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In April 2014, the faculty passed the following motion:

Motion: The faculty calls for the establishment of a task force on shared governance with elected representation of members of the continuing academic faculty with rank from across the disciplines and divisions, and continuing faculty without rank, and the administration. The task force will examine in detail the deliberative and decision making processes at Colby and the disparate roles played by the faculty in the current processes, especially in relation to decisions that affect the academic program. Among other things, the task force will explore the workings of and responsibilities toward the full faculty of all faculty committees, committees of the college, and special planning committees currently in place; the structure and function of the faculty meeting; the role, responsibility, and purview of the division chairs; the role, responsibility, and purview of department chairs and program directors; the possibility of including an elected member of the tenured academic faculty at the weekly senior staff meetings. We believe that the task force should generate its report by the spring of 2015. The task force will elect its own chair.

Pursuant to that motion, the Task Force on Shared Governance was convened during the last academic year. In the fall semester, the faculty elected Adam Howard, Associate Professor of Education; Bruce Maxwell, Professor of Computer Science; Betty Sasaki, Associate Professor of Spanish; and Winifred Tate, Assistant Professor of Anthropology to represent the four academic divisions; Lisa McDaniel, Assistant Director of Scholarly Resources and Services was elected to represent the faculty librarians; and Stewart Stokes, Adjunct Associate Professor of Athletics was elected to represent the coaches. Subsequently, after consultation with the Provost and the Division Chairs, President Greene appointed Denise Bruesewitz, Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies; Michael Burke, Professor of English; Sandy Maisel, William R. Kenan Jr. Professor of Government; Paul Greenwood, Senior Associate Provost; Lori Kletzer, Provost and Dean of Faculty; and Andy McGadney, Vice President and Secretary of the College to fill out the Task Force. At the first meeting of the Task Force, in January 2015, Sandy Maisel was elected as Task Force Chair.

The Task Force met—either as a group or in various sub-groups—approximately every two weeks from mid-January through the second semester. We reviewed governance documents from other liberal arts institutions and met with Richard Chait, a consultant on college governance who is also consulting with the Board of Trustees. We have consulted with colleagues at department and division meetings. In April 2015 we asked the faculty to extend our deadline to the fall semester, a request to which the faculty acquiesced.
History of Governance Changes

There have been three major governance reviews over the last 50 years, with the most recent review concluded in 1994. During the 1969-70 academic year, a large and representative group named Con Con I expanded shared governance to include voting seats for students on College committees. Con Con II, in 1972, restructured College committees and pared the number of committees to 12 from 22. From 1992-1994 the issue of equal representation in College governance was revisited, with a proposal from the Committee on Committees approved in 1994 that serves as the basis of Colby’s committee system today.

Twenty years have passed since the conclusion of the last governance review. With a new President and with Colby poised to make investments in its academic and co-curricular programs to ensure that it is among a small group of preeminent liberal arts colleges, now is an opportune moment to reevaluate Colby’s shared governance practices with a goal of ensuring an effective shared governance system in which faculty hold a leadership role in curricular, academic, and educational issues. A shared governance model with responsibility, accountability, and authority is essential for Colby to achieve its greatest ambitions. The importance of this moment is further underscored by the fact that in April 2014 faculty voted for a task force on shared governance.

Presented below is a proposal for a set of principles to guide the governance review process, questions for consideration, and a process for constituting a task force to review these issues.

Task and Principles

The College’s governance system is a structure for sharing information, distributing authority, and making decisions. This system, at its best, includes provisions for broad communication and meaningful consultation, clarity of roles and responsibilities of groups and individuals in governing the College, distributed decision making, and a shared commitment to furthering the College’s mission.

We recognize and have undertaken our work understanding that the Colby College Board of Trustees has ultimate authority for the governance of the College and chooses to delegate authority through the President to the faculty and college officers of the College. With that understanding, our task has been to outline, as clearly as possible, effective models of shared governance, specifying the role that faculty should play in that shared relationship.

The proposals that follow represent our best attempt to describe a shared governance structure that adheres to the following principles:

1. The more central an issue is to our mutual sense of intellectual community, the more central the faculty role should be in deciding the issue. While everything that goes on at the College affects our intellectual community, some aspects of campus decision-making (e.g. academic regulations) are more central to our sense of community than are others (e.g. dining services). Our sense is that the centrality of College concerns falls on a continuum and that the involvement of the faculty in decisions should parallel that continuum.
2. A system of shared governance involves clear expectations for participation by everyone, which include:
   
a. Equity in opportunities to participate;
b. Elections to most positions, especially those most central to the faculty role;
c. General agreement that all faculty members have a responsibility to participate in shared governance.

