College's legal obligations, but there is still more work to do. One potential sticking point: the procedures via which harassment claims are investigated and adjudicated. An early flowchart included a faculty review panel, but only after a formal investigation had been conducted and a decision reached. AAUP guidelines recommend that a faculty panel be involved much earlier — and that it conduct its own investigation. Responding to the notion that untrained faculty conducting an investigation on their own might make other faculty

uncomfortable, Dan agreed that this is a valid concern, but noted that the three faculty members on the working group all thought that faculty input on a case was required, and required earlier.

On the Committee of Committees (COC), the current annual procedure is as follows: one meeting in the fall, minutes from that meeting posted as well as the administration's response to the minutes, a second meeting in spring, minutes of that meeting posted, the COC report at the final Faculty Meeting of the year and the administration's response. Dan expressed his opinion that this is a ponderous arrangement, one not conducive to conversation with the administration, but rather a tedious succession of volleys. He suggested a new arrangement, one proposed by the VPAA in her response to the fall minutes: one COC meeting earlier in the fall, minutes of that meeting posted; a second COC meeting at the start of spring term that included the VPAA and DOF, minutes of that meeting posted; a third COC meeting late in the fall, with minutes; and then the COC report as usual, with the administration's response. John expressed his general reluctance ever to add meetings, and asked for time to study this specific matter. Dan agreed that this matter deserves careful thought, but noted that any change in the meeting structure needs to be advertised as early as possible. Paty commented on the usefulness of the COC meetings overall, how they allow members of the faculty governance structure to hear where problems arise, especially over the course of an academic year.

4. Discussion of the IPPC report.

The item on the IPPC report garnering the most attention was number two, "Retiree health care costs." Opinions ranged on what FEC's role should be as discussions of this issue proceed at IPPC:

- Some faculty find it difficult to process the numbers that get presented.
- Would it be possible to get an outside opinion on whatever numbers get presented?
- This issue would be appropriate for a Faculty Caucus (faculty-only meeting).
- Perhaps a new governance system is in order, one with teeth and owned by the faculty, such as a senate.
- Rather than agitate, let's set a tone which allows for the possibility of drawing a line.
- Whatever FEC decides to do, it must do it thoughtfully so as not to impugn the committee's credibility.

5. Emergency Election.

There are vacancies on CAFR, FEC, and Curriculum Committee, and Dan proposed that FEC run an emergency election for at least CAFR and CC as soon as possible. There was agreement for this idea, as well as support for putting FEC on the ballot was well. Dan suggested that the committee strategize about whom to invite to serve, and promised to draft a willingness-to-serve form in the near future. Paty noted that

the fec-eligible-list needs careful review in order to make sure that those on the list belong on the list — which was not the case last spring.

6. Other.

Everyone agreed to hold Wednesdays from 9:30-11:00 and Fridays from 10:30-noon open on their schedules as potential meeting times next semester. The fall Board of Trustees visit is set for October 26-26; FEC's Observer duties will be decided before then.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Curley
Chair, FEC