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Committee Membership:

Deyonne Bryant (called from reserve to chair, Fall 2011, and to co-chair, Spring 2012): assumed primary responsibility for faculty meeting agenda in the spring; and continued committee review of the Budget Advisory Committee

Rolf Nelson (co-chair, on leave Fall 2011): assumed primary responsibility for committee elections

Yuen-Gen Liang (on leave Spring 2012)

Chris Kalberg (elected Spring 2012), incoming COCA Chair

Meetings

CoCA met monthly in the fall semester and three times during the spring semester (in February, March, and April). Since elections were handled electronically and other matters were discussed via email, more frequent meetings were not necessary.

Elections and Appointments

Rolf Nelson maintained a database of committee membership, updating during the year as needed. This database was made available to the committee and consulted for election planning purposes. Elections were held, as in the past two years, on Survey Monkey. This system again proved effective and efficient.

Standing committee elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Elected faculty member</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>2/16/2012</td>
<td>Shawn Christian</td>
<td>HUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>2/16/2012</td>
<td>Geoffrey Collins</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2/26/2012</td>
<td>Robert Morris</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Advisory Committee</td>
<td>2/26/2012</td>
<td>Rachelle DeCoste</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Committees and Agenda</td>
<td>3/9/2012</td>
<td>Nancy Evans</td>
<td>HUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>3/22/2012</td>
<td>Phoebe Chan</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CoCA appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy (Curriculum Evaluation subcommittee)</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>Kirk Anderson, Barbara Darling-Smith</td>
<td>HUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS in the Curriculum Working Group</td>
<td>Fall 2011-Spring '12</td>
<td>Kathryn Tomacek, Josh Stenger, Claire Buck, Tim Barker, Chuck Straley, John Bezis-Selfa, Tom Armstrong, Karen McCormack</td>
<td>HUM, NS, SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Advisory*</td>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Shawn McCafferty</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure*</td>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Rochelle Leibowitz</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes reserve appointment

Agenda Items:

I. Reviews of the Planning and Priorities Committee (PPC) and the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

   A. Planning and Priorities Committee (an administrative committee of the college)
      1. Accepted a proposal submitted by Professors Miller and Kricher, incoming and outgoing chairs of the all-campus PPC, to alter its structure. [See Appendix 1]
      2. Discussed the proposal with President Crutcher and Provost Eisenmann and convened a meeting of the faculty and administrators to discuss proposed legislation on a Faculty PPC.
      3. Brought a proposal to the faculty to adopt new legislation on the Faculty PPC. Legislation passed and the Faculty PPC was constituted of representatives from the Educational Policy Committee, Economic Status and Workload Committee,
Advisory Committee, and Faculty Scholarship and Promotions Committee. The provost and Vice President for Finance and Administration began its work immediately. [See Appendix 2]

B. Budget Advisory Committee (an administrative committee of the college)

1. Accepted a proposal submitted by Professors Miller and Kricher, incoming and outgoing Chairs of the all-campus PPC, which included disbanding the BAC. [See Appendix 1]

2. Discussed the proposal with President Crutcher and Provost Eisenmann. The president recommended further discussion of the recommendation in committees. CoCA chair Bryant and President Crutcher agreed to convene a discussion with the faculty before the academic year ended.

3. Bryant initiated discussions with Staff Council Co-Chairs Sara Smith and Gary Ahrendts about the recommendations of the staff members on the BAC. The staff indicated that they valued the all-campus committee structure and wanted to stay on the committee until the permanent Vice President for Finance and Administration arrived with possible ideas about the committee.

4. Bryant, Liang, and Kalberg met with current members of the BAC for their input about its status. The faculty members of the BAC expressed concern that the committee had met only once by mid-semester, but they also valued the all-campus committee structure and did not want to step down from the committee, leaving the staff and students behind.