3. Fairness and equal treatment for all candidates for promotion and tenure.

4. Rules that treat all members of the community with equity across all communities of the College. Students and staff play a valuable role in governing the College and additional opportunities for their engagement would be welcome.

5. Regular and effective communication among faculty, students, administration, and staff is a necessary component of any meaningful and productive governance structure, both formally and informally.

6. Timing is often an important component of taking advantage of opportunities, and a strong governance system is nimble and adaptable.

With those basic principles in mind, we offer recommendations in four categories: the Faculty Meeting, Appointment Guidelines and Excusal Procedures, the Committee System, and the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Various proposals within these four categories overlap. In the recommendations below, we attempt to cross-reference these overlapping recommendations, so that the rationales need not be repeated.

**The Faculty Meeting**

The formal role of the Faculty Meeting is to decide on those issues over which we have authority as designated by the By-Laws of the College, specifically issues related to curriculum and degree requirements. However, reaching those decisions constitutes only a portion of the institutional reach of the Faculty Meeting. Equally important is the role that the Faculty Meeting plays as a venue to discuss broad issues relating to our sense of intellectual community. We must deal with certain matters of policy, but our sense of community comes from our participation in broader issues.

**The business of the Faculty Meeting.** The By-Laws of the College specify that the President shall chair the Faculty Meeting. For the purpose of discussion, the President will preside, designating others (e.g. the Provost, the chair of the committee bringing forth an item for discussion) when appropriate. When the Faculty formally considers items for adoption, the proceedings will be facilitated by a Moderator, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Faculty Steering
Committee (hereinafter also referred to as the Steering Committee). In addition, the President shall appoint a Secretary and a Parliamentarian for the Faculty Meeting.

*Note: See the Committee System below for description of the Faculty Steering Committee.*

**The agenda for Faculty Meetings.** To facilitate these discussions, we suggest that the agenda for the Faculty Meeting be set by the President and the Steering Committee, meeting in the week before the scheduled Faculty Meeting. In deciding among items for inclusion on the Faculty Meeting agenda, the agenda-setting group will give primacy to those items on which the faculty must reach a decision (perhaps grouping more routine items on a consent agenda); in deciding among other items proposed for the agenda, the group will use the criterion of how central the proposed items are to our intellectual community. If the group decides not to place a suggested item on the Faculty Meeting agenda, they will communicate that decision back to the individuals or group suggesting the item, noting the reason that other items have been prioritized more highly.

**Sources of items for consideration by the agenda-setting group: Committees, Divisional meetings, and individuals.** In addition to emanating from the President and other members of the agenda-setting group, items for inclusion on the agenda will come from three sources: committee chairs, whose responsibility will include suggesting items to this group for inclusion; meetings of the academic divisions, which will be set for the Wednesday afternoons two weeks before each Faculty Meeting; and individual members of the faculty who feel important items have not been raised in either of the first two ways. As noted above, the agenda-setting committee will prioritize among the items suggested scheduling first those items on which the Faculty must vote and then items deemed most central to our shared sense of intellectual community.

**Appointment Guidelines and Excusal Procedures**

The Task Force dealt with the following issues regarding expectations for faculty participation in shared governance:

- Setting clear expectations for untenured tenure-track faculty regarding service and participation in shared governance at the all-College level;
- Setting clear expectations for tenured faculty regarding service and participation in shared governance at the all-College level;
- Setting clear expectations for non-tenure-track faculty regarding service and participation in shared governance at the all-College level;
- Setting clear expectations for faculty librarians regarding service and participation in shared governance at the all-College level and ensuring appropriate structures are in place to enable that participation;
• Setting clear expectations for coaches regarding service and participation in shared governance at the all-College level and ensuring appropriate structures are in place to enable that participation;

• Clarifying the role and expectations for faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees;

• Understanding the role of Division Chair.

Shared governance, a goal embraced by the Colby faculty, requires broad faculty participation to be successful. One of the goals of the restructure proposed by this Task Force is to broaden participation and provide more opportunities for faculty to participate. However, the goal of broadening participation must be tempered by an understanding that service commitments should not become a burden to faculty.

