

Review and Planning Committee
Minutes for April 19, 2000

Present: Becker, Cabe, Edwards, Koskovich, Norton, Odell, Pristash, Rohn, Schuurman.

THE APPROVAL OF MINUTES for the April 12th meeting was by unanimous agreement tabled until the next meeting, though a couple of minor corrections were made.

CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION BY TONY BECKER TO RESTRUCTURE PART OF THE FACULTY MANUAL AND INTRODUCE CERTAIN LIMITED GOVERNANCE REFORMS was the first order of business, but new circumstances led to the motion being indefinitely tabled. A committee member expressed concern that the President's resignation made it more likely that he would not want to endorse such a change, thus imposing it on his successor, when he had expressed some reservations about it. President Edwards concurred. The committee could not see the regents approving the motion without President Edwards's endorsement.

THE DRAFT MOTION TO CHANGE FACULTY MEETINGS TO A DAY TIME HOUR NEXT YEAR WAS THEN CONSIDERED. Each faculty representative reported on responses to this idea from her or his faculty. Science faculty are split with some strongly for it and some strongly against it (because of labs). Some Physical Education faculty are against it in Social and Applied Sciences, but many more SAS faculty are enthusiastically for the change. All the IGS faculty voiced support. Some significant Fine Arts faculty, particularly in Music and Dance, are against it, but the majority responding from each department are for it.

Various members of RPC expressed concern that a change should not place exceptional burdens on a minority of faculty doing teaching activities (including certain rehearsing) if that could be avoided; much discussion centered on this. Concluding that that group in many instances has some options for avoiding conflicts and appeared to be very small, the committee decided to go forward with crafting the motion and bringing it to the faculty.

THE PRESIDENT WAS ASKED TO ELABORATE ON COMMENTS HE HAD MADE TO THE COMMITTEE IN A MEMO ABOUT POSSIBLE CHANGES IN THE BY-LAWS. He said that these were fairly technical in nature and stemmed from the college's attorney periodically reviewing the by-laws to see how they conformed to current statutes and practices. A recent review indicated that some changes to update the by-laws should be considered, but the President now thought that they probably won't be pursued as early as he had previously thought. He said that should any consideration of changes involve faculty matters, faculty would be brought into that discussion.

The President also pointed out to fellow committee members that language in the by-laws about 'the efficient operation of the college' appeared in at least two sections unrelated to faculty authority. This is shared language, he noted, and is not unique to one group.

A MOTION TO SEEK WIDESPREAD DISSEMINATION OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICIES IN HIRING PRACTICES was considered next. The President provided a brief

overview of how these initiatives were being developed. He said that the leader of the Diversity Design Team, Mark Schelske, could provide more details about this. The motion under consideration was tabled until RPC heard from Mark Schelske.

A SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON TENURE AND PROMOTION was the next order of business. RPC members received the first part of the report, which makes suggestions for changes in the Manual to correct what the subcommittee views as relatively minor matters. The second part of the report will detail more substantive changes that probably require broad-based faculty policy decisions. RPC went over the changes suggested in the first part as far as time allowed. Concern was expressed whether the suggested change of convening professorial rank faculty to initiate recommending candidates for tenure and promotion was too limiting. This also led to a lengthy discussion about the practice of uncoupling promotion from tenure, which several RPC members questioned. We wondered how best to include input from the Paracollege Senior Tutor and how that language and set of concerns related to increased interdisciplinary hiring and teaching and the proper evaluation of it. We wrestled some with the details on how to set limits on curriculum vitae (pages formatted in certain ways versus word count as a limit). Concern was also expressed that individuals responsible for compiling the dossier see that proper criteria are used for evaluative material submitted. Having devoted more time to these matters than allotted, RPC postponed further discussion of this report until the next meeting, when we hoped to have some subcommittee members in attendance.

THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE BUNTROCK FACULTY SPACES SUBCOMMITTEE was considered and endorsed as modified based upon discussions with several people. The recommendations are being forwarded to the director of the Commons.

ALAN NORTON THEN GAVE RPC A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE BUDGET DECISION MAKING PROCESS WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION PAID TO THE CAPITAL BUDGET. He explained how relatively new practices informed recommendations about the Operations budget. He as Treasurer, the other vice presidents, and Community Budget Group all provide input to the President, who makes recommendations to the Board. With the Capital budget, by comparison, the Board has done more of the decision making. The President makes recommendations to the Board and seeks advice from the vice presidents and framework planning process. Alan also explained how the college has in recent years commissioned two framework planning processes to assist in thinking about capital development.

Maggie Odell, Chair of RPC, said that the meeting was running late and the committee would return to this topic to consider the policy implications of the capital budget at a future meeting. That elicited a question and a response from the President, who said that he could not envision any faculty-based policy issues involving capital expenditures.

Following a brief discussion of this, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Matt Rohn