Faculty-Only Meeting Notes
Faculty Executive Committee
Updates on the Review of the Service Cycle and the Governance System
April 12, 2024

The chair of FEC welcomed attendees and introduced

.

Faculty member 1: There are a lot of NTT faculty who would like to serve on committees but are essentially iced out due to the length of their contracts. There is a proposal to make all full-time NTT faculty eligible to serve.

Faculty member 2: CPDs are classified as managerial, and often TT faculty, more generally, are considered managerial. What is the relationship between self-governance and the NTT union? Is governance part of management?

Chair of FEC: There is tension in classifying TT faculty as management; there are common interests between TT and NTT.

Faculte

Faculty member 7: Unsure that changes experienced are related to the service cycle. Never felt like the required governance service was a box to check. The service cycle might not be the mechanism by which things changed.

Faculty member 8: Agreed that mid to late career service is affected by the service cycle; changes in junior service were affected by the 50-40-10 rule. Faculty input and serious representation at the college are at an all-time low. We need to think about it. IPPC is not really a consultative body. What is the role faculty want to have in governance (the college in general) at this moment? Need to have a reckoning. Our role has diminished. Need to discuss.

Faculty member 9: Has sat in IPPC and participated in the interview process for the new DOF/VPAA. Knows the importance of faculty representation. At some institutions, there is faculty representation on the Board of Trustees (BoT). Should faculty representation on BoT be considered?

Faculty member 10: If changes are going to be made, we should look at past experiences. Previous faculty observers on BoT ended because the representation was burdensome and not very effective. We need a bigger change to make IPPC a more consultative body. When considering service, we need to be careful in differentiating service generally and required governance service. ATC and PC consider a full picture (all service). The service cycle became required because committees were required for the function of the college, and there were not enough people who volunteered to fill them. There were groups of people who always served, and others who felt that governace service was not their thing. If committees must be filled, there

Faculty member 9: Likes 50-40-10 rule, one of the reasons why they decided to work at Skidmore.

Faculty member 6: 50-40-10 rule emerged in an effort to add clarity to the tenure process. An unintended consequence is the change of service pathways. The "10" part limited the relevance and expectations of service for junior faculty. As a result, they do not get to meet other colleagues.

Faculty member 14: Offered clarification of 50-40-10 rule. Their initial perception was that the rule referred to time (workload distribution). When on ATC, they realized it was more about assembling the tenure file.

Faculty member 3: The committee structure does not address the individual and group needs. For instance, undue interference of administration in departmental matters. There is no mechanism for faculty to respond when in comes to departmental issues. HR is the solution, but it is not appropriate. Regrets we are still preventing faculty from sending messages to each other.

Faculty member 15: Feels like parts of the service cycle work well. They were initially appointed to CEPP from ad hoc as pre-tenure faculty. It was good preparation for current service as chair. Only hears shared governance when we talk about complaints. Eager to hear targeted proposals that would boldly advance goals but not expect to fix all issues.

Faculty member 16: PC weights service; it carries a lot of weight in decisions. As far as the mechanics of committees, not sure the mechanics of committee work have a big effect on faculty voice. A faculty senate proposal comes from a gut feeling, but not ready to support it if it would have a negative effect. Being on PC allows one to see the strength of files. Criteria for tenure are far beyond PC criteria. People are doing a lot to get tenure; how much more could one ask from faculty to get promoted? The one thing to differentiate, perhaps, is to increase the weight of service. We should consider how the college is changing, for instance, the financial pressures it faces. Compensation was bad, but it got better. Can we do that again? Regarding the NTT union, do tenure-line faculty have a body that represents their interests? We need something to voice tenure-line faculty concerns, a mechanism in addition to the current system. Perhaps a "super FEC" that not only governs the mechanics of the system but represents the interests of tenure-line faculty?

Faculty member 17: Wondering about the 50-40-10 and the expectation of becoming available for 3 years. Differences in service between those who get elected and those in the ad hoc pool. Perhaps the 50-40-10 does not need to mention the "10" part, given the required governance service.

Faculty member 6: Service to the college covered by the required governance service is not the only type of service considered during evaluations. The rule is meant to capture the variety of service a faculty member can perform.

Faculty member 18: Interesting conversation, perhaps an indication that we should have these conversations more often. We have heard about many issues, including committee structure. But

that is not really doing a review of the service cycle. They are important issues that are somewhat related. When the service cycle was adopted, one big concern was that it would add a lot of work to the faculty. The motivation was to spread the workload. Regarding faculty presence in BoT meetings, there were many issues in the past: it was seen as ineffective (faculty were only observers in some of the meetings). Also, faculty were writing reports vetted by admin; it was a frustrating process. If we consider the idea again, it is worth considering a different model.

Faculty member 13: We should look at all of the issues. Every generation should look at the governance system and have the opportunity to think about the governance system. We should always be mindful of the division of labor. Try to be clear about what our responsibility is and what is not our job. There are trade-offs in every system; it is important to identify what those are. There are different experiences for faculty that result from differences in departments and programs. We should strengthen how CPDs work. We need to train and support CPDs.

Faculty member 7: Since this is a review of the gov00912 0 q0912 Qq0.000009120.000009120.000009120.0000

the community, which adds difficulty for faculty representatives in reconnecting with the rest of the faculty. Important to look at ways to tweak the current system.

Faculty member 20: Thank you to FEC for organizing this session.

