

Minutes of Committee of Committees Meeting, May 4, 2006. Intercultural Lounge

The meeting began at 3:30. Representatives were present from CAFR, CAPT, CEPP, Curriculum Committee, FEC, FDC, IPPC, the FYE Taskforce, and Athletic Council.

As required by the Faculty Handbook, (Part Two, section II, number 1) the committees' representatives reported their assessments of interactions among member committees and between them and the administration, and discussed ongoing issues and any problems in committee operations.

### **CAFR**

Interaction between the committee and the administration went smoothly. CAFR had a procedural question for the C of C: Why does CAFR report to the Board of Trustees at all each year, if CAFR is a confidential committee and so is unable to speak to the Board about its cases? It was noted that the regular report of CAFR to the Board need not entail more than the annual report that it presents to the faculty, but that there have been occasions in the past in which CAFR has handled cases involving administrators, including Board appointed administrators, and that in such cases CAFR and the Board hold a confidential session so that the Board is apprised of the particulars of the cases.

Since the rationale and procedures of CAFR's annual meeting wi

Relations with the administration have been excellent this year, and CAPT is delighted about that. Relations with the President, with the VPAA, and with Deans have been

seek that opinion as needed. Dean Poston has been a strong voice for the faculty on CEPP.

The committee has had preliminary discussions of Special Programs. With MALS and the UWW becoming, or potentially becoming, important parts of Academic Affairs, CEPP may begin to consider having regular visits from the DoSP, or having the DoSP on the committee.

A question was raised about Special Programs. With the administrative restructuring, is it not the case that all of our special programs should now come under the purview of CEPP, the Curriculum Committee, etc.?

CEPP's chair has had coffee with the DoSP and the VPAA to discuss the matter. The VPAA indicated a need to proceed without haste and with all the necessary deliberation in this matter, and the DoSP indicated that part of her task in this first year has been to attempt to sort out just where and how Special Programs would fit in the new structure. It was also pointed out that the VPAA is hoping that through the search for the VPAA, there will be a better articulation of the administrative structure.

Finally, CEPP had wished to review its charge this year, with a view to limiting its agenda. Tellingly, it ran out of time and was unable to do so.

CEPP is concerned about the lack of willingness of faculty to serve on the committee, and suspects that this is in part caused by the perception of the amount of work that the committee must at present undertake, as indicated by the large number of its subcommittees and task forces.

This prompted a discussion of how the vacancy on CEPP would be filled, and a more general discussion of the dearth of responses to willingness-to-serve calls.

With respect to the vacancy, FEC will be appointing someone to serve on CEPP for the year, in accord with both present Handbook procedures and with the pending Handbook revision of procedures.

With respect to the broader question of boosting the number of volunteers for service, FEC was asked to reconsider increasing the number of elections from three to four, so that there would be more opportunities for faculty to run for a committee. It was pointed out that the task force on course releases was examining the issue of compensation of



itself to collaboration with students, and that when scientists engage in collaborative research, they typically do so almost strictly for the sake of pedagogy or mentoring, not for the sake of their research, which often does not profit, in fact, from collaborative research, but is delayed by it. Another faculty member from the sciences noted that when faculty-student collaborative research does result in publication it is widely celebrated, perhaps leading to the false impression that such joint publication routinely happens. In sum, collaborative research appears to assist faculty in neither the humanities nor the sciences to the extent that is sometimes portrayed, and may actually be impeding it. Its value is largely pedagogical, i.e., it is of profit to the students, not to the faculty. The hope was expressed that faculty research funding be made available that is *not* directed to collaborative research. In addition, the C of C encouraged the FDC to determine the allocation of funds to the humanities, sciences, pre-professional, and social sciences areas to determine whether disciplines whose pedagogy does not stress collaborative research methods may be receiving less funding. And the FDC noted that it is embarking on a study of the history of collaborative-research grants, to determine their effectiveness.

### **IPPC**

The faculty representatives on IPPC have had good relations with the administration. The vice-chair meets regularly with the President, prior to each meeting. The Committee has had a busy year with the Middle States Review, optimization, the budget, and the Master Plan for the campus. Faculty input into the budget-making process occurred in the optimization discussions, in the Budget and Finance subcommittee, and through faculty

representation on IPPC, where much of the discussion took place. It was informed by statements made at the Faculty-only meeting, and by email responses to Bill Lewis's March e-mail.

The Committee has need of an operating code. Mark Huibregtse has been asked informally by the President to work on one this summer. One of the items that will have to be addressed in the code is the level of confidentiality in the Committee, especially with respect to the budget. There is some concern that if confidentiality is too broad, this will restrict the effectiveness of faculty representation, since it will impede the ability of representatives to discuss matters with the faculty. The faculty representatives, willing to serve on a non-confidential committee, find themselves asked to keep matters confidential. It was pointed out that non-confidential committees sometimes require confidentiality, and that by Robert's Reece R byt et

tbha.03 id10 R. -2(a)4(c)4(e)4(3)-2(s) J -0.004 Tc2(he)(o)-1( t)-2(de)4(. M)-1(a)4(r)3(n )JTJ( l)-2(.03

## **Athletic Council**

Relationships with the Athletic Director and the Dean of Student Affairs have been very good. The major focus of the Committee has been on the question of what to do about credit-bearing courses in Athletics. A subcommittee was formed with the Athletic



The Committee's interactions with the administration have been fine. It has had productive and informative meetings with the VPAA, the DoF, the Associate DoF, and the DoSP, and they have sought FEC's direction on which committees need to be consulted on various matters, including Middle States, Study Abroad, etc. The Committee worked with CAPT in setting up the Search Committee for the VPAA and