Unfortunately, there is no existing clear statement of expectations for faculty participation in all-College governance or service. The most explicit statement of service expectations is in the Faculty Handbook in the section on tenure expectations.

Service to the candidate's department/program, to the College, and to the discipline should be taken into account. At a college with a small and involved faculty, service to the College is expected; but evidence of such service is not in itself sufficient grounds for tenure.

Faculty Handbook, pp. 2015-24

The ambiguity of expectations in service, and the fact that election to all-College committees is usually beyond an individual's control, can lead to significant anxiety among junior faculty regarding how strongly they need to pursue all-College service. The ambiguity also provides room for tenured faculty to step away from all-College service.

While the Task Force felt that setting explicit expectations on levels of faculty service was outside its purview, the Task Force did feel it was important to provide guidance to the Steering Committee on making committee appointments and to define new procedures for excusals. These guidelines and procedures are designed to encourage broader and more equitable participation in shared governance.

The Task Force realizes that there are many aspects of college service, and any evaluation of equity in service is complicated by departmental service, search committees, and disparities in advising loads. Understanding that inequity exists at the department level, and that solving those issues was beyond our purview, the Task Force focused solely on the all-College service aspect. The goal of these recommendations is to provide guidance to those making appointments, suggest mechanisms for engagement, and help create a culture that will ensure that there is sufficient participation by the faculty in shared governance to make it successful.

In our discussion of all-College governance responsibilities, the Task Force identified two categories of committee service.

• An “A” committee: one that requires a regular or extensive time-commitment and includes the following: Academic Affairs Committee, College Affairs Committee, Committee on Promotion and Tenure, Committee on Mission and Priorities, Faculty
Steering Committee, and any ad hoc task forces or other special committees created by the faculty or the President.

- Other committee: any all-College committee assignment not in the list of “A” committee assignments.

When considering appointments for all-College committees, the Steering Committee and any other appointing bodies or individuals should be guided by the following.

1. The all-College service responsibilities for a tenured faculty member should not normally exceed one “A” committee assignment or two other committee assignments in any given year. This standard, along with the faculty member’s other departmental or programmatic responsibilities should be considered when making an appointment.

2. The all-College service responsibilities for untenured tenure-track faculty, non-tenure-track faculty, coaches, and faculty librarians, should not normally exceed one committee assignment, of either type, in any given year after the first year of employment. This standard, along with the individual’s other departmental or programmatic responsibilities should be considered when making an appointment.

3. Before asking faculty members to accept appointments to all-college or faculty committees, the Steering Committee should take into account departmental and other service that the faculty member has been engaged in.

For most situations, the above guidelines should constitute strong advice to the Steering Committee. Extraordinary circumstances, combined with the willingness of the individual to participate in College governance, may justify an appointment that exceeds these guidelines.

When a faculty member is appointed to an all-College position, the expectation is that that faculty member will serve. Faculty, faculty librarians, and coaches who wish to be excused from service after an appointment has been made must provide a justification to and obtain approval from the Steering Committee. If a faculty member has a personal reason for seeking excusal that he or she wishes to remain confidential, that faculty member may so inform the Provost who will convey his/her excusal of that faculty member to the Steering Committee.

While serving, a committee member is expected to participate fully, including making every reasonable effort to attend meetings, participate in discussions, and assist in completing the committee’s business.

Each all-College committee will have an elected faculty chair, with experience on the committee when possible, unless otherwise specified. The responsibilities of the faculty chair of a committee include the following.

1. To organize and lead all meetings of the committee and to ensure that the committee meets at least twice during the course of the academic year.

2. To ensure that minutes from each committee meeting are provided to the Provost’s office for posting within a reasonable time frame (e.g. two weeks), unless the work of the committee is confidential.

3. To communicate with other committee chairs or the agenda setting body for the faculty meeting when the committee generates any proposals or motions.
4. To ensure that a written summary report of the committee’s work is provided to the May faculty meeting and the Provost’s office for posting.

The Task Force did not develop a specific recommendation on clarifying the rules for faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees (including the role of faculty appointed to Board committees). However, there was a sense of the Task Force that more transparency about the appointment process and clarity of expectations regarding the participation of faculty members elected as representatives to the Board or appointed to Board committees would improve the sense of faculty role in shared governance at the Board level.

