Committee on Committees (ConC)
Annual Report to Faculty Senate, June 1, 2015

Co-Chairs: Richard Clucas (CUPA), David Hansen (SBA); Chair-Elect: To be determined
Members: Christina Luther (AO), Malgorzata Chranowska-Jeske (ECS), Michael Smith (ED), Corey Griffin (FPA), Lynn Santelmann (LAS-AL), Susan Reese (LAS-AL), John Reuter (LAS-SCI), Steven Bleiler (LAS SCI), Roberto de Anda (LAS-SS), Sharon Carstens (LAS-SS), Michael Bowman (LIB), Rowana Carpenter (OI), and Ted Donlan (SSW).

Committee Charge: The ConC is responsible for (1) appointing the members and chairpersons of constitutional committees, (2) making recommendations to the President for numerous committees established by administrative action, and (3) ensuring appropriate divisional representation.

Activities for 2014-2015

- Over the course of the academic year the ConC conducted most committee activities via e-mail and Doodle. Thanks to the efforts of Richard Clucas, all the interim committee vacancies were filled, with the exception of representatives from the School of Social Work on the Faculty Development Committee and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and a representative of the Graduate School of Education on the Honors Council. Multiple attempts were made by the ConC to recruit replacement committee members through other channels, but without success. This effort was unsuccessful largely due to insufficient numbers of available candidates from the respective senate divisions responding to the annual Committee Preference Survey.

- The work of filling Senate committees for AY 2015-2016 began in early April with the release of the results of the annual Committee Preference Survey. Via e-mail exchanges and a committee meeting in late May, the ConC has appointed, or recommended for appointment, nearly 95% of the 211 constitutional and administrative committee positions.

- As of the drafting of this report, the ConC has affirmed all but twelve of the 211 appointments/recommendations, including alternates. Of the remaining, seven are pending, and five are associated with senate divisions having no candidates available in the annual Committee Preference Survey.

General Comments and Observations: (1) It would be very helpful if the annual Committee Preference Survey, in addition to identifying a candidate’s senate division, also identified the academic department or the administrative unit of the survey respondents. (2) Based on the results of the Committee Preference Survey, there seems to be a general insufficiency of faculty members interested in and available for committee service, and it may be of value to the Senate to explore other avenues for encouraging committee service. (3) Though the turnover in appointments/recommendations was nearly 25%, to promote greater opportunity for participation on high demand committees, term limits should be considered for committees not requiring significant institutional memory, or committee-specific expertise. (4) To attract greater interest in committees with low survey response rates, one-year terms of service, rather than two-year terms, should be considered. (5) Limit survey choices (first, second, or third) to one of each.