5. Bryant met again with senior administrative officers about the status of the BAC, upon the request of the BAC co-chair, and a second meeting of the committee was convened. After this meeting, the faculty co-chair of the BAC stepped down from the committee. CoCA did not replace the co-chair and elections to replace members whose terms had expired were suspended in the 2012 election cycle.

6. Bryant requested input from faculty members of the AAUP about the BAC on April 27, 2012.

7. CoCA, the Co-Chairs of the Staff Council, President Crutcher, Provost Eisenmann, and VP Brian Douglas met, May 4, 2012, to reach a decision on the status of the BAC. The senior administrative officers recommended dissolving it and convening joint meetings of the Staff and Faculty PPC several times each semester for input about long-term capital planning and expenditures—the new direction of financial planning and budgeting at the college. CoCA agreed with the recommendation and reported to the faculty at the May 4, 2012 faculty meeting. [See Appendix 3]

8. After the discussion at the faculty meeting, President Crutcher recommended suspending the Budget Advisory Committee, in AY 2012-2013, and convening the joint meetings of the Faculty and Staff Planning and Priorities Committees in its stead. CoCA agreed to the recommendation.

C. Recommendations of CoCA on BAC and the PPC

1. The proliferation of administrative committees and ad hoc committees erodes the integrity of the standing committees. Requests for new committees should be reviewed carefully and deliberatively.

2. The BAC process, although important and useful to the college for many years, does not have the support of the administrative officers with oversight of the
committee. Since the BAC operates at the will of the senior administrative officers, and not the faculty, the faculty should reach consensus to disband it.

3. The Committee on Committees and Agenda is scheduled to review the Faculty PPC at the end of AY 2012-2013.

II. Faculty Meeting Agenda

A. Committee Chairperson Deyonne Bryant worked with Faculty Secretary Lynda Marcoccia this year to set the agenda. After reports from the president and provost, which were timely and concise, priority was given to (1) action items on faculty legislation, (2) items requiring full discussion of the faculty, (3) brief reports, (4) New Business, and (4) announcements—in this order. Moreover, faculty and administrators were encouraged to send their announcements via the Wheaton Faculty listserv. Still, many meetings ran long this year, due mainly to the presentations and remarks made to the faculty and staff by trustees, consultants, and advisors about the extraordinary financial setback. Also, several items that were submitted as brief reports by their presenters became longer, unplanned discussions.

B. The incoming CoCA should continue to work with the president and provost in reporting ahead of time the roster of people they will invite to speak at the faculty meetings. These people and their items should follow the established order of the agenda.

C. The incoming CoCA might is recommended to work with faculty to gauge better the amount of time their agenda items should take.

III. Minutes of the Faculty Meetings

A. The Committee on Committees and Agenda, at its February committee meeting, discussed the recommendation brought by Deyonne Bryant to move from the current model of transcribing the Minutes to a thorough summary. Bryant stated that the amount of time that Lynda Marcoccia spent transcribing the Minutes represented a workload problem for Ms. Marcoccia. Committee members Nelson and Kalberg agreed. The incoming Committee on Committees and Agenda should take up this matter again. CoCA 2011-2012 members Nelson, Kalberg, Liang, and Bryant thank Lynda Marcoccia for her indefatigable work as Secretary to the Faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

Deyonne Bryant
Rolf Nelson
A Proposal to Reconfigure the Planning and Priorities Committee

[Presented by Professors John Miller and John Kricher at the September 2011 Faculty Meeting]

Please find below the proposal to reconfigure the Planning and Priorities Committee the faculty on PPC included in its 2011 annual report. We hope the proposal will serve as a good starting point for a discussion of how PPC might better serve the interests of the faculty, clarify the lines of communication between the faculty and the administration and among faculty committees about college planning and priorities, and at the same time eliminate some of the redundancy in the faculty committee structure.

Here is the relevant portion from our 2011 annual report:

At this point, we would make the following recommendations to improve faculty input into the planning process.

* The faculty should consider the formation of a faculty planning committee. Our experience this year suggests that staff and faculty bring different interests to the planning process, and those different interests would be best served by separate faculty and staff planning committees.

