

TO: Dean Swartz
FROM: Faculty Organization Committee
RE: Annual Committee Report for 2004-05
DATE: May 26, 2005

The Faculty Organization Committee for the 2004-05 academic year consisted of Jon Andelson (chair), David Harrison, Sarah Purcell, Sam Rebelsky, and Rebecca Stuhr. The committee met regularly during the year to deal with routine business (faculty elections, faculty committee assignments, replacements on committees) as well as to address questions or concerns that we either were asked to consider by others or ourselves thought needed consideration. These non-routine issues are enumerated and briefly described below.

1. Changes in the Tutorial Committee

The librarians and the Tutorial Committee asked FOC to consider the merits of adding a librarian to the Tutorial Committee as a permanent member. In its discussion of this idea, the FOC also addressed the suggestion that the Tutorial Committee's functions be expanded to include advising in the first two years. The FOC saw merit in both changes and received full support regarding both changes from the librarians as well as the Tutorial Committee. As the Tutorial Committee is not a standing committee of the faculty, changes in its structure do not require faculty legislation. However, the FOC reported the changes, which will go into effect in the 2005-06 academic year, to the faculty at the April 1, 2005, faculty meeting.

2. Changes in the Schedule of Election to Faculty Office

The Executive Council expressed to the FOC its concern that the schedule of courses for the following academic year is first published in April, prior to the elections of faculty officers, several of which accrue course releases, necessitating subsequent changes in course schedules. Council asked the FOC to consider the possibility of moving the election cycle to earlier in the spring semester. FOC carefully reviewed the issue and saw no major drawbacks to changing the timing of the cycle. FOC also considered the potential benefits of changing the sequence of the elections. Currently, all-college positions (At-Large Representative to the Executive Council and At-Large Representative to the Personnel Committee) are elected prior to divisional positions (Division Chairs, who also sit on Executive Council, and Divisional Representatives to the Personnel Committee), even though the latter entail more responsibilities and must be drawn from a smaller pool of candidates.

The FOC submitted to Council two versions of a proposal to move the election cycle to earlier in the spring semester, one of which entailed changes in the sequence of elections while the other left the sequence as it is presently. Council preferred the former version and suggested that Council and FOC jointly propose it for action at the May 12 faculty meeting. (Action by the faculty is necessary because both the timing and sequence of elections is spelled out in the Faculty Handbook.) The proposal passed unanimously.

3. Minor Changes in Committee Organization

- a. *Addition of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee:* This committee is federally mandated and will be added to the list of committees that the FOC sends to the faculty every spring when faculty are asked to indicate committee assignment preferences. This committee will assume (from the Institutional Review Board) oversight over use of experimental animals, and its chair will need to be someone familiar with animal experimentation. The committee will be appointed by the president upon recommendations of the FOC. The chair of IRB, which will now focus exclusively on research with human subjects, no longer needs to be familiar with animal research.
- b. *Convocation Committee:* The FOC recommends that the members of the Convocation Committee not be major stakeholders in convocation.
- c. *Apparel Purchasing Policy Committee:* This committee will be added to the list of committees that the FOC sends to the faculty every spring.
- d. *Heath Professorship Committee:* Through mutual agreement, this committee's duties have been assumed by the Center for International Studies and the committee disbanded.
- e. *Student Presence at Instructional Support Committee Meetings:* The FOC was asked to give an opinion on the question of student presence at ISC meetings, as the wording in the faculty handbook ("two students are invited to attend meetings when appropriate") is vague. The FOC's interpretation of the wording is that students are allowed generally to be present unless there are issues before the committee which, in the opinion of the chair, it would be inappropriate to have students present.
- f. *College Marshall:* Although not a committee, the college marshall is appointed by the FOC. A question arose as to eligibility for service on this committee. The Faculty Handbook appears to indicate that the individual may be a professor or someone on senior faculty status, but not an emeritus professor.

4. Advance Publication of Agendas for Executive Council Meetings

Several members of the faculty raised with the FOC the possibility of asking Executive Council to publish the agenda for its weekly meetings in advance of the meetings in order for the faculty to be better informed and to increase the transparency of Council's activities. The FOC feels that this would be a useful procedure for Council to adopt and recommended that Council do so. The agenda could be sent to the faculty electronically, omitting the attachments that Council members often receive and with confidential items either noted generally or omitted. The Chair of the Faculty reported back to the FOC that this will be done.

