

We've run out of virgins!

S.E.P.C.

MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 11, 1993

Present: Joanna R. Schaap (Chair), Jennifer Zeuli (Secretary), Tina Gross, Krista Cook, Brian Dunn, Amy Huff, Jay Metz, Sandra Mendes, Matt Connors, Andromache Chalfant, Ian Jelinek, Catherine Wenglowski

Absent: Jonas Omberg, Mikel Wadewitz, Melissa Feldman, Giles Lewey, Mary Springer

Meeting called to order at 6:15.

RATIFICATION OF MINUTES:

The minutes were ratified. Following this, there was some discussion regarding a letter sent to me, your loyal secretary, by the Faculty Personnel Committee. They felt that the description of the faculty review proceedings in last week's minutes constituted a breach of confidentiality. As nothing relating to individual faculty members was mentioned, the Committee was in agreement that last week's discussion, and the report of it in the minutes, did not constitute a violation of the confidentiality surrounding personnel review. It was also agreed that maintaining this confidentiality is of the utmost importance; therefore it is vital that division reps never attempt to characterize the nature of the SEPC evaluations they read to anyone. Not even to the teacher in question. Not even to Rosie. You must carry these secrets to the grave.

END-OF-TERM EVALUATIONS:

Should students continue to have the right to deny a teacher access to their SEPC comment at the end of the term? Should these comments be anonymous? This continues to be a source of some **controversy**, and was debated briefly by the Committee. Questions were raised as to whether or not the class reps' summaries are an accurate or adequate representation of comments the faculty member is not allowed to see. Also, could writing a critical evaluation have adverse effects on one's final comment or one's relationship with the teacher? And what should be done if this is considered a possibility? Susan Sgorbati suggested a **campus-wide forum** on the issue--discussion could be led by two faculty members, one for and one against changing the current policy. Thoughts? Opinions? Anyone? Anyone?

GRADUATE PROGRAMS:

Susan asked Rosie to attempt to gauge **undergraduate sentiment** about the proliferation of graduate programs on campus. Says one Committee member, "As if you had a choice." There are quite a few grad students here these days, actually. While the Dance Division recently agreed to set their limit at four, and Music, we think, has even fewer than that, there are currently about twenty post bacs enrolled in the Science Division. That is, by the way, roughly twice the

number of undergrad science majors. Visual Arts also reports quite a few. Grad programs are fairly cheap here--they're about \$10,000, not including housing. The **big mystery**, however, is the new "low residency" MFA program in Creative Writing. It's run mostly by Writer's Workshop people--apparently, most of the Lit Division didn't even realize it was happening until the posters went up. Huh? Then there are the people who come here for programs that don't actually exist...like this poor soul who showed up a few years ago to get a Master's in Creative Writing, when we didn't offer one at the time. They strung him along for a term, and then he left. So sad. Anyway, if anyone has any feedback regarding these programs, from a graduate or undergraduate perspective, talk to me, Rosie, or your Division rep.

SUBSTANCES, SOCIAL LIFE, AND ACADEMICS:

Susan wants to know what we think the connections are. The general state of affairs was briefly discussed, and the Committee, once again, agreed that it could stand some improvement. To put it mildly. To attempt to ascertain the exact effect the current, depressed, social state of the campus has on academics, Division reps agreed to attend next week's coffehours to discuss the issue. Rosie will prepare a questionnaire to be filled out by students--if anyone has specific questions they want on it, put them in my box. In the absence of action from other student committees, this may, or may not, lead to some sort of formal proposal regarding residential life policy.

**You can help stop
this madness!**

FACULTY REVIEWS:

Social Science, Music, and Dance/Drama met with FPC this week, and apparently it went fairly well. The question was raised as to whether or not FPC should ask reps about their personal opinions of the faculty member they're reviewing. This is fairly common practice. Does it place a disproportionate degree of emphasis upon a single point of view? Feelings were mixed...it was decided that reps should use their discretion if such a request is made of them.

The lack of material on which to base these reviews was also discussed. We got very few canvass letters, and for some faculty there were huge chunks of end-of-term comments missing. There was not much to be said aside from the necessity of simply working with what you have, although it was noted that handwritten notes requesting canvass letters have been successful in the past.

SOCIAL SCIENCE:

Brian and Krista reported some frustration regarding the search for a developmental psychologist. The deal, basically, is this: the Division put out an ad, which was approved by the administration, for a tenure-track position. Such positions are usually assumed to entail three-year contract, and this was in fact what the Division thought it was offering. So then these candidates showed up, and were told by said administration that they would only be given a one-year contract. In some cases, the candidates knew this before the Division faculty did.

There were similar problems during the process that resulted in the hiring of David Lubke; it was pointed out that these misunderstandings make the College look really bad. Several of the psychology people have already stated that they won't take a one-year contract...clearly, this is a problem. The soc. sci. reps discussed the matter with Susan, who said that everything will be more settled in June. It seems that there's going to be some huge Trustee decision at that point...The Great Change, at last. And speaking of the Change....

"SYMPOSIUM":

The question was raised as to whether we can be alerted of the possibilities of decisions before they happen. That is to say, if The Board could let us know what They're considering before the decision is made, so that we could have a little more influence, or at least some time to prepare. The inadvisability of making sweeping decisions over the summer was also mentioned, and there was a request that we devote a "Symposium" forum to current issues, problems that could be addressed in terms of the present, rather than the distant future. It was also agreed that some attention should be paid to what actually works, what should stay the same.

SEPC QUOTE OF THE WEEK:

"Consistency would be so beautiful."

--Krista

Meeting adjourned at 7:30

Corpse sits up & burps!