* Faculty members on the planning committee should represent not just the general interest of the college as we did, but specific interests of the faculty as well. While we have not come to a common understanding of how best to do that, we discussed constituting a planning committee that would include members of Economics Status of Faculty Committee, the Advisory Committee, the Educational Policy Committee, and would provide some guaranteed representation of non-tenured faculty. The committee might also have a member at large.

* Because staffing a planning committee takes a considerable commitment of faculty time and because a planning committee’s duties would directly overlap with those of the Budget Advisory Committee, we recommend disbanding the faculty Budget Advisory Committee. (We recognize that some faculty value the experience they gain considering budgetary matters while serving on the Budget Advisory Committee and would retain BAC.)

This is our best thinking at the moment. We offer these recommendations not as “the answer” to how the faculty should be represented in the college planning process but as “one answer” to be considered by the faculty. We believe that the current system is failing us and that the PPC, in its present iteration, is not serving the objectives identified in the original charge to the committee, as defined in faculty legislation.

We understand fully that the construction of a faculty planning committee is a matter around which faculty will differ. We selected the Economic Status of the Faculty Committee because items such as our benefits package and wage increases and freezes have a direct effect on the
economic status of the faculty. We also thought the charge of the Advisory Committee could be read to include offering advice on financial planning matters. In addition, as President Crutcher emphasized in a faculty meeting this year, the curriculum is the province of the faculty, and financial planning affects the college curriculum. Finally we feel it is essential for non-tenured faculty to have a voice on a faculty planning committee.
APPENDIX 2

D. FACULTY PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE (An ad hoc faculty committee)

I. The Faculty Planning and Priorities Committee shall consist of four members of the full-time teaching faculty, at least three of whom are tenured, and the provost and Vice-President for Finance and Operations as ex-officio members. The provost and VP for Finance and Operations shall be sources of communication between the committee and the administration and vice versa, and sources of information and expertise to the committee; however, representing faculty opinion on matters rests with the regularly appointed faculty members. The faculty members shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees and Agenda in consultation with the committee chairpersons from the following standing committees whose charges represent shared governance in planning and setting priorities for the College, particularly when those plans might have bearing on (i) the academic program, (ii) faculty workload, salaries, and benefits, (iii) faculty promotions and reappointments, and (iv) the welfare of the college in perpetuity: the Advisory Committee, the Committee on Faculty Scholarship and Promotions, the Committee on Economic Status and Workload, and the Educational Policy Committee. The committee structure assures greater efficiency and transparency, and it recognizes the legitimacy of the standing committees whose members were elected by the faculty to serve its needs (Faculty Legislation VIII.A.1). The tenured members, representing the three academic divisions whenever possible, normally will serve staggered two-year terms. Untenured faculty members, also serving two years, who receive tenure while serving shall nevertheless serve out the remainder of their terms in the untenured slot. A tenured faculty member will chair the committee.

II. The committee shall set its calendar and agenda in consultation with the president and with a view to the budgetary and strategic milestones established by the Board of Trustees. The committee may also initiate discussion within the committee and with the faculty, the president, the Vice-President for Finance and Operations, and other administrative officers.

III. The Faculty Planning and Priorities Committee shall represent the faculty in evaluating proposals and making recommendations to the president and to the trustees on issues relating to changes in the college’s integrated strategic and financial plan, or whatever plan might replace it. These duties shall include the following:

1. to assess the effects of short-term and long-term responses to economic conditions, including strategies for the reorganization and restructuring of the College, on (a) the academic program of the college, (b) faculty workload, salaries, and benefits, and (c) faculty promotions and reappointments.