Faculty member 21: A point of information regarding faculty senates. In their experience, tenure track and NTT faculty are involved in faculty senates; they do not represent tenure-line faculty exclusively.

Faculty member 8: The discussion illustrated tensions in the governance system. Encourage attendees to think big, think bold. The problem is that the current structure is not conducive to thinking big.

Faculty member 15: Power, governance, and service are not the same thing. Doing the humble work of running the college is necessary.

The chair of FEC thanked everyone for their participation and concluded the meeting.

Acronym List:
50-40-10: Reference to language in the Faculty Handbook regarding the weight given to tenure criteria: "While one cannot give mathematical precision to the weight given to the three criteria, one may say that 50 percent, 40 percent, and 10 percent express the general expectation that teaching and professional work are primary (teaching being the principal criterion), and that a modest level of service is expected in pre-tenure years." (p. 124)
ATC: Appointments and Tenure Committee
CEPP: Committee on Educational Policies and Planning
CPDs: Chairs and Program Directors

Faculty-Only Meeting on Governance System Review

Faculty Executive Committee
April 12, 2024

Factors to Consider:
Committee Self-Reported Perception of Membership Changes

No justification to increase or decrease size

Appointments and Tenure Committee (ATC)
Promotions Committee (PC)
Committee on Educational Policies & Planning (CEPP)
Committee on Academic Freedom and Rights (CAFR)
Faculty Development Committee (FDC)
Periclean Honors Forum Council (PHFC)
Athletic Council (AC)
Institutional Policy and Planning Committee (IPPC)
Committee on Academic Standing (CAS)
Faculty Advisory Board (FAB)

Possible Justification to Increase Size

Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
Self-Determined Major Committee (SDMC)

Possible Justification to Decrease Size

Curriculum Committee (CC)
Campus Sustainability Committee (CSC, subcommittee of IPPC)

Information Pending

Student Affairs Subcommittee of IPPC (SAS)
Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding (CIGU, subcommittee of IPPC)
Subcommittee on Responsible Citizenship (SRC, subcommittee of IPPC)

Factors to Consider: Committee Self-Reported Approximate Meeting Time

Committee	Approx. Meetings per Semester	Average Minutes of Meetings	Average Meeting Mins. per Semester	Notes
Appointments and Tenure Committee (ATC)	28	180	5040	
Promotions Committee (PC)	28	180	5040	Meeting time varies by need.
Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)	14	60	840	
Institutional Policy and Planning Committee (IPPC)	7	90	630	
Committee on Educational Policies & Planning (CEPP)	14	60	840	Meeting time varies by need.
Committee on Academic Freedom and Rights (CAFR)	14	60	840	
Curriculum Committee (CC)	14	60	840	
Self-Determined Major Committee (SDMC)	14	90	1260	
Faculty Development Committee (FDC)	7	60	420	
Committee on Academic Standing (CAS)	14	60	840	

Factors to Consider: Committee Self-Reported Approximate Meeting Time

Committee	Approx. Meetings per Semester	Average Minutes of Meetings	Average Meeting Mins. per Semester	Notes
Periclean Honors Forum Council (PHFC)	6	60	360	
Athletic Council (AC)				

Factors to Consider:

Committee Service that Fulfills Required Governance Service

Elected:

1.

Factors to Consider:

Committee Service that DOES NOT Fulfill Required Governance Service

Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Institutional Animal Care & Use Committee (IACUC)
Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)
Radiation Safety Committee
Tenure Appeal Committee (TAC)
Safety Committee
Campus Safety Advisory Committee
Engineering Advisory Committee
Advisory Panel (AP)
Grievance Panel (GP)
Fulbright Advisor
Porter-Wachenheim Scholarship Committee

*** This is a non-exhaustive list***

Sub-Committees of IPPC
Subcommittee on Budget and Finance
Bias Response Group (BRG)
Subcommittee on Institutional Effectiveness

ID Steering Committees and Advisory Boards
Environmental Studies and Sciences Steering Committee
Health Professions Advisory Committee
International Affairs Steering Committee
Neuroscience Steering Committee
Latin American, Caribbean, and Latinx Studies Advisory Board Black Studies Advisory Board
Skidmore Analytical Interdisciplinary Laboratory Steering Committee Asian Studies Steering Committee
Gender Studies Advisory Board
Film and Media Studies Advisory Board

Factors to Consider:

Committee Service that DOES NOT Fulfill Required Governance Service

1.   Senior administrative review committees
2.

Black Studies Program Planning
Subcommittee (2018)
Academic Planning Working Group (2020)
Grading Policy Working Group (2020)
Healthcare Working Group (2021)
Faculty Advisory Committee (2021-2022)
Faculty Compensation Working Group
(2021-2022)
HHMI Working Group (2022-2023)
Middle States Working Groups (2024-2025)

*** This is a non-exhaustive list***

Search Committees
Chief Human Resources Officer (2018)
Program Director of Black Studies (2018)
President of the College (2019)
Chief Technology Officer (2019)
VP Advancement (2020-2021)
Dean of Students and Vice President for Student Affairs
(2021) IdeaLab Director (2021)
VP Communications and Marketing (2021-2022, 2023)
Dean of the Faculty & VP Academic Affairs (2022)
VP Finance and Administration and Treasurer (2022)
VP Enrollment & Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
(2022)

Factors to Consider:

Big Picture Questions

What service counts (fulfills Required Governance Service)?

Scope of system (what committees are in and out)

Supply and demand of committee members (look at cohort sizes)

Divisional representation

The service cycle as a mechanism for assigning service