Moment of silence.

I. Introduction of new faculty and staff.

Action I. Approval of the minutes of December 19, 2013, with the addition of the following phrase in the Open Question Period, first COMMENT: [There seems to be very little “unfiltered” contact between the whole faculty and the decision-makers, “including previously-regular informal contact between faculty and the Board as a whole.”]

II. Reports, Items for Action, and Items for discussion.

1. Richard Freedman for FAPC: a proposal to continue FAPC for another four years, and to reduce the membership to 4 faculty members (2 fac. reps. to the Board and 2 elected at large.) (att. doc.)

COMMENT: This is a very thoroughly-argued proposal, which I accept. FAPC has done a very good job. However, I would like to raise questions about the procedure by which we choose the members of FAPC. As we have it now, there is a “campaign” element: faculty are proposed and then the willing faculty make statements of position before the voting; this restricts our choices, since many faculty (although willing to step up to the plate when chosen), are unwilling to put themselves forward in this way. I suggest that we use the old system by which we elect members to Academic Council: a list of all eligible faculty and then a series of voting to narrow it down.

RESPONSE (FAPC): Our current procedure asks you to serve, but if you agree you do not have to make a statement.

COMMENT: I also am very appreciative of what FAPC has done, (and I was skeptical about it at first.) FAPC has been responsive to wide faculty interests; it acts as a body, not as individuals with decided views; so why should we ask prospective members to make “campaign statements?”

REPLY: The campaign statements do get us to define agendas.

COMMENT: I (also once skeptical), now think that FAPC works just fine. Do we have an agenda-plan for FAPC? RESPONSE: We listen as things come up. We also maintain, and publish at the outset of each year, a master list for consideration.

COMMENT: I want to bring up another issue: the relationship between the Provost and FAPC. I want FAPC to have autonomy as a just-faculty committee. RESPONSE (FAPC):
The Provost’s office acts as an archive for FAPC discussions (through Moodle); FAPC sets its own agenda. **COMMENT:** FAPC was designed as a place for just-faculty “talk”; if the Provost attends every meeting, this is diminished as a possibility. It was understood earlier that the Provost would attend only on invitation, and usually late in the meeting. **RESPONSE (FAPC):** We have not felt constrained by the Provost’s presence.

**COMMENT:** I would like to join the previous Comment. The words in the document distributed by FAPC which makes the case of “pros” for continuance of FAPC (a proposal which I DO support) make a *quantitative* argument about its utility; but I want to make a *qualitative* argument in terms of the autonomy of FAPC as a just-faculty body, in which the Provost would come only late in the meeting on invitation. It should be a body which sets its own agenda and which would be constrained by the regular presence of a member of the Administration.

**COMMENT (FAPC member):** I don’t understand this concern; FAPC works well. **RESPONSE:** I want to emphasize faculty autonomy; the faculty can be vulnerable to Administration pressure; I want to support a situation of relative faculty-invulnerability.

The Clerk asked for a straw-poll on the FAPC proposal to continue FAPC:
(47 votes): No (not renew in any form) 3, Renew for four years 41, Re-new permanently (no sunset clause) 3.

The Clerk asked for a straw-poll on the structure of FAPC:
(45 votes): the same structure, [3 at large + two Board reps] 8, a “slimming” [of 2 at large + two Board reps] 37

The Clerk asked for a straw-poll on method of elections to FAPC:
(43 votes): elections as for Academic Council 7, elections by nomination but with no “campaign” statement 14, elections as we do it now 22.

2. Ingrid Arauco, for AAC: the budget for FY 2015

Constructing budgets are always a trade-off. We are presenting a balanced budget.

Major elements: 3.9% increase in student charges; an increased student body of 1205 (1,220 projected by 2018.) The discount rate is 41.2% (an apparent leveling off.); a salary pool of 2.5%. Endowment spending is up by 3.7%. Total revenues have gone up, but there are increased expenditures also, especially new salary-lines and capital expenditures.

