

SPECIAL CALLED MEETING OF FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Friday, February 28, 2020 at 1:00 p.m.

KAREN J. WILLIAMS COURTROOM OF THE LAW SCHOOL

PRESIDING: Professor Mark Cooper, Chair

Call to Order

CHAIR MARK COOPER (Film and Media Studies) –called the meeting to order.

Updates from the Chair

I wanted to give you a few updates that may be relevant to discussion and then open the floor for discussion of Board level and then campus level governance.

Related to the Board, the legislative calendar is such, and interest in other matters has been such, that we are unlikely to see any legislative reform of the Board in this session. That seems to have gotten stuck in the House and Senate committees, and it's unlikely that there will be time for it to come out and move through the process.

It is likely that we will see governance changes on the Board. There's an ad hoc committee looking at developing a standing governance committee for the Board. The bylaws changes and the new meeting and committee structure proposed by the AGB report may emerge from the Board's own process. They have already passed an Oath of Office and a Statement on External Influence, passed that a couple Fridays ago. So those actions had been taken, and Board committee restructuring is underway.

On campus level stuff. I want to really apologize. I know that the library's data did not make it into the spreadsheet I released. Libraries were grouped by ModernThink with administrative divisions. We got colleges and not divisions which include, administration and finance for example.. I've asked that that be corrected. Apparently, it's a little bit more complicated then it seems to me like it should be, but we will get the library's data. It's likely also that we will receive a whole bunch of more data on Monday, so more comparative data, more detailed data on Monday.

I want to remind you about the COACHE Survey Town Hall. You'll receive an email from Cheryl Addy. There are two meetings: Monday in this room, 2:30 to 4:00 PM, and Tuesday this room, 10:00 to 11:30 AM. Some COACHE data will be discussed. There's a lot more data coming, so they will be more releases and more town hall meetings and opportunities to discuss that data over the coming months.

Finally, just a reminder that the QEP Forum is Tuesday in the Russell House from 3:00 to 4:30. I don't know if we're going to have particular suggestions for the QEP process, but certainly that

would be an opportunity to participate.

The Strategic Planning process is progressing. We met for a long day yesterday and the President and the Provost will likely have more to say about this at the Faculty Senate meeting next week. Yesterday was mainly about tweaking some of the language around the strategic priorities and building out goals and objectives for those priorities. There will be more revisions there and then there will be the development of programs, metrics and resources. So putting dollar amounts next to some specific programs devised to enact the goals and objectives being identified.

There was pretty good participation by faculty representation in some of the areas of the strategic planning process. Research, in particular, had good faculty participation and it's published—look for the Council on Research Excellence. There's a website for it. In other areas., faculty participation has not yet been successful. One of those is system planning, where, I think there was a lot of concern about how to get that started. I expect to have more faculty participation in that aspect soon. And then, lots of kind of in the middle, some faculty participation, but maybe not great. So work to do there.

Shared governance questions. All this year I've been asking you several shared governance questions. They were, in case you haven't memorized them: Is the Senate the right size? Should the Senate be a different size? Is it properly representative? Should the Senate have a diversity and inclusion plan? Those two questions don't seem to receive much enthusiasm, so that's okay. I've also been asking you about budget and participation of faculty in setting priorities. In those areas, I think we have seen significant movement. I would say that at the central administration level or upper administration level, we're beginning to develop a shared governance process for budget development. That is starting to work. Only one of the advisory committees is really met, that's the Support Unit Allocation Committee, but we're starting to develop I think a good interaction between that committee and the Budget committee. So we'll see how that goes.

Structures are being built; they're starting to operate; and it has been brought up at several meetings of this body in the past that not every college has a structure that would allow faculty participation in budget development. At the college level, faculty participation in budget priority setting is likely to become very important as we move into the new hybrid RCM model. So, I'm just reminding you that this seems to be something that the Senate has identified as an area we could work on.

Strategic priority setting. I've just spoken about the strategic planning effort. I think there's more we can do there, but that seems to be something we're working on.

Other suggestions from the Senate. We haven't really had much time to develop, it might be worth more conversation, but the idea of having some differently structured kinds of meetings to allow for maybe small group conversations around matters of particular concern. That idea has been floated, we haven't done much with that, we might. The idea of quicker reporting out of key actions or matters being discussed at Senate meetings is also been brought up. And also we haven't worked on that yet, I'm hoping to work with our new Secretary-elect, Spencer Platt, about what we can do there.