The role of the Division Chairs has been subsumed under the Steering Committee and is discussed below.

The election process and some of the specific duties of Steering Committee are clarified elsewhere in this document.

The Committee System

In restructuring the committee system in line with the principles outlined above, we differentiate committees into five groupings:

1. The first group is comprised of those committees that deal with policy areas in which the faculty plays the most central role, i.e. those committees whose subject matters are closest to our concern for the intellectual life of the community;

2. The second group is comprised of committees that deal with areas in which the faculty clearly has a stake, but which are somewhat less central to our primary concerns;

3. The committees in the third group are those in which the faculty has an advisory role, though the decision making locus resides elsewhere;

4. The fourth group committees perform primarily a judicial function;

5. The committees in the fifth group are primarily service committees, including advisory committees to Centers and similar organizations, for which special expertise is often required.

In order to balance workload among faculty members on College committees to at least a limited extent (see section on Appointment Guidelines above), we have designated a small set of committees as “A” level committees. The guidelines suggest that tenured faculty members will normally serve on one “A” or two other committees; the guidelines suggest that untenured faculty will normally serve on one committee of any type. Coaches, faculty librarians, and Category III faculty will normally serve on one committee (including in some positions designated for them.)
To facilitate faculty members’ abilities to allocate their time, we propose to hold faculty elections in three waves; the first wave will involve the election of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure and the Faculty Steering Committee (see descriptions and discussion below); the second wave will be the remaining “A” level committees; the third wave will be all other committees. Appointments will be made by the Steering Committee after the third wave of elections.

We also propose the following to implement the new committee system:

1. The creation of a Faculty Steering Committee (described in detail below). The Faculty Steering Committee—comprised of the Provost, the Senior Associate Provost, the four division chairs and an additional elected tenured and untenured faculty member—will assume many of the current responsibilities of the Division Chairs and the Nominating Committee plus additional responsibilities, such as meeting with the President to set the agenda for the Faculty Meeting, as described below.

2. The norm for policymaking committees will continue to be for most members to be elected; we propose appointments to some committees in order to expand expertise, and the opportunity for more equitable participation for faculty members who were not elected (committees with possible appointed members are noted in the committee list below).

3. The term of service for elected members on committees will be three years, to allow new members to build appropriate expertise; we assume that faculty on sabbatical will be replaced by appointment by the Steering Committee. Members appointed to committees (by the Steering Committee) will serve one-year renewable terms, with the maximum consecutive appointed service on any one committee set at three years.

4. Divisional representation will only be used for those committees that deal with issues on which members of the four divisions are seen to have different perspectives; other committees will be elected at large, by status as tenured or untenured.

5. Each committee will meet once in the spring, following elections and appointments, to elect a chair and to set up the schedule of meetings for the next year; the incumbent chair of the committee is responsible for calling this meeting.

6. A faculty member, elected at the spring meeting, will chair each committee, unless otherwise noted below.

7. Recognizing that some of our committees have judicial rather than policymaking roles, we believe that the principle for selecting members of those committees (listed below) should be to create an unbiased group of faculty who would serve to hear specific cases. Thus, we propose that we no longer elect these committees but rather, as is the
case with jury duty, draw potential members at random from the pool of eligible faculty. Eligibility would vary from situation to situation (see Committee List below).

8. As was the case in the past, we are recommending appointment to other committees—with appointments to be made by the Steering Committee, following self-nomination. Here the norm would allow the committees to expand, if possible, to reflect faculty interest (but each faculty member should be appointed to one committee before anyone is appointed to more than one).

9. Faculty librarians and coaches will have reserved slots for appropriate committees and will be able to run for or express interest in being appointed to other committees.

10. The President and the Provost will serve as *ex officio* members of all committees except those specifically exclude in The By-Laws of the Corporation.

11. We discussed the suggestion, raised in the original faculty motion regarding this Task Force, of including an elected member of the tenured academic faculty at the President’s weekly senior staff meetings. We believe that the President has a right to consult with whomever he chooses as his closest advisors and, therefore, make no recommendation on this point.

12. The current Nominating Committee will be charged with running elections in the Spring of 2016, including elections called for with the passage of recommendations in this report. The new Steering Committee will be charged with transitioning from our current system to the new one and, more generally, with implementing the new committee system once it is in place.

The list of committees, grouped as discussed above, appears in the Appendix to this report. Each committee is followed by a suggested new mission statement and membership. The existing mission statement and membership is presented under each new item.

