

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 the purpose of the meeting. She went over prepared slides, highlighting relevant points for the discussion. After the brief introduction, an open discussion ensued.

Note: The questions, answers, and comments presented here are based on the notes taken by members of FEC. They should not be taken as a transcript of the meeting, which was not recorded. Hence, it should be assumed that the actual wording and content of questions, answers, and comments are not exactly the same as those expressed during the meeting.

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.

Faculty member 3: Reminded attendees about the Yeshiva University Case, which the Supreme Court resolved. There is a legal case that defines managerial responsibilities. Recommends to check the case.

Faculty member 4: There are currently NTT faculty in managerial roles who are prevented from serving on governance committees, despite their experience with and interest in serving. Feels current practice is not welcoming of NTT governance service. ~~due to contract limitations.~~

Faculty member 5: There are exceptions in the Yeshiva University Case that should be considered.

Faculty member 6: These are not big-picture questions [referring to a slide shown by FEC]. Big questions would include how can faculty do a better job in decisions to allocate resources at the college level. The question about NTT participation in the governance system does not address the broader question. Faculty can do a better job participating in discussions. Service cycle at fault.

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 governance service was not their thing. If committees must be filled, there should be a mechanism to do it effectively. The cycle itself is not tied to some of these issues.

Faculty member 11: We have an accounting problem on one hand; it requires consideration of the number of junior TT faculty, NTT faculty, and size of committees. On the other hand, there is a problem related to the power of faculty; perhaps consider the formation of a group that could take on big ideas (e.g., faculty senate).

Faculty member 12: Has served in a faculty senate as secretary at former institution. Senate can play a role in enabling changes to recover power: changes in meetings (no long reports), and how we can engage faculty more in what committees are doing and reporting out (accountability of committees). Our power is in our numbers for having our voices heard by upper administration.

Faculty member 13: In 1994, faculty were talking about power and representation. The issue is always here. In some ways, conversations have been surrendered. There was a time when there were two faculty observers on the Board of Trustees. But only in executive sessions. Regretted the change. Since then, we have gotten more complicated as faculty with more complicated pathways. People are doing more research now. We only have so much energy. The 50-40-10 rule is not good for us. Junior faculty should participate more in the governance system early on.

Faculty member 14: The 50-40-10 model provides a framework for CPDs when working with candidates. How can we prepare people to be CPDs and participate in committees? The sooner faculty get involved in the governance system, the better.

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 it 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 governance service cycle, we should ask questions on how the service cycle puts people in committees, the strengths and weaknesses of the service cycle, and some questions within committees themselves.

Faculty member 11: Question about the number of available faculty members to serve and the ability to populate competitive ballots. A cohort with few people results in a lack of choice. People should be doing service that they are good at.

Chair of FEC: Numbers work as long as there is a redistribution in cohorts. Most likely recommendations from FEC will include a fair policy to redistribute cohort sizes. Considering the value of equity, the system has done a good job of spreading the length and diversity of service.

Faculty member 19: It is good we are talking about issues that are not being discussed in committees. Highlighted that new structures will add hours of service to current service. It seems that making big moves toward increasing faculty power requires a rigorous examination of those hours (perhaps cutting some hours of current service).

Faculty member 6: In the past, there was talk of a “big six” group of committees: the six most important committees. When we look at service that does not count, we see service that is really important, perhaps more important than some of the committees that fulfill the required governance service. We would benefit from having a mechanism to let people match interests and skills with governance service.

Chair of FEC: The current governance system is hybrid: a mix of elected/appointed governance committees and other types of service.

Faculty member 18: After the review, one option would be to abolish the service cycle, but it conflicts with Faculty Handbook language that requires broad participation of faculty. Another option is to tweak the service cycle to a better job at matching expertise, interest, and availability. The new president embraces IPPC not a decision-making body but a body that has open discussions. Deliberations are secret as long as decisions are not made and announced to

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

FEC: Faculty Executive Committee

IPPC: Institutional Policy and Planning Committee

NTT: Non-tenure track

PC: Promotions Committee

TT: Tenure track

DOF/VPAA: Dean of the Faculty/Vice President for Academic Affairs

[\[Versioning note\] This document was originally posted on April 24, 2024, and has been amended in response to faculty feedback on April 29, 2024.](#)

Faculty-Only Meeting on Governance System Review

Faculty Executive Committee
April 12, 2024

Governance System Review Process (2023-2024)

1. Faculty-only meeting in April 2023

- a. Values around service
- b. Matching values and governance system
- c. Improvement opportunities

2. Committee Operations Audits

- a. Size and constraints of membership
- b. Workload
- c. Chair's responsibilities
- d. Overall operations

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)	5	60	300	
Faculty Advisory Board (FAB)	1			One meeting is required. Other meetings vary by need.
Campus Sustainability Committee (CSC, subcommittee of IPPC)	4	90	360	
Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding (CIGU, subcommittee of IPPC)	7	60	420	Co-chair goes to IPPC

Pending Information:

Student Affairs Subcommittee of IPPC (SAS)

Subcommittee on Responsible Citizenship (SRC, subcommittee of IPPC)

Factors to Consider:

Committee Service that Fulfills Required Governance Service

Elected:

1. Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)
2. Appointments and Tenure Committee (ATC)
3. Promotions Committee (PC)
4. Committee on Educational Policies & Planning (CEPP)
5. Committee on Academic Freedom and Rights (CAFR)
6. Curriculum Committee (CC)
7. Faculty Development Committee (FDC)
8. Periclean Honors Forum Council (PHFC)
9. Athletic Council (AC)
10. Institutional Policy and Planning Committee (IPPC)

Appointed:

1. Self-Determined Major Committee (SDMC)
2. Committee on Academic Standing (CAS)
3. Faculty Advisory Board (FAB)
4. Student Affairs Subcommittee of IPPC (SAS)
5. Committee on Intercultural and Global Understanding (CIGU, subcommittee of IPPC)
6. Campus Sustainability Committee (CSC, subcommittee of IPPC)
7. Subcommittee on Responsible Citizenship (SRC, subcommittee of IPPC)

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. Administrative search committees
3. Working groups
4. Task forces

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: Cohort Sizes and Faculty Availability to Serve

Cohort/Group	Number of Faculty	Next Sabbatical
A	31	2029-2030
B	31	2023-2024
C	18	2024-2025
D	22	2025-2026
E	30	2026-2027
F	24	2027-2028
G	22	2028-2029
TT 1st year	21	
TT 2nd year	4	
TT 3rd year	2	
NTT	116	

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