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**Announcements**

**DAY CARE ISSUE**
We have received a letter from Elizabeth Remick saying the Provost has promised to look into this issue; Elizabeth will keep us posted.

**DEANS SEARCH COMMITTEE**
There has been a query about why no one from Athletics is on the search committee for the Deans.

**ENGINEERING MEMBER**
Why is there not an Engineering member from the Exec Committee?

**Discussion**

**I. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE’S DISCUSSION OF PROVOST’S PROPOSED CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

a. The bylaws suggest that the faculty must deliberate (and act on?) all changes in administration.

b. Why has the Provost not given us a written copy of the new proposal, as he promised?

c. Two issues must be discussed:
   1) The faculty has lost trust in the administration; how repair?
   2) How to go forward?

We will proceed with the action outlined in the proposal for which most depts. have already voted. We will begin by inviting the Chairs of the appropriate committees next Monday and asking them to prepare reports on the best structure from their perspectives. We need to energize these committees. The relevant committees are:

- EPC
- Athletics
- Budget and Priorities
- Student Life
- GSAS Exec Committee
- Engineering Grad Committee

Provost David Harris and Vice Provost Kevin Dunn enter.

We present the issues and the plan above.

**II. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION WITH PROVOST REGARDING PROPOSED CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

The Provost and the Vice Provost say that the bylaws have never been interpreted in the way we read them before; the committee counters that even if they are debatable, they could be seen as giving support to the faculty position.
The Provost says that there are frequently deeper reasons for family quarrels; are there here? One
member suggests that faculty governance has been eroded for some time, and this seems like a
further instance of that. Another member agrees, but adds that the particulars are extremely
important too; this restructuring seems to consolidate power and financial decisions in the
Provost’s office and thus seems like a “power grab” to some. It is also mentioned that the bad
feelings aroused by the day-care issue have also spilled over into this one. The Provost emphasizes
the time constraint: we must have this finished by Nov 21 for the Deans’ search. The committee
members explain that many faculty feel this is being done too hurriedly, that the need to find an
external dean should not force us to restructure the university in a manner that has not been fully
considered, particularly since several past external hires have not turned out very well; it is
suggested that we could have an interim dean if necessary, or even an internal dean. The Provost
feels that the lack of confidence in another external hire and the desire for an internal dean form the
“subtext” behind the discontent. Some committee members feel that this puts the emphasis in the
wrong place: the issues to which the faculty have objected are very real and serious, as is their
discontent with the process, but they don’t think that ending up with an internal dean would be an
insupportable outcome; at any rate, they don’t feel the fear of this necessitates restructuring the
whole school. And they still want to know what is being fixed by this process. The Provost gives
some examples of current problems with the flow of money and resources that would be better
handled by the Provost’s office; it is suggested that he give these examples to the faculty.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

a. The Executive Committee intends to go ahead with gathering reports from the relevant
committees and presenting them to the faculty; the Provost is asked to stop the search
process while this occurs. He does not want to stop, but he will think about all we have
said. He suggests that we continue with our process for 6 weeks and then see where we
are.
b. The Provost promises to send the new proposal to us in writing.
c. There is no one from Athletics on the Search Committee because no one wanted to do it;
they were invited.
d. Not putting a member from the Exec Committee on the Engineering Search was a simple
oversight.
e. Problems faced by the Budget and Priorities Committee were discussed; the Provost said
he would look into these.