**The Committee on Promotion and Tenure**

The Task Force dealt with the following issues regarding consideration for retention, tenure, and promotion:

1. Whether the rules for withdrawing from the ballot for the Committee on Promotion and Tenure should be revised;

2. Whether an individual on the Committee on Promotion and Tenure should be allowed to be the outside member of a Departmental review committee;
3. Whether divisional representation on the Committee on Promotion and Tenure should be revised;

4. Whether the appeals process for tenure denial cases should be revised;

5. Whether a larger group of people, presumably those involved in evaluating tenure cases, should evaluate sixth-semester dossiers and participate in that review process;

6. Whether the Promotion and Tenure committee should be separated into a Tenure and Review committee and a separate Promotion committee.

The Task Force was concerned with issues of equity for and fairness to both candidates for promotion and tenure and the faculty involved in evaluating those dossiers. We recognize the importance of this process in the maintenance of the quality of the College faculty and the level of commitment required to evaluate dossiers in an effective and comprehensive manner.

Given the importance of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the Task Force felt that the expectations for withdrawing from the ballot for this committee should be revised to provide a more equitable distribution of responsibilities across the faculty. In particular, we felt that reasons for excusal from the ballot should be substantive, except in certain explicit cases. These cases are identified in the recommendations below.

With respect to dual-membership on the Committee on Promotion and Tenure and being an external member of a departmental review committee, our primary concern was equity. While it is likely a benefit to the candidate to have an external member of the departmental committee who is on the Committee on Promotion and Tenure, it is not a benefit that is necessarily available to all candidates. In the past different candidates for tenure or promotion have received different advice about whether selecting someone on P&T as an external member of a departmental committee was desirable or even allowed under existing rules. The lack of clarity and the differential advice was deemed unacceptable in this important process. Therefore, our recommendation below is to disallow dual-membership in this case.

In recognition of the unique characteristics of the Interdisciplinary Studies division, the Task Force felt that a small change to the membership of the Tenure and the Promotion and Review committees was appropriate.

The Task Force spent a good deal of time discussing and received a good deal of input on the procedures that we use for sixth-semester reviews. We also debated the question of whether associate professors should serve on the committee that considers others for promotion to full rank. As part of that extended discussion, we debated the wisdom of dividing the responsibility of deciding tenure cases from that of deciding promotion cases. Our recommendation is that we retain the current structure.

With these conditions in mind, we make the following proposals:
1. The Committee on Promotion and Tenure should consist of three members each from the Natural Science, Social Science, and Humanities divisions and one member from the Interdisciplinary Studies division. All members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee should be elected following the existing procedures, noting potentially new eligibility requirements for withdrawing from the ballot.

2. Faculty members who will be hearing a case before the Committee on Promotion and Tenure are not eligible to serve as outside members of a departmental tenure or promotion committee.

3. All tenured faculty not currently serving (or in a department from which two members are already serving) will be considered eligible to be on the ballot for election to the Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Faculty who provide a substantive reason to the Steering Committee may be excused from the ballot, at the Steering Committee’s discretion. Requests for excusals from faculty who fall in any one of the following categories will be honored except for in unusual circumstances:

   a. Faculty within three years of receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor;
   b. Faculty within two years of rotating off the Promotion and Tenure Committee;
   c. Faculty who have served six years on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4. The current reconsideration procedure should be revised. The Task Force suggests that the Advisory Committee on Faculty Personnel Policy (ACFPP), charged with setting these procedures, give consideration to the following revised procedure: If the Reconsideration Committee issues an opinion that a case merits reconsideration based on the stated criteria of procedural irregularities or evidence that the case was considered in a discriminatory manner, a new committee—comprised of three individuals who have previously served on the Committee on Promotion and Tenure but who did not serve when the case was originally heard, chaired by the Provost, who serves without vote, shall rehear the case and make a recommendation to the President.
APPENDIX

LIST OF COMMITTEES

The following is a proposed new list of committees. The proposed new committee structure appears below with the existing committee name (if different for the proposed new committee) noted. The committees are grouped by the categories described in the section on The Committee System above. The committees designated as “A” level committees (because of presumed workload) are so designated.

I. Central Faculty Role

Academic Affairs Committee (A)

The Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) will oversee the curriculum and all educational policy.

