

Committee of Committees

Minutes of 13 December 2018 meeting during which faculty enjoyed snacks provided by the DoF office.

FEC members Katie Hauser (Chair), Casey Schofield (scribe) and Juan Navea (scribe) present, along with representatives from FEC, ATC, IPPC, CAFR, CC, PC, CC, CEPP, and FDC.

Hauser welcomed attendees and reminded them about the objectives of the meeting, to assess the interactions among member committees and between them and the Administration, and to discuss ongoing issues and any problems in committee operations (FHB 211)

Committee on Academic Freedoms and Rights (CAFR)

CAFR has met and will continue to meet with ATC, FEC, and the Tenure Review Board to discuss a process by which the committee may be involved in evaluation of appeal cases for tenure.

CAFR is preparing guidelines for chair's responsibilities to ease transition into that role in the future. This led to a discussion about chairing: Everyone present agreed that guidelines like these would be useful for all committees (committee chairs may want to consult the FEC Operating Code to see how tasks are set out for FEC in general, but essentially for the chair). All agreed that designating the following year's chair in the fall would facilitate transition from one chair to another (and make scheduling classes easier). Some noted that a co-chair model can also facilitate a smooth transfer of responsibilities, but raises the complication of who gets a course release if one is available.

Promotions Committee (PC)

PC has developed its operating code and established a productive committee culture and procedures. Along the lines of what CAFR is undertaking, the committee is creating a guide for new chairs.

PC reports that the number of pre-tenure faculty going up for promotion to Associate Professor increased significantly this year. This may be the start of a trend due to changes in hiring. It raises questions about workload and policy since many of those candidates are eligible for tenure within a few years of standing for promotion. A revised promotion and/or tenure policy may solve the issue; PC will follow up in consultation with ATC.

PC did not find the mandated bias training for this committee to be particularly useful, so it pursued its own training and education in this domain. The committee found this process very helpful although it acknowledges that not all committees have the time to do this.

PC has enjoyed productive interactions with the administration, finding the DoF office responsive and attentive.

Committee on Educational Policies and Planning (CEPP)

CEPP discussed their hard work on implementing the new curriculum, and reviewing the use of the "new" Dean's card (which was slated to be reviewed in 2016-17).

CEPP has been working closely with the Curriculum Committee on implementing the general ed curriculum, with particular attention on the bridge experience. It plans to start trainings/workshops to support faculty in developing bridge courses.

Recognizing the sensitivity associated with teaching evaluations, CEPP has carefully developed their procedure to review the Dean's cards and have plans for an external review. CEPP anticipates working with FEC, ATC, and PC if any changes are to be made to the card, recognizing that the use of the card (for tenure and promotion) falls outside the purview of CEPP. The Committee of Committees discussed the fact that different constituencies used the form in different ways. CEPP noted that they are not only considering how this specific mode of evaluation is working, but also the larger issue of these types of evaluation, a question they see as not being entirely supported by the administration because it exceeds, according to the administration, its responsibility. This gathering encouraged CEPP to consider both the particulars of this mode of evaluation *and* the larger questions associated with teaching evaluations.

CEPP noted that Institutional Research is planning to share with them the data over the past five years about total faculty evaluation, with an attempt to capture subgroup characteristics (i.e., performance on the "big 3" items on the qSET—"course overall", "instructor overall", and "learning overall") as a way to investigate whether the tool expresses bias. CEPP has been in close consultation with the Dean of Faculty's office in the course of this project. CEPP was cautioned to focus on the present charge—i.e., evaluating the qSET instrument—rather than taking on the larger question regarding use of student evaluation data in personnel actions. The concern was that that larger question may be more within the purview of ATC and PC than of CEPP. CEPP will take care to consult with pertinent committees before putting forth any recommendations.

Miscellaneous issues: the committee has been evaluating interdisciplinary minors, considering whether they are stable and sufficiently resourced.

CEPP is considering whether to/how to establish certificate programs (i.e., MDOCs, World Languages & Literatures).

CEPP has recommended to president's cabinet to give everyone on campus a religious holiday to use at their discretion rather than assign specific religious holidays that would privilege some religions over others.

Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)

FEC reports on mostly trouble-free relations with the DoF. FEC has discussed the process of granting committee service exemptions with the DoF; both FEC and the DoF recognize that it should be a consultative process. FEC has noted a general concern among chairs and program directors of less and slower communication with the DoF office than may be ideal.

FEC is planning a faculty-only meeting in February to potentially discuss service, divisional representation, and other matters.

The Committee of Committees discussed the associate chair program and wondered when it was supposed to be evaluated, who will undertake the evaluation, and when. Questions that might be

considered: is it working? Is compensation adequate? Are faculty satisfied with the model? Does it support transition to the chair position?

Curriculum Committee (CC)

CC reports on good communication with the administration, especially around developing the Black Studies minor.

This fall, as noted above, the CC has been working closely with CEPP to establish clear guidelines for assessing course proposals for the new and revised courses required of the new General Education Requirements. This work, done through working groups, has focused on the Senior Coda and the Bridge Experience.

CC has also met with the Idea Lab group to clarify and better define these new curricular offerings. The CC has approved a new IL category for courses and supported the new well-defined vision the program now has.

CC approved a proposal from the Athletic Council to provide Physical Activity course credit for students who are participating in a varsity sport; the proposal will go into effect fall 2019.

Faculty Development Committee (FDC)

FDC reports having reasonably frequent contact with Associate Dean Moore.

FDC has recently become informed about their budget, and thus has a better sense that the sabbatical enhancement budget has been cut by 7.7% and the college offers less sabbatical benefits than peer institutions. The committee does not have control over their budget. The gathering discussed that the helios model should help with sabbatical funding, but wondered about folks who do not have the opportunity to accumulate credits.

FDC clarified that it has a very small role in the determination of whether awards are granted (i.e., the FDC responsibility is simply to make a recommendation) based on cursory review by folks from well outside an area of expertise. The process is highly time-consuming for both applicants and reviewers and arguably results in a rubber-stamp approach (i.e., a practice of fairness as compared to an evaluation of quality).

FDC would like to have a more public discussion of the sabbatical evaluation process – are all faculty entitled to a sabbatical? If so why should everyone, including applicants and the committee, take the time and effort to submit applications?

FDC encourages more nominations for campus awards and endowed chairs. FDC and the PC plan to consider collaborating on whether the nomination process could be streamlined.

Institutional Policy and Planning Committee (IPPC)

IPPC reports on less than satisfactory relations with the administration. Representatives from IPPC discussed the fact that two recent meetings had been canceled on the grounds that there were no agenda items. While the representatives acknowledge that faculty on IPPC can and should raise agenda items, there seem to be more than a sufficient number of issues for discussion: CIS funding and changes, impending budget/enrollment crisis, changes to salary

bands for progressive charges for health insurance, space planning more generally on campus, and more. The faculty have requested that these and other items be added to agendas for upcoming meetings.

Appointments and Tenure Committee (ATC)

ATC reports that interactions with the administration have been collegial, respectful, and productive; it is early in the process of the committee's work.

ATC has met and will continue to meet with CAFR, FEC, and the Tenure Review Board (TRB) to discuss a process by which CAFR may be involved in evaluation of appeal cases for tenure.

ATC is working with the PC and the DoF on fostering discussion on the possibility of early tenure.