

## **Committee on Committees Annual Report 2001-02**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

Until now, COC's annual "Report to the Senate" has consisted of our slate of nominations for Senate committees, which is presented and voted upon at the Spring Quarter Senate meeting. *This* annual report constitutes an addition to that practice: in it we will report in prose, for the record and to inform the Senate, of the increased activities and responsibilities of COC with respect to both the Senate and the Administration, as well as the agreements COC has reached with the Administration. We decided to make this report because, during the last two years, COC has in effect become the Committee on Organization of Committees and Senate Interface with the Administration--although we advise against changing our acronym to COOCSIA. This prose report covers two years; future reports may be forthcoming yearly or bi-yearly.

The Committee on Committees thoughtfully considers the composition of all committees, seeking to appoint individuals with the expertise to make positive contributions while collectively presenting a variety of viewpoints. The committee also attempts to provide balance in terms of gender, ethnicity, and discipline while maintaining an appropriate ratio of experienced and new members. When considering possible committee appointments, the Committee takes into account the Senate Bylaws, the personal knowledge of Committee members, their performance on former committees, the availability of Senate members to serve diversity, and the stated preferences of faculty members. We also try to develop future leaders for the Senate and to serve as chairs of systemwide Senate committees. (Most UCSC Senate Committees have system-wide counterparts.)

In 2001-2002 Committee on Committees appointed members to the usual Senate standing committees and nominated faculty to many administrative committees including

- 131 appointments to 21 standing Senate committees, two Special Committees and Senate Officers.
- Many recommendations of Senate members to administrative committees and task forces.

As a result of COC and UCOC nominations for 2002-2003, the following faculty are serving in leadership positions on UC wide committees: Darrell Long, Chair of UC Committee on Research and Policy; and Mark Traugott, Chair of UC Committee on Faculty and Welfare.

For the academic year 2001-2002 there were 617 members of the Santa Cruz Divisional Academic Senate, of whom 123 were emeriti. Approximately 32% of the faculty responded to the new on-line volunteer call for preferences in November 2001. We do not restrict ourselves to considering only those who responded, but we find it helpful to understand each faculty member's interests and preferences, and we urge you to fill out the form when you receive it.

### **A More Activist COC**

Aside from nominating Senators to committees, in the last two years COC has taken a very active role in trying to facilitate the effective functioning of Senate committees and trying to facilitate the effective functioning of Senate committees' interface with the Administration.

*Increasing Senate committees' effective functioning*

- Behind the scenes, the Chair and occasionally the entire COC continue to consult with the Administration and leaders of the Senate to rethink the institutional and organizational arrangements in which Senate committees are embedded, with the purpose of increasing the effectiveness of both of the work of Senate committees and the effectiveness of Administrative bodies, where their activities touch upon or overlap with the charges of Senate committees.
- We have been working to rationalize scheduling so that Senate committees with eight people or more (and a few that are smaller) have set meeting times that remain constant every quarter and every year, are posted on the Senate website, and that can be announced at the time faculty members are asked to serve on them. We have also been working to rationalize calendaring so that Senate committees are informed in the Fall and in a timely way by the Administration concerning events and deadlines, or as soon as possible for late-breaking news. This is an ongoing project.
- We periodically invite Chairs of Senate committees to consult with us concerning their procedures, charges, interface with relevant administrators, and size of membership. We have taken appropriate action concerning these matters. (Please note that these consultations regard only the organizational matters listed above and not committee appointments.)
- Working closely with the Senate Chair and the Administration, the Chair of COC helped plan a well-received joint Senate-Administration Orientation in Fall 2001. A Senate Orientation (coordinated but not joint with the Administration) is being planned by the new Chair of COC and the Senate Chair for Fall 2002. We hope this will be useful enough to become an annual event.
- COC has initiated and sponsored end-of-the-academic year events in late Spring quarter of 2001 and 2002 to which old, new, and continuing members of all Senate committees have been invited, along with relevant administrators for each committee, new administrators, and the Chancellor and Provost/EVC. These are good-spirited but productive occasions, in which old-committee members discuss informally and frankly some of the issues with new ones, and at which administrators and Senators can make informal and frank contact. We plan for this to become a tradition, and we urge and expect all Senators on committees to make every effort to attend future such events.
- Along with the increased number of meetings, increased amount of planning activity, and other issues important to our campus, the paperwork involved in Senate committees has increased in years of late. This COC believes that practical advice about how to run an effective meeting, how to organize and keep track of paperwork/emails, and so forth, should be part of the professional training the Senate offers its officers and Senate Committee chairs and members--no less than analogous training received by Department Chairs. In an effort help Senate committee Chairs and members, COC organized and, with the kind financial assistance of Academic Human Resources, sponsored a workshop on organizing paperwork, lead by a professional organizer. If popular demand dictates, more such sessions can be organized.
- COC has written its section of a handbook of "best practices" for Senate committees, which we hope will be a project on which progress will be made, through the ASO, during 2002-03.