Composition: The Provost and the Senior Associate Provost (one of whom will chair the committee); five faculty members (one from each division and one appointed by the President upon recommendation by the Steering Committee); an elected faculty librarian; and four students. The Registrar (or designee) and the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students (or designee) will be non-voting members of the AAC.

Separately elected AAC Subcommittees

Independent Majors Committee

The Independent Majors Committee, a separately chosen sub-committee of the AAC, is in charge of approving independent majors and Senior Scholar Projects. Any policy recommendations from this Committee reach the faculty through the AAC.

Composition: The Senior Associate Provost; four faculty members elected by division; the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students (or his designee) and the Registrar (or her designee) will serve as non-voting members.

Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

The Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, a sub-committee of the AAC, advises the Director of the Writing Program and suggests changes in the Writing Across the Curriculum Program to the AAC.

Composition: The Senior Associate Provost; four faculty members elected by division; an appointed member who has experience in teaching a writing intensive course; the Director of the Writing Program; the Director of the Writers’ Center (non-voting).
**Off-Campus Study Advisory Committee**

The Off-Campus Study Advisory Committee develops and recommends policy regarding foreign and domestic off-campus study to the Academic Affairs Committee and coordinates the work of the departmental liaisons to the Office of Off-Campus Study; meeting in executive session without students present, the committee makes recommendations for action on student applications referred to it by the Director of Off-Campus Study and hears appeals from students who wish to contest the disposition of their applications for off-campus studies,

Composition: The Director of Off-Campus Study; five elected faculty members (four elected by division and an elected faculty librarian); an appointed faculty member (optional); the Provost (or his/her representative); the Senior Associate Dean of Students; the Registrar; the Associate Director of Off-Campus Study; and three students.

**Advisory Committee on Faculty Personnel Policy**

The Advisory Committee on Faculty Personnel Policies (ACFPP) serves as an advisory body to the President, the Provost, and the faculty on matters relating to faculty personnel policy.

Composition: Two tenured faculty members and one untenured faculty member; two faculty members in Category II or Category III; one faculty member appointed by the Steering Committee.

**Faculty Course Evaluation Committee**

The Faculty Course Evaluation Committee oversees the system of student evaluation of faculty and courses and formulates recommendations on policies and procedures to report to the Provost and the faculty at large.

Composition: Two tenured and one untenured member of the faculty; one faculty member with expertise in psychometric scaling or behavioral data analysis, appointed by the Steering Committee; the Director of Institutional Research (or her designee) (nonvoting); the Director of ITS (or his designee) (non-voting); the Senior Associate Provost (nonvoting).

**Faculty Steering Committee (A)**

The Faculty Steering Committee, chaired by the Provost, advises the President and the Provost on matters on which either of them wish to have timely faculty input. This committee, in monthly meetings with the President, sets the agenda for the Faculty Meeting. In addition, the Steering Committee serves as the nominating committee for faculty elections, fills vacancies.
that occur when elected members leave committees, appoints members of those committees for which appointed members are designated, reviews and decides on excusal requests, considers any changes that it deems necessary to the committee system, reviews and acts upon applications for research and travel grants and sabbatical leaves, and advises the President and Provost on the allocation of faculty positions.

The Division Chairs, without the additional two members will continue to meet as a discrete group to advise the Provost and President on the allocation of slots; they will also review applications for divisional research grants and for travel and sabbatical leaves, and will meet with visiting Overseer Committees.

Composition: The Provost, the Senior Associate Provost, the four Division Chairs (tenured faculty elected by the faculty members in the division from a list of faculty in each division who either have nominated themselves or who have agreed to nomination by someone else), an additional elected tenured and an untenured member of the faculty, elected for three-year terms from any division by the normal faculty procedures.

* Replaces Existing Nominating Committee

Library Committee

The Library Committee advises the Director of the Colby Libraries on matters of policy and regulations governing library use by students and faculty, on facilities, and on library purchases.

Composition: The Director of Colby Libraries; the Director of Academic ITS; two other faculty librarians elected by the faculty; one faculty member elected from each of the four divisions; one appointed faculty member; and three students.

Committee on Mission and Priorities (A)

The Committee on Mission and Priorities (CMP) was established to ensure that Colby's planning and priority setting benefits from broad input and consultation and furthers the College's mission. The Committee is advisory to the President, who serves as CMP's chair. The Committee's work will inform and be informed by the work of other College committees. It differs from most committees in taking a long-term view of priority and planning, in looking across the College to consider areas of need as well as opportunities for excellence, and in ensuring that programmatic priorities and the College's financial strategy are aligned.

