

ATTACHMENT A

Presidential Search Faculty-only Meeting, November 15, 2002

Introduction

On November 15, 2002, CFG held the scheduled faculty-only meeting for the fall semester. With the consent of the faculty, CFG focused the meeting on matters relating to the presidential search. Given such an agenda, CFG invited Charles Joseph, Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, and Sarah Goodwin, Associate Dean of the Faculty, to attend. Gove Effinger, Chair of CFG, called the meeting to order and presided over the discussion. Since faculty-only meetings do not carry the authority of the official faculty meeting, the faculty was informed that any recommendations arising from the discussion would need to be taken to the regular faculty meeting (or to appropriate college committees) for action.

During the course of the meeting, several concerns surfaced, which the group wished to communicate with the Board of Trustees and with the Presidential Search Committee. As discussion developed, it became clear that some faculty members wished to communicate their concerns via motions (assuming those were approved by the faculty at the official faculty meeting), while others preferred to offer the search committee a summary of the most important ideas discussed at the meeting.

In order that the faculty may choose which course of action it wishes to follow, CFG offers here both a summary of the sense of the meeting and a series of motions. The faculty may wish to choose one or the other—or even a combination of both. In CFG's view, the advantage of presenting a sense of the meeting is that the faculty can both forcefully present its concerns while emphasizing that its chosen mode of communication is not the assertive motion but the more informal statement of concerns. The disadvantage is that such a statement might too easily be ignored. The advantage of presenting motions is that such motions make very clear the will of the faculty. The disadvantage is that such motions may not accommodate the complexity of a search once it gets under way; indeed, some faculty members at the meeting spoke warily of passing motions which might seem to limit the freedom of a search committee to act in the best interests of the college. Since the faculty has, in fact, no real power to constrain the actions of the search committee and can therefore only make recommendations, the difference between these two modes of communication is primarily one of tone, we think—but, if we want effective and successful exchanges with the Board and with the Presidential Search Communication, then tone is surely important.

CFG offers first a motion (over) on the sense of the November 15th meeting; if that passes, we will withdraw the motions under item II.

I. Sense of the Meeting

**Committee on Faculty Governance
Motion on the Presidential Search, 6 December 2002**

Resolved: That the faculty send the following letter to the Board of Trustees and the Presidential Search Committee.

To: The Board of Trustees and the Presidential Search Committee

From: The Faculty of Skidmore College

Subject: The Presidential Search