*New Committees*

COC has worked closely with other Senate committees to create Standing and Special Committees that will address some of pressing issues facing our Division.

- COC proposed and the Senate approved a new Standing Committee, conveniently pronounced "CLUB-D," the Committee on Land Use and Building Development. Two years have passed

since it was formed. COC has concluded that its effectiveness can be increased in a variety of ways and is currently working on proposals to make to the Senate and Administration.

- COC sponsored legislation in Spring 2001 creating the Special Advisory Committee for Affordable Housing (known as SACAH).
- With CPB, COC co-sponsored legislation in Spring 2002 creating the Special Committee on the Colleges.
- The Special Committee on Merit Equity's report in 2002 recommended the formation a Screening Committee on Merit Equity to function during the summers 2002-03 and 2003-04. Although this is an Administrative Committee, the Provost/EVC and AHR wisely asked COC to make the appointments, which we did.

### **The New Administrative Committee Structure and the Senate's Role**

In the Fall of 2000, EVC/Provost Simpson proposed a reorganization of his administration's structure, partly in order to increase the flow of information and good relations between the Senate and the Administration during this era of intensive and crucial planning on our campus. He created five major committees, each headed by a senior administrator, each cutting across an administrative division, and each having Senate representation. At the time of the formation, it was agreed that they would be re-assessed at the end of two academic years (in Spring 2002); COC did submit its report in July 2002.

The general purpose of these Administrative Committees, which usually meet every two weeks for two hours, was to cut across administrative and academic divisions for the purpose of discussing campus-wide policy and planning. Of course, each has its own particular charge. The five are the PAC (Provost's Advisory Committee); APC (Academic Policy Planning Committee); ITC (Information Technology Committee); CWC (Campus Welfare Committee); ACF (Advisory Committee on Facilities) and ASPC (Academic Support Planning Committee).

The form that Senate participation takes in these Administrative Committees owes much to COC's work in the fall of 2000. Here is what was established:

- (1) Each Administrative Committee has one or more representatives from relevant Senate committees. (The relevance was established by COC in consultation with the Senate committees and the Provost/EVC.) Often, but not always, the representative is the chair of the relevant Senate committee.
- (2) Alternates from each Senate committee, appointed by the committee in question, may attend if the regular designated Senate representative is unable to do so.
- (3) Senators do not vote on these Administrative Committees. From the Senate's point of view, our attendance is to facilitate the flow of information and the formulation of policy between Senate and Administration, but it is in no way to be construed as "consultation" with the Senate.

#### *COC's comment:*

At the end of two academic years of experimenting with this structure, the Chair of the Senate and Provost/EVC Simpson requested that COC assess its effectiveness from the point of view of the Senate. COC submitted that report in July 2002, which was on the whole positive but with some reservations.

Without going into details, it is clear that the downside of this structure is that the chairs of major committees--CPB, GC, CEP, COR, and CFW--have a much increased workload. Nonetheless, it is also clear that the Senate committee representatives believe that their presence is important

both for their input into issues at an early stage, and for increasing their own awareness at an early stage of issues facing the Administration and its thinking on them. The most resounding success seems to be that both Administrators and Senators, working together, have come to understand each others' issues and points of view better than formerly, and that the Senate-- whose importance is precisely that we think about the campus planning as a whole, cross-cutting academic divisions-- has increased its influence in the formulation of planning and procedures.

