

Committee on Committees (CoC)

Approved via email 5/13/15

April 27, 2015

3:30 p.m.

Chancellor's Conference Room, 12 Holladay Hall

Present: Tyler Allen, Warwick Arden, Betsy Brown, Khari Cyrus, Wyona Goodwin, Amy Jinnette, Donna Johnson, Jeannette Moore, Michael Mullen, David Zonderman

The minutes of the April 28, 2014 meeting were approved via email on May 15, 2014. The email requested a response only to suggest changes or corrections and indicated that otherwise the minutes would stand as written. They were so approved.

Amy Jinnette reported that the committee has been active by email in seeking approvals on actions required since the last meeting. The actions routinely include approval of replacements for general faculty seat vacancies and approval of the annual report from the Committee on Committees to the Chancellor.

In the way of new business, the Provost read a proposal from Louis Hunt requesting an ex-officio, non-voting seat for a representative from the Department of Athletics be added to the Registration, Records and Calendar Committee. The proposal justifies this need by noting that communication and coordination between academic and athletic scheduling is essential to the efficient operation of both enterprises. Following brief discussion, a motion was made and seconded. The motion to approve the seat addition passed.

Betsy Brown continued the discussion with the proposal from the Copyright Committee. Due to revisions in the Copyright Regulation and the duties that now fall to the Director of Copyright and Digital Scholarship, the Copyright Committee passed a motion recommending the Committee become advisory to the Director of Copyright and Digital Scholarship [and through him to the Provost] rather than a Standing Committee. Additionally, in the interest of institutional efficiency, the Copyright Committee should be called to meet when necessary to advise the Director. A motion was called for to present the proposal to the Chancellor for approval; it was approved.

Betsy next presented a proposal on the status of the Lifelong Faculty Involvement Committee. She explained the purpose of the committee and the way it interfaces with the Association of Retired Faculty (ARF). The proposal indicates the committee should continue as a standing committee, still be populated from the standing committee survey results, and meet at least once a semester, with additional meetings if requested by the Senate, the Provost, the ARF Board, or other faculty or administrators. A motion was made to amend the charge as indicated in the proposal; it was approved.

David Zonderman discussed the resolution proposing the formation of a University Standing Committee on Lectures and Speakers. The Harrelson Fund Committee often co-sponsors speakers with other funds; due to the high cost of speakers it cannot fund the cost alone. A university-wide lecture committee would ideally be able to pool resources of the various groups across campus who sponsor lectures. Changes involving the Harrelson Fund will depend on the flexibility allowed by the language of the bequest of the late Chancellor Harrelson. The resolution hopes to expand the mandate of the Harrelson Fund and coordinate campus efforts in

the areas of financing and publicizing lectures. Discussion followed on whether to abolish the Harrelson Fund and create a new committee or change the charge of the Harrelson Fund committee and expand its current role. Since the process for making this change is uncertain, the motion was made to explore and define further before presenting the idea to the Chancellor. The motion was approved.

Amy described changes made in rank categories in the survey this past year. Based on feedback from the Faculty Senate committee meetings, the identification of a faculty member's rank was added to this year's survey in the drop-down box to self-select employee type. Specifically requested this year is further distinction among Non-tenure Track faculty ranks. We also recognize that Emeritus/Emerita needs to be added to the list in the drop-down box since emeriti faculty are eligible for service on standing committees. Amy will contact the survey programmer to request these features be included in next year's survey.

Amy next explained the process in place for vetting faculty appointments to standing committees both at the beginning of the year and to fill vacant seats when replacements are needed. Since a similar vetting process is not in place for the appointment of staff and student members, she wanted to bring this to the attention of the committee and open the discussion for possible changes to the current process. Khari Cyrus noted that students are appointed to the committees based on their class schedules and interests. Wyona Goodwin said she had worked with Robert Davis last year to get a feel for the staff process. One problem in that process is that supervisors are not always agreeable to granting time away from work to serve on a standing committee. Amy mentioned that since we encourage staff to participate in the survey, we need to choose from the list of volunteers whenever possible.

Amy offered an update on the appointment process with respect to the Courses and Curricula Committee since it continues to be a concern. Last year, we added language to the survey for both UCCC and CUE that stated "Familiarity with undergraduate education and/or participation with the College Courses and Curricula Committee is desirable." This year, the Academic Policy committee suggested that if there is more than one choice from a college for a vacant seat that the colleges (specifically the associate deans) be allowed to give input on the selection. Discussion followed on the importance of the curriculum being a function of the faculty and involving as many as possible. The conclusion reached was that in the case of multiple choices for a seat, we should approach the chair of the college courses and curricula committee, not an administrator, for input on the decision.

Amy Jinnette provided an overview of the committee management process including the 2015-16 selection process for appointments. The preference survey was open for three weeks, and two reminders were sent to all faculty and staff. 311 responded, which is down by 61 from last year. After a brief explanation of the selection process for faculty replacements, she noted that the Faculty Senate Committees had provided input on the proposed committee members. Amy then indicated the spreadsheet of vacant seats for Faculty Senate, students and staff at Tab 5 and encouraged those present to start early locating volunteers for their respective seats.

As further new business, Tyler Allen inquired whether a seat for a Graduate Student representative could be added to the Council on Athletics. He was advised to draft a proposal justifying the request for submission to the Committee on Committees as a first step in this process.

Tyler also inquired how the Graduate Student member on the Committee on Committees could be designated as a full voting member instead of an invited guest. That action will require a review of the committee bylaws and having the committee consider making the change.

Mike Mullen expressed concern about college administrators who teach an occasional class being seated on committees as faculty members particularly on UCCC and CUE.

A final comment on survey participation was made by David Zonderman regarding the response rate being lower this year than last. He encouraged more discussion through the Faculty Senate to increase participation next year. He also suggested to consider approaching the college Faculty Senate representative instead of the Dean in the case of no volunteers for a vacant designated seat to further enhance faculty involvement in the process.

Provost Arden called for a motion to recommend the committee rosters and charges to the Chancellor. The motion was made and seconded; the motion carried.

The Provost asked if there was any further business to be discussed. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:20.