Composition: Six elected faculty members, one from each of the four academic divisions, one from athletics and one faculty librarian; two faculty members appointed by the President, after consultation with the Steering Committee; two students appointed by the President in consultation with the Student Government Association; four senior officers of the College; and one staff representative. The committee will be chaired by the President.
*Same as the current system except that the elected members will serve three year terms and that the President will consult with the Steering Committee on his appointments.

Committee on Promotion and Tenure (A)

The Committee on Promotion and Tenure recommends actions on tenure to the Provost and President, forwarding its votes to the President with reasons for acceptance or rejection. The Committee also advises the Provost and the President on actions regarding promotions to full rank.

Composition: Three faculty members each from the Humanities, Natural Science, and Social Science Divisions; one from the Interdisciplinary Division. The Provost serves as non-voting chair of the committee.

*No change in mission from current practice

Committee on Standing

The Committee on Standing decides upon dismissal, probationary, or conditional status for students of low academic standing; considers applications for readmission following academic dismissal.

Composition: Four faculty elected by division for six-year rotating terms; the Provost; the Vice President for Student Affairs. Non-voting members include the Vice President for Admissions and Financial Aid, the Registrar, and the Senior Associate Dean of Students, who acts as secretary.

II. Faculty have a stake, but more equally shared with others

Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee advises the President on administrative matters not primarily involving academic policy; considers and makes recommendations on requests for exemptions from College regulations; periodically reviews the College calendar and functions and structures of the committees of the College and recommends changes to the faculty meeting and to the Student Government Association; receives reports from the Committee on Standing on their decisions.

Composition: Three elected faculty (two tenured and one untenured); one appointed faculty member; the Provost, the Senior Associate Dean of Students; three students; the Registrar will serve as secretary without vote.

Admissions and Financial Aid
The Admissions and Financial Aid Committee recommends and reviews admissions policy and is available to the Office of Admissions for consultation, advice, and support; recommends and reviews financial aid policy; and acts as an advisory group and sounding board to the Director of Financial Aid. (Note: Bunche Scholars and International Admissions remain subcommittees).

Composition: Three tenured and two untenured faculty members; one faculty member appointed by the Steering Committee; four students; the Vice President and Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid.

**Athletics Advisory Committee**

The Athletics Advisory Committee provides general oversight and advice regarding planning, staffing, scheduling, policy-making and policy review for the Department of Athletics.

Composition: The Provost or his/her representative; the Director of Athletics; the Senior Women’s Administrator from the department of Athletics; two additional coaches elected by the faculty; two tenured faculty members and one untenured faculty member; one faculty member appointed by the Steering Committee; three students; the Vice President for Student Affairs; and the coach with scheduling responsibility as a non-voting member.

**Budget Committee**

The Budget Committee reviews the annual and projected budget with the administration before its presentation to the Board of Trustees. The committee makes suggestions to the administration as to the adequacy of budgetary provisions for College programs and activities in relation to the College’s resources.

Composition: Three elected faculty members, two tenured and one untenured; two students; the Provost; the Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer.

**College Affairs (A)**

The College Affairs Committee will oversee the co-curricular program, and will formulate and recommend policies concerning student life to appropriate bodies (e.g. to the Faculty and to the Student Government Association).

Composition: The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students; two tenured and two untenured faculty members; one coach, elected by the faculty; five students.

**Committee on Diversity and Inclusion***

The Committee on Diversity and Inclusion meets regularly to discuss issues related to diversity and inclusion in all sectors of the Colby community: students, staff, administration, and
faculty. It makes recommendations related to community education, programming, and policies to be pursued by the appropriate bodies on campus. It can provide a public forum for the Colby community to engage with issues related to diversity and inclusion.

Composition: The Senior Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion; the Director of Gender and Sexual Diversity Program; an appointed member of the Admissions staff; three faculty members, two tenured and one untenured; a coach, elected by the faculty; and four students.

*replaces the committees on Race and Racism and on Multi-cultural Affairs

Information Technology Committee

The Information Technology Committee shall oversee strategic direction for the use of information technology at the College, making recommendations to other Committees or Administrative Officers as appropriate. This oversight involves review of significant goals, programs, and policies, as well as the relation of these goals, programs, and policies to important choices involving hardware, software, infrastructure, staffing, and financial support.