2. to refer matters to the appropriate standing committee or committees when necessary.
3. to communicate regularly and transparently across campus constituencies. To this end, the committee shall:

a. meet with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees and/or the Board of Trustees at least once annually;

b. establish regular and reliable means for receiving information (queries, suggestions, complaints, etc.) from the faculty and respond to these in a responsible, transparent, and timely manner;

c. communicate with the faculty using established methods such as through the standing committees and regular reports at Faculty Meeting as well as the Committee of the Whole, “town meetings," and sending a representative to meetings of Department Chairs, the Untenured Faculty Organization, and the AAUP.

d. meet periodically with a recommended staff planning and priorities committee

IV. In accordance with the power vested in it by Faculty Legislation (VIII.B.III.2.f, g, i), the Committee on Committees and Agenda shall review the necessity of the Faculty Planning and Priorities Committee and make recommendations to the faculty for an extension of service or the dissolution of the Faculty Priorities and Planning Committee normally every two or three years. To this end, the committee shall:

1. request yearly reports regarding the faculty members' recommendations as to revising the charge of the Planning and Priorities Committee;

2. review recommendations from the faculty membership of the committee concerning the revision of relevant legislation.

3. consider the effects of the ad hoc committee on the structure of the standing committees.
For a number of years the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) has not functioned fully as a committee with a clear purpose or stated charge, and the Committee on Committees and Agenda suspended elections in the Spring 2012 election cycle to replace members who had stepped down from the committee or whose terms had expired. The poor functioning of the Budget Advisory Committee and a proposal from a group of faculty members to disband the BAC brought the committee under review by the Committee on Committees and Agenda.

The standard view of organization structures is that a committee that is not functioning should be terminated because it weakens the overall committee structure and threatens the integrity of the organizational structure—in this case, shared governance.

In keeping with this view the Committee on Committees discharged its duty to: (a) recommend to the faculty or to concerned administrative officers any change in the organization, terms of service, and functions of standing or other committees; (b) regularly review, or initiate self-review of, the structure and function of faculty committees; and (c) consider all proposals to terminate or alter the charge of a standing committee of the faculty; and, after consideration, to bring the proposal to the Faculty for a vote with the recommendation of the Committee on Committees and Agenda.

To these ends, we have consulted with the president, provost, and both the interim Vice President and new VP Brian Douglas about the status of the Budget Advisory Committee, as well as the faculty members who served on the Budget Advisory Committee this year and the Co-Chairs of the Staff Council.

We also have kept in mind that the Budget Advisory Committee is one of few all-campus committees at the college, and the value that this type of committee holds for faculty, staff, and students. And, I have worked with various constituencies to work out a solution to the dilemma.

This consultation culminated in a meeting earlier today of the Committee and Committees and Agenda, the Co-Chairs of the Staff Council, Sara Smith and Gary Ahrendts, and the senior administrative officers, President Crutcher, Provost Eisenmann, and VP of Administration Brian Douglas.

The decision of the senior administrative officers is to dissolve the Budget Advisory Committee and substitute it with periodic, joint meetings of the Staff and Faculty Planning and Priorities Committees—as written in Faculty Legislation. This continues the inclusive practice of an all-campus committee working in a consultative role at the college. The joint committee structure
also serves the following three points, which VP Brian Douglas will elaborate on.

1. It replaces the old process of reviewing an annual budget, which constituted the work of the Budget Advisory Committee, with the current process of long-term planning.
2. The upcoming focus on long-term Capital Planning will require input about prioritizing capital expenditures from various constituencies at the college, especially the staff, faculty, and students.
3. Recent re-accreditation reports recommend that the college establish a method of long-term planning and priorities committees with input from the college community at large.

The joint committee structure would meet a couple of times each semester; and the individual staff and faculty planning and priorities committees will carry out their remaining charges at all other times.

The joint committee should not impede, obstruct, or duplicate the work of the faculty standing committees, particularly the Economic Status and Workload Committee.

The Committee on Committees and Agenda agreed that using joint meetings of the faculty and staff PPCs, subject to review as stipulated in Faculty Legislation is a good and acceptable solution to the problem of the Budget Advisory Committee.

[We’ll invite Brian Douglas to address the room and then open the floor for discussion.]