**In response to QUESTIONS:** 1205 is the actual number of students we expect; there was no discussion of restoring the 12% College contribution to the retirement plan; yes, we did have job descriptions for the new positions.
COMMENT (AAC): AAC will soon be discussing compensation in terms of the balance between salary and the retirement package; we would like to hear from you about this.

II. Report of the President

Dick Wynn will be retiring as V.P. and Treasurer at the end of the spring semester. He will continue part-time next year to help us in the transition and to manage a few special projects. We are beginning a search for a successor. There will be a small campus search committee, including Ingrid Arauco for AAC and another faculty member (would anyone like to volunteer to join us?; this is a committee which will have a short-term existence.)

At the Board meeting next weekend, we will bring the Board up to date on strategic plans.

Of the current capital projects, the VCAM project is ready for Board review and approval to proceed to the design phase.

The (balanced) budget will be presented to the Board, and also the 10-yr. model budget. We realize that we must get compensation back to a 3% level very soon.

The No-Loan proposal will go back to the Board for action. If it is a “Yes,” we would still be one of only about 10 liberal arts colleges with a No-Loan policy for some portion of students.

On interim funding (the endowment borrowing): we won’t actually take the money out until we actually need it; for the Sharpless project, and for Information Technology, we are still in the process of trying to get it absolutely “right” and won’t spend hastily.

There will be two formal presentations to the Board: 1) about our Center for Career Professional Advising and 2) about the working and meaning of College “Rankings.”

The Board has asked for a review of its own Governance (its committee structure.)

III. Report of the Provost (att. doc.)

Rob Fairman drew our attention to two new funding opportunities (the Spencer Program and the Chicago Seminar.)

Jeff Tecosky-Feldman solicited proposals for the Chesick Scholars program, and pointed out that variations in summer time-structure (the time-chart for the course) were certainly possible.

QUESTION: Do we have impact-measures? REPLY: yes, some, but it has been only two years of data and thus we do not have a four-year picture for a Chesick scholar’s trajectory. It is modeled on the very successful Meyerhold program.

The Open Question Period.

1) Student Honor Council leaders appeared and gave us a report.
QUESTION: How do you set parameters for students to balance their school work and their Honor Council work? REPLY: We try to tell them that they are students first; that they can say no; and that they can appeal to their professors for flexibility and help. We are trying to change procedures to make it easier and less burdensome, perhaps having only 6 students on a case.

QUESTION: What about the backlog in submitting abstracts to the community? We need those abstracts to educate ourselves about the situations we might face. REPLY: We are trying to shorten it.

COMMENT: There should be time-limits on cases; the time-burden on Honor Council is enormous.

COMMENT: What if we doubled the size of Honor Council and thus shared out the work more? REPLY: More students would not help; it is harder to manage a larger group.

QUESTION: Has there been an increase in the number of cases? What is the balance between academic and social honor code violations? REPLY: Yes, there is an increase. It is about 2/3 academic-cases and 1/3 social-cases, and that balance hasn’t changed.

The President: The Administration knows that they are facing an increased workload and perhaps outdated processes. We need change. We have offered to help the students in this.

COMMENT: We appreciate your efforts and the terrible work load. But this is also a burden on faculty; a faculty member involved in an Honor Council case has a terrible burden, that of sometimes almost becoming a prosecuting attorney. Therefore, we faculty need to see those abstracts in order to help us understand the situation and know how to act.

2) Phil Meneely for EPC: TWO NEW DEADLINES: new course proposals Feb. 14 (and there is a new form coming out) and new tenure-track positions March 21, (for which we need enrollment data for the past 5 years.)

3) QUESTION: To clarify the electronic submission of theses document: does this mean that The Faculty has the final say? REPLY: Yes. Yes. COMMENT: I applaud the document that has just been issued and I thank the Associate Provost for such a thoughtful response to our questions.

Adjourned at 5:45 p.m. Linda Gerstein, Secretary to the Faculty