

FEC meeting minutes

10.22.18

Present: Katie Hauser, Kendrah Murphy, Juan Navea, Casey Schofield, Denise Smith, Greg Gerbi

Raise concerns about election system – both people ending up on committees that they are either (or both) not suited for and/or not motivated for.

- a. Previous FEC chair reports that the faculty have had a problem with meeting the service needs of the college for many years (and FEC has wrestled with this many times). Over time there has been recognition that willingness to serve is not sufficient. Agreement was on modest service (3/6 years); the way it was sold was that faculty would have choice over when they serve, what committees they serve on, and who they elect. These agreements are how this system came into being.
- b. Additionally suggests that faculty may not have a sense of how fragile the system is, and though acknowledges that folks are unhappy with the current system, feels strongly that it is unwise to invest a lot of energy in creating a new system (working against constraining facts; the demands that need to be met with limited resources). Suggested encouraging a focus on how to make the system works rather than abandon it. In two years we will have gone through the entire cycle and the community will have a better sense of how the system works and the utility of it.
- c. Also acknowledges that there may have been a strategic error in including all of the IPPC subcommittees; would suggest that FEC consider taking out the IPPC subcommittees from the system (this would take pressure off the system/reduce fragility).
- d. Would also suggest that as part of the education we encourage/celebrate folks volunteering to serve outside their cycle.
- e. FEC member highlights concern about equity in light of an election system in which the *same* people will routinely be elected into the high burden committees.
- f. Previous FEC chair argues that it is important to evaluate the *entire* service burden on campus without central focus on “governance.” What the current system has resulted in is difficulties in filling particular committees.
- g. FEC member proposed a point-system in which everyone is compelled to complete number of service points in a sabbatical cycle, and different governmental service earns different points. This raised the following points of consideration:
 - i. How to define “governance”; one approach is to consider defines governance committees as those that the faculty would not tolerate administrative appointments to. Thinks point system conflates two systems (governmental service and non-governmental service) in ways that are problematic. She argues that FEC’s responsibility is first and foremost to ensure that faculty governance is met.
 - ii. Discussed whether we *should* consider service broadly and not make FEC’s mission uniquely about governance because of issues of equity for the committees being populated and equity for the individuals (who now cannot make a choice while being heavily burdened by departmental commitment to chair, for example) who cannot elect out of governance when they’re already at

max for commitments. In short, he does not think that these can and should be divorced.

- iii. It is possible that sorting out these concerns is feasible for FEC (and if so FEC should be involved in the conversation with the administration about how to negotiate the path forward), but it's also possible that FEC cannot bring a solution to the faculty in a timely way that solves problems with a current system or proposes a new system in light of the very real problem of too much work and too few people.
- iv. One proposal is to shorten the list of committees that "count" for governance (e.g., CEPP, CC, FEC, ATC, PC, IPPC, TRB, FDC, FAB... This dumps AC, SGBM, BRG, CIGU, Sustainability).
- v. Another person noted that a point-based system was considered and some logistical concerns precluded moving forward with it last spring, but highlighted that quantifying a service load at the Associate Level may illuminate service contributions for PC. Suggested we could revisit the conversations from last spring in this regard, and acknowledges that this would not be the work of FEC alone (ATC and PC are important stakeholders here).
- h. Previous FEC chair acknowledges that this past year was particularly challenging because of the small cohort and many slots. Noted that one approach to addressing the problem would be to have pretenure folks have larger obligations to governance and/or require full professors to serve all 6 years (or at least *more* than associate professors).
 - i. Potential concerns about both unfairness to senior faculty and also concerns about how this overrepresents senior folks in service and undermines the power and contributions of more junior folks.

Respectfully submitted,

CAS