COC continues to believe that the functions of the Administrative Committees, their articulation with each other, and the protocols by which they interact hierarchically, can be streamlined and improved, and that their charges and purposes in relation to policy can be more focused. We hope that the Provost/EVC will continue to seek COC's advice and suggestions concerning these issues. One clear criticism that emerged in our report was that in many of these meetings too much time is taken up with the *presentation* of issues and their supporting materials. Senate representatives would strongly prefer that reading material and agendas be distributed sufficiently in advance to allow the most meaningful discussions to take place, which is impossible when the issues and background material are presented in the same session in which they are to be discussed. We at COC believe that faculty (and administrative) time should not be used up in dealing with anything but informed, efficient, and consequential deliberations. We therefore urge further fine-tuning of the processes.

#### *What Ever Happened to All Those Administrative Committees?*

During earlier administrations, a plethora of administrative committees existed (the most notoriously-named was the Ground-Squirrel Committee), which quite often dealt with implementation or extremely low-level policy. COC strongly believes that faculty time should not be used for such functions. These minor administrative committees had been established and perpetuated over the course of decades, but were seldom if ever abolished. Senators were yearly asked to volunteer for these committees. Quite frequently, newer and inexperienced Senate faculty confused these less important administrative committees with Senate committees, with unfortunate consequences--e.g., they assumed that Senate work did not have an impact on major campus issues, or they believed they had already volunteered for Senate service when they had not.

The elimination of many of these less-important administrative committees is due to the concerted effort of the Chancellor, the Assistant Chancellor Leslie Sunell, and the COC Chair during 1999-2000, Karen McNally. Those that remain have been largely rationalized in function and faculty participation due to the new Administrative Committee Structure outlined above and to agreements COC has made with the Campus Provost/EVC Simpson.

#### **New Agreements with the Administration**

We have several agreements with the Administration concerning new procedures for COC's input into the composition of Administrative committees of various sorts.

•Administrative Search Committees, etc. Formerly, the EVC would submit a request to COC for a slate of nominees for certain kinds of Administrative committees (e.g., Search committees for high administrators); COC would then submit its slate to the EVC, without comment as to its logic or composition; the EVC would then choose (or not) from among COC's slate; and COC would eventually discover (or not) who of its slate had been chosen. Both parties found this process unsatisfactory.

At the end of August 2000, the Campus Provost/EVC Simpson reached an agreement with the Chair and Vice-Chair of COC (at that time Karen McNally and Shelly Errington, respectively), subsequently accepted by COC, that when appropriate he would submit his own list of preferred nominees, *and* the full charge of the proposed committee, to COC for comments and additions. With a few glitches, this new process has worked far better for both parties.

•Subsequently, during the year 2000-01, Campus Provost/EVC Simpson, without prompting from COC, decided that all administrators who have Senate Faculty on their administrative committees must, in a similar manner, request these appointment through COC. (As of this writing, it appears that some administrators still are unaware of the procedure, but it is being brought to their attention, with follow-up.) Sometimes said administrators give us a blank slate, and sometimes they ask for particular Senators. The downside of this procedure is that it makes more work for COC. The upsides are (1) that the practice mitigates the possibilities of certain kinds of abuses of representation; and (2) that now a *Senate* body (COC) has knowledge of which Senators are serving in which capacities on *all* committees, Senate and Administrative, which makes us better informed and better able to spread workload and match talents with functions; and finally, (3) that, because COC tends to be highly informed of the talents, interests, and activities of many faculty members, administrators often end up with a faculty member more suited to the work at hand than they might have discovered themselves.

### **Conclusion**

The price of democracy is eternal vigilance, and the price of faculty participation in our own governance is eternal work. During the past two years the role of COC has expanded to include the facilitation of the smooth functioning of senate committees as well as the coordination of new administrative committees with their senate counterparts. We believe that COC serves a very useful function in our new capacities, and that it will need to continue to play a proactive role in the future as the campus reaches its full size and complexity.

Respectfully Submitted,

### COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Sandra Faber

John Isbister

John Hay

Lincoln Taiz

Shelly Errington, Chair

September 26, 2002