ANNUAL REPORT 1998-99

The Committee of Faculty Governance met 27 times during the academic yeal 91 99 meetings included sessions of the Committee of Committees (Adllege Council, CAFR, CAPT, CEPP, College Benefits, Committee on Faculty Governance, Curriculum Committee, Financial Policy and Planning, and IPC) on

st to review the presidential search. The CFG also met with Jamie Studley on February 24to discuss faculty goveance and administrative structure.

RIESE, ULFAR particular particula

th, 1999 approved motions that revised threation of Athletic Council and Charlet Bullet Bulle

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH. In addition to the normal business, CFG, like the faculty at large, took part in the presidential search process that came to a close in the fall of 1998. The chair of CFG in the fall term, Betty Balevic, maintained communications with theulthus members of the search committee through its liaison, Elaine Rubenstein.

At its meeting on November 4, 1998, CFG determined that it should initiate a review of both the 1997-86-1997-98 presidential searches in order to provide historical context at lessons that should inform future searches. The Committee reminded the Faculty Meeting in February of 1999 that the members would prepar report to the trustees during the spring term and share that report with the faculty by the endrof Theete CFG discussed a draft of that report with the faculty members of the Committee of Committees and with othe faculty members. Tadahisa Kuroda, Chair of CFG in the spring term, explained at the May 19

th, 1999 Faculty

Meeting that the report attempts to provide a faculty Ful(a)15(t)-115(t)-1(f)3(a)4(c)4(uu-)-2()]TJ 0(doc)4(5) measures to thealeulty Meeting for a formal vote. If adopted by the Faculty Meeting, the measures will then require the approval of the Board of Trustees. CFG put a draft of its perpits website.

CENTRAL CONCERNS. The CFG's spent a good deal of time thinking about faculty governance and its man manifestations. The committee held extensive discussions about the current faculty governance system in the and practice. The members agreed that faculty members responsibilities in certain areas, such as academic freedom, academic standards, educational policy and curriculum, faculty status, agroved fance. They also recognized that the faculty members have major interests and share responsibilities for constituencies in areas such as institutional planning and financial policy and planning, but that faculty representatives on these committees expressed frustration with their roles at the Committee of Committees meeting of February 19

1999. CFG observes that FPPC, IPC, and Benefits Committee (which reports to FPPC) have functions in are over which faculty have a significant but not primary responsibility and in which faculty members comprise a minority of the membership.

CFG discussed some very preliminary ideas about simplification and clarification of faculty committees, including reducing the number of faculty members on committees and combining committees with related responsibilities. Consultation with various members of such corresiptersuaded CFG that this was a direction that we should not pursue. Instead, CFG asked CAFR, CAPT, Curriculum Committee, FPPC, IPC, College Benefits, UWW, CEPP, and EMAC to do a-aets essment around several questions: (1) what is the major function of your committee, (2) what is its membership, (3) what are the committee's major objectives this year, (4) is your committee achieving its goals, (5) is your committee having difficulty in meeting its goals and, if so, what issues or problems seem to your committee difficulty, (6) if you were asked to propose changes relative to the goals, membership, major function of your committee for purposes of improving your committee's overall performance, what suggestions might you have?

The subsequent repoints dicated that the committees with faculty majorities and faculty chairs are functioning satisfactorily. IPC, FPPC, and Benefits have had difficulties in the past but appear to be doing better now, though issues remain. The Committee of Committees supplied idea of having CFG do and pth study next academic year on this subject and coming back to the Faculty with a recommendation about how these committees might be made more effective and where they should be situated, under Faculty Governance or College Governance. In the interim, CFG proposed a preamble to Part Two Faculty Governance of the Faculty Handbook that explains the thinking behind the committee structure now in place. The Faculty Meeting on Ma 19th

that CFG occupies a unique position because membership is broadly open to faculty of differing status and departments and because CFG has broad responsibilities in areas of faculty governance and faculty relations with the administration. CFG is one of only three committees comprised solely of faculty methberthers are CAPT and CAFR (when dealing with faculty issues); yet it does not have the opportunity to meet with the trustees. He informed the trustees that CFG will ask formally for meeting with the appropriate board committee next year.

AGENDA FOR 19992000.

- propose a new edition of the Faculty Handbook for 12099 at the September Faculty Meeting.
- conduct the four rounds of elections, make omnibus appointments, and designate sabbatical replacements for faculty members of committees who are going on leaves of absence, and examine the possibility of going to electronic balloting for elections.
- o establish a CFG website with CFG operating code, some deflections, annual report;

Fall Term 1998	Spring Term 1999	1999-2000
Betty Balevic, Chair	Jacqueline Azzarto	Jacqueline Azzarto 2002
Tadahisa Kuroda	Tadahisa Kuroda, Chair	Betty Balevic 2000
K. Gary McClure	K. Gary McClure	Richard Hihn 2002
Vasantha Narasimhan	Vasantha Narasimhan	Tadahisa Kuroda 2001
Mehmet Odekon	Mehmet Odekon	Mehmet Odekon 2001
Mary Z. Stange	Mary Z. Stange	Mary Z. Stange 2000