5. Discussion of Reinstating A Faculty Committee on Information Technology

Early in the fall semester, interested parties asked the FOC to consider reinstating a committee on information technology. For many years the college had an Academic Computing Committee (ACC) as a standing committee of the faculty. This committee attended to non-administrative computing issues on campus, including long-term planning regarding academic computer, philosophies of computing on campus, and issues pertaining to the Academic Computer Use Policies (ACUP). In the late 1990s, in an attempt to reduce the number of committees on campus, FOC combined ACC, the Bookstore Committee, and the Library Committee into a single Instructional Support Committee (ISC).

The members of the faculty who approached FOC felt that the ISC perhaps had too many responsibilities to devote sufficient time to issues of computer use, and in particular they were concerned that the ISC had been excluded from discussions of computer issues that are clearly academic, but not as clearly instructional.

The FOC was persuaded that these concerns were valid. After a considerable amount of discussion, the FOC drafted a proposal to institute a Committee on Information Technology (CIT) with responsibilities similar to the former ACC. Under this proposal, aspects of computer use that are currently under the purview of the ISC would have been transferred to the CIT, except for the power to make grants for curricular development using technology.

The FOC circulated its proposal to the ISC, Information Technology Services (ITS), and the dean's office. All three entities had reservations about the proposal. The ISC felt that, as the college will be undertaking long-range planning of new library facilities--in which the ISC would be centrally involved--it would benefit the planning process if both library and computing issues were to remain with the ISC for the time being. Furthermore, the ISC had made modifications in its operations that would permit it to address computer issues more vigorously than it had in recent years. The director of ITS agreed with ISC's view and urged that the computer and library functions remain together under ISC. The deans strongly supported the ISC and ITS position and urged time to allow ISC's new structure to address the concerns that had prompted our consideration of the issue to be resolved.

After further deliberation, FOC withdrew from consideration the idea of creating a faculty Committee on Information Technology..

6. Role of Those on Senior Faculty Status in Faculty Governance

The FOC was asked by a member of the faculty to clarify the role of SFS faculty in departmental decisions. Discussion of SFS in the Faculty Handbook is scattered and not entirely consistent. In general, SFS faculty need to be teaching at least one course in order to vote in departmental, divisional, and all-faculty elections and to serve on standing committees of the faculty. The Faculty Handbook does not allow SFS faculty to serve as department chairs or to serve on the Executive Council (as they are not full-time faculty members). However, faculty on SFS may serve on the Personnel Committee. Next year's FOC may wish to consider this matter further.

7. Cancelled Faculty Meetings and Information About Committee Activities

Some faculty members expressed concern to the FOC about the number of cancelled faculty meetings and the possibility of using the time for committees to report to the faculty about their activities. FOC was generally sympathetic to this idea and communicated as much to the Dean, who discussed it with Executive Council. Members of Council noted that a previous FOC had communicated to the Council that faculty meetings not be called simply for committee reports. Opinion appeared divided. A subsequent meeting among the Dean, the Chair of the Faculty, and the Chair of FOC resulted in agreement that the Chair of the Faculty would announce at an early faculty meeting each year that any faculty member who wished to hear more about a particular committee's activities could convey that request to the Chair of the Faculty, who would invite the committee to report to the faculty.

8. Voting Eligibility of Lecturers

The FOC was asked by a faculty member and the Dean to offer an opinion on the eligibility of instructors to vote in faculty meetings. In the FOC's opinion: the Faculty Handbook does not grant Lecturers the privilege to vote in departmental elections (see Sections I.A. second paragraph of introduction and III.C.1). However, the Faculty Handbook does grant Lecturers the right to vote in all-faculty elections.

9. Electronic Version of Committee "Preference List" Developed

Sam Rebelsky, with the help of Leonid Ivanov, developed a new electronic version of the list sent to faculty every spring in which they indicate their preferences for committee assignment. The version was used successfully by this year's FOC and saved a considerable amount of secretarial time.