Composition: The Director of ITS; the registrar; four faculty members elected by division; one faculty librarian elected by the faculty; one faculty member appointed by the Steering Committee.

III. Faculty have advisory role but not decision making

The faculty committees listed below, each of which will be chaired by a faculty member, are primarily advisory. The first two committees currently exist; the remaining five would be new committees. The charge of each committee would be to meet at least twice a semester with the administrator in charge of the function on which they would be advising (and with such others as the chair of the committee or the administrator might suggest) to discuss faculty perceptions of how that office affects those areas of the College with which we are most centrally concerned, i.e. the intellectual community.

The committees would be comprised of members who express interest in serving and are appointed by the Steering Committee. Each member will serve a three-year term, so that expertise can be acquired. The committees will range in size from three to eight faculty members, drawn from all categories of faculty appointments, with tenured and untenured represented and with divisional representation if that seems appropriate to the Steering Committee. The role of the Steering Committee will be to afford faculty members the opportunity to serve in areas in which they have interest, to guarantee appropriate representation, to solicit colleagues to serve on advisory committees in areas in which a sufficient number do not volunteer their services. The size of these committees is not fixed, in order to give the Steering Committee opportunity to respond to faculty interest.

Campus Life (the residential program)
IV. Judicial Committees

The committees listed below (with their current mission statements) have primarily judicial functions, i.e. hearing specific cases and adjudicating results, rather than setting policy, with a partial exception noted for the Academic Honesty Committee. The principle is that an unbiased group of faculty should serve to hear these cases. Our proposal is that we no longer elect these committees, but rather, as is the case with jury duty, draw potential members at random from the pool of eligible faculty. Eligibility would vary from situation to situation. For example, a faculty member who has served on the Grievance Committee cannot serve on the Hearing Committee on Dismissal Proceedings (and vice versa) within a three-year period. Those hearing a grievance cannot be department chairs or administrative officers. At the direction of the Steering Committee, the Provost’s Office will both determine which members of the faculty are eligible to be in the candidate pool for Judicial Committees and randomly select those to serve from this pool. This selection will occur in the early fall in order to have committees in place.

Academic Honesty Committee

The Academic Honesty committee is charged with assigning sanctions to students who have been found responsible for academic dishonesty, to conduct investigations into charges of academic dishonesty, and to work to create a sustain a culture of academic integrity. The committee is chaired by the Academic Integrity Coordinator (tenured faculty member, appointed) and additionally consists of a representative from the Dean of Students office, three students (appointed by the Dean of Students office), and three faculty members chosen at random from a uniform distribution on the pool of eligible faculty members.

*New committee charge

Appeals Board

Grievance Committee

Hearing Committee for Dismissal Proceedings

Student Conduct Board
V. Service Committee (often with specialized expertise)

Most of the following committees have been appointed in the past—and they will continue to be so. The Steering Committee will make the appointments to these committees:

Alcohol, Education, Awareness and Training Advisory Group

Cultural Events Committee (Lipman Lecture Committee is a sub-committee)

Environmental Advisory Group

Fellowship Advisory Board

Funded Internship Committee

Harassment Advisory Group

Institutional Animal Care and Use

Institutional Biohazard Board

Institutional Review Board

Radiation Safety Board

VI. Center Advisory Boards

The following Centers should have advisory boards of at least four faculty members, appointed by the Steering Committee upon recommendation of the Center director. Each Advisory Board should meet with the Center director at least twice a semester to review Center programming and planning.

Center for the Arts and Humanities

Center for Teaching and Learning

Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement

Oak Institute for International Human Rights

VII. Board of Trustees and Museum Board of Governors Committees

In the spirit of shared governance the faculty believe two faculty members should be appointed to each Trustee Committee (with the exception of the Executive and Nominations Committees) recognizing this is the Board’s prerogative. Appointments will be made by the Chair of the Board of Trustees, consulting with the President and with the advice of the Steering Committee. When parallel faculty committees exist, appointments should be drawn from those committees.
As the Colby Museum of Art has become such a central part of our academic mission, it is the sense of the faculty that two elected faculty members should serve on the Museum’s Board of Governors, in addition to the Director of the Center for the Arts and Humanities and the current, appointed member of the Art Department. We further believe that faculty members should be asked to serve on committees of the Board of Governors.