

[Editor's note: What follow are notes by VPAA Susan Kress in response to the Minutes among committees and between committees and administrators and to be sure we are working well together on the major issues), I wonder whether FEC might be open to a structure where administrators meet with all appropriate committee chairs to discuss and assess our mutual work and make recommendations for improvement. Maybe this could happen at mid-year?

2. IPPC: Administrators who sat on IPPC this year would like to add the following to your report. In addition to refining the operating code, the committee spent considerable time developing the agenda for the year. Significant time has also been spent on the Campus Plan, with several community meetings sponsored by IPPC. IPPC also supported a presentation by the architects for the Zankel Music Building.

The schedule for budget discussions was affected in part by the search for the VPAA. While the group has only met twice thus far, the committee has reviewed an update on the budget for fiscal 2006 and 2007—and discussed in detail the preliminary planning assumptions for the upcoming budget for 2008, including tuition and fee increases, enrollment assumptions, the endowment spending rate, the targeted amount for new initiatives, a plan to defer again the scheduled increase in cost sharing for health insurance, the general salary pool, the next phase of the comprehensive salary framework, and related items. Administrators on IPPC point out that some IPPC meetings were canceled as a result of conflicts with visits from VPAA candidates.

3. CEPP: As we continue to refine the structural relationships in Academic Affairs, I think it will become clear that both the VPAA and the DOF need to be seated on CEPP. There is a longer rationale for this and perhaps it is best saved for another document.

The point about reviewing the administrative structure of the College and the authority of the DSA is not clear; it should be pointed out that the DOF is seated on the President's Cabinet.

4. FDC: With respect to sabbatical fellowships, we believe that the initiative was abandoned last year because of the decision to focus resources in the compensation pool. Moreover, this year the VPAA asked the Associate Dean of the Faculty to run several studies to explore the costs of supporting sabbaticals at 80%, 75%, 70%, and 65% respectively. The ADOF worked with Mike Hall, Director of Financial Planning and Budget to produce these studies; the money required to support sabbaticals at all these levels is considerable, and we want to think more creatively about how to support this priority.

This year as well we changed the process of distributing Mellon Funds and ad hoc funds for sabbaticals to make that process more transparent. Administrators in Academic Affairs sent out notices to all who were eligible for leaves (both pre and post tenure) this year and invited applications for support. We put all the available money in one pool (close to \$80,000). We established a group consisting of the VPAA, the DOF, the ADOF, and members of FDC not themselves eligible for leaves this year—and we distributed the money among the applicants, paying attention to Mellon guidelines and to previous guidelines for ad hoc funds. At a joint meeting of FDC with the VPAA, DOF, and ADOF, we decided as well to ask department chairs about whether they would like to see one or two full-year sabbatical fellowships supported at 80% or all full-year sabbatical applicants supported at a lesser level (the average with Mellon funds this year was \$10,000). Accordingly, the DOF made time for a presentation from FDC at the last Department Chairs/Program Directors meeting (I believe this event took place after the CoC meeting); the consensus from that meeting appeared to be that Chairs prefer a model where all are supported moderately rather than one or two at 80%.

With respect to PDF money, the President did provide additional funds last spring for summer collaborative research.

We are struck by the line that conversations about resources are “subject to intense prioritization.” With limited resources, we must indeed prioritize (with input from the community) about what is most institutionally valuable to all of us.

5. FEC: We are confused about the sentence that reads: “Specifically, the will of the faculty at the November 2004 meeting was for FEC to act as the primary conduit of information . . . into and out of the faculty concerning all-college issues and policies, “ and for the faculty members of IPPC to represent the interests of FEC. Could you clarify what is meant by the interests of FEC in relation to the interests of the College? We believe that the faculty members on IPPC and FEC represent the interests of the College.

With respect to the formation of a group to work on student scholarships (Fulbrights, Goldwaters, Marshalls, Trumans, etc.), the DOF and Dean of Studies were interested in recruiting specific faculty who had worked with these programs in the past. They did not realize they needed to consult FEC since they did not wish to use the "willingness to serve" framework. But with respect to faculty service, we certainly do wish to keep FEC apprised of faculty work. We are glad to note that FEC is pursuing a project on faculty service and are eager to partner with the committee in this initiative.