

**Faculty Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 20, 2013
4-5 p.m.**

Present: April Bernard, Jörg Bibow, Barbara Black (chair and scribe), Paul Sattler

I. The 3/6/13 minutes were approved with minimal revision.

II. The chair updated the committee on four matters. 1) The BOT notes have been disseminated to the faculty; our web author Paul Sattler will post them to our governance site. 2) The chair has contacted Jenn Crewell in Communications about streamlining our governance website. 3) The chair informed the committee about a query from a previous FEC member who, based on a past FEC discussion (none of the current FEC members was on the committee at the time), recommended that minutes be taken at the Community Meetings—which are occurring this week. The chair followed up by contacting the President to inquire if there was merit in having minutes. While the President was initially inclined to have minutes, he reached the conclusion that the Community Meetings are places for conversation that may be stifled by the presence of minute-taking. The FEC chair was persuaded by this reasoning; and, when she shared this exchange with her fellow FEC members, so too were they. The chair has communicated this decision to the former FEC member who first raised the issue. 4) Finally, the FEC chair updated the committee on her feedback to CEPP chair Michael Arnush regarding the CEPP plan for a subcommittee on demographic data and the new student evaluation form. She also has conveyed to next year's CEPP chair Peter von Allmen FEC's concerns about a possible summer working group to tackle developing a new curriculum. She will have a follow-up meeting with Peter this Friday, and has proposed that Peter come to a FEC meeting as well to discuss in person.

III. The DOF/VPAA has asked for FEC's counsel on the matter of Open Access Information. To summarize his query: There is ongoing interest at Skidmore's peer and aspirant schools — and, indeed, across the country — to provide open access for publications. Some publishing houses charge exorbitant prices to colleges/universities for access to their materials. They have a monopoly and thus some schools simply can't pay.

The faculty at schools like Amherst, Wooster, and others are making statements by agreeing to create open access repositories. In effect, folks still publish wherever they want, in whatever journal they choose, but, additionally, the school posts the complete article on its website (hence the repository). This matter has obvious faculty implications. What group, office, or committee ought to take this up?

In response to the DOF/VPAA's query, FEC believes CAFR and/or FDC would be the right committees to examine this issue. Additionally, the issue seems related to the Intellectual Property Policy working group's charge, though their charge has been

necessarily quite specific, and they will soon sunset. But we would welcome hearing their initial reaction before they disband.

Also FEC posed a question back to the DOF/VPAA: While his query implied, at least to us, general applicability, an attached white paper he sent seems to focus more directly on government-funded research and open access.

IV. The DOF/VPAA has solicited FEC's assistance in constituting a search committee for a new endowed Chair in Chinese Studies. The department or program in which the Chair will reside was not stipulated by the donor. The DOF/VPAA shared with FEC his process for constituting the search committee—which closely resembles the very successful Chairs Advisory Group model—and timeline. We are in complete support and will help him with the constituting of the committee when the time comes.

V. In preparation for our April CoW on faculty governance, members of FEC reported back their findings regarding governance at a group of five top liberal arts colleges: Amherst, Carleton, Mt. Holyoke, Swarthmore, and Williams.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Black