

April 24, 2013

TO: Paul Zuckerman, Presiding Officer Faculty Governance

Janice W. Anderson, Co-Chair Academic Affairs Committee

Sarah Wyman, Co-Chair Organization Committee

CC: Mary Bacorn, Student Representatives to the Academic Affairs Committee

FROM: Ken Goldstein, Co-Chair Budget, Goals, and Plans Committee

RE: Resolution on Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Departmental Status

From Academic Affairs Committee of April 10, 2013

Per the decision at the last Executive Committee Meeting, the Budget, Goals, and Plans Committee has reviewed the proposal forwarded by the Academic Affairs Committee regarding the Resolution on Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Departmental Status. The membership present at the meeting of April 23rd is in full support of this proposal continuing on to the Faculty Senate. While a few outstanding questions were identified and will be listed below, the proposal indicates the change from program to department to have minimal if any budgetary impact. The proposal articulates benefits from this change that are in keeping with elements of both the College Mission and the draft Strategic Plan. Specifically, the proposal articulates growth in interdisciplinary learning opportunities, recruitment and retention of students, and community and alumni outreach.

As mentioned, the Committee discussion did raise a few questions based, not on the resolution, but on the supporting document. The Committee does **not** think this should hold up the presentation to the Faculty Senate, but rather might serve the Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program in discussing the structure of the proposed new department.

They are, in no particular order:

1. How might the arrangements of a Chair position, as opposed to a Program Director, impact stipend and course release for that individual? Are there hidden costs in a new course release replacement, or are these currently accounted for?
2. How are course loads divided between faculty jointly appointed to two Departments? Will a need develop for more adjunct faculty in a more structured *departmental* curriculum? Would there be any need for more Fulltime Tenure Track positions to deliver the new *departmental* curriculum?
3. Given the current office and meeting spaces, does the change in status require additional or centralized space for faculty offices?

Again, having reviewed the proposal from the Academic Affairs Committee, and the supporting document, the Budget, Goals, and Plans Committee sees no reason this should not continue on to the full Faculty Senate.

Ken Goldstein

Co-Chair, Budget, Goals and Plans