Finally, just want to mention nominations for the new chair. You should all have received an

email and please get those to me by Monday, so we can present you with the names of the nominees at the Wednesday meeting next week. That's my report. Are there questions for me about these matters or any others on your mind?

Board-Level Governance

So I've set aside 20 minutes for discussion of Board level governance. There are two main documents there: The SACS COC letter to President Caslen describing the monitoring situation, and the AGB report, a quite detailed report with lots of concrete recommendations that then came along with a retreat where the Board heard them. So, any discussion of these documents or ideas about what the Senate might do to follow up on either of those reports or anything else related to shared governance at the Board level?

SENATOR MARCO VALTORTA (Computer Science and Engineering)– Mark, I wonder whether you could give your feedback, I don't know if you're planning to do it later on the Board's reaction to these documents and maybe even to the President's reaction to the documents, you know, whether there is any update on things that are being done, whether you feel that this is sufficient, more should be requested, you know, anything like.

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah. So you may have snuck in. I did say a little bit at the top of the meeting about that. The Board has taken several concrete steps to act on the recommendations of AGB. It has created for itself an oath of office, and it has defined a policy on external influence. Both of those have already been approved. And then the most consequential, potentially consequential action is to create an ad hoc committee to establish a new governance structure, a governance committee separate from the current governance and an executive committee, and also to rethink the committee structure. I'll go into a little bit more detail there.

At the retreat this was one of the ideas that received the most enthusiasm. AGB recommended that the Board move from a ten-meeting per year calendar to a quarterly-meeting calendar, to have less frequent but longer meetings--like two-day meetings; to move them around the system campuses; and to have concurrent meetings of the standing committees. Right now each committee of the Board meets in full session of the Board, basically. They move little flags around to determine who can vote on particular things, but otherwise every committee meeting is a meeting of the full Board. And part of the rationale of those proposals, and I think this rationale was well received by the Board, was that maybe without the glare of the full public board meeting,--it would still be open sessions, public sessions--but maybe the smaller committees would attract less of an audience and you could have franker, more candid, more free-flowing conversations on the committees rather than just receiving reports. The board meetings can tend to be a little bit pre-scripted. A different committee meeting structure might also allow for the Board to add non-voting members to committees, to improve diversity on the Board, and to maybe allow for better faculty voice on some areas of the Board. So I think those recommendations, which the Board seems to be acting on, are positive.

AGB recommended some pretty concrete bylaws changes. It'll be nice to see if they pick those up. The idea of eliminating the Athletics Committee was not welcomed. And there were some

other ideas that the Board did not pick up. The Board received at the retreat, and this comes across in the report, a very stern talking to about how information should flow between campus and the Board. That it should flow through the President's office, and it's really going to be up to the President's office to try to be the gatekeeper there to ensure that some habits the board has of reaching down into administrative layers whenever they feel like it to get information, that maybe those habits will shift a little bit. I don't know if we've seen that yet, but that would be a healthy change as well. So that, is that satisfactory? I can talk about this probably longer than any of you would care me to hear me talk.

SENATOR ERIK DOXTADER (English)- Thank you. That report is most welcome and it's striking to me how much of a transition we're in right now. I mean, we have all this survey data, that we've yet to sort of even see, let alone internalize and kind of assess. And this sort of question that follows is, you know, where are we and how did we get here? And as I said at the last meeting, that question of how did we get here is really one that's sort of presses on me because I think it's a question of what is it that we need to address. What is it that we need to address, and what is it that we need to set aside? There's been a lot of anger on campus. There's been a lot of anger in this chamber and some of that's been productive and some of it has come about and produced certain things, and that's all for the good perhaps.

But there's also a moment in which to move on, which is part of what it means to be in a transition. I guess in terms of looking back at the question of how did we get here a couple of things in the AGB reports struck me. The first was I think from the Chair of the Board indicating that there was some consideration being given to changing the presidential selection process. Could you talk about that if there's anything to say?

And then second in the AGB recommendations, there's a, and this is on page 14 of the January 24th, 2020 document. Number five on that page is strategic planning, is the responsibility of the president. I'm sort of curious to know how that idea was received, not least with respect to things like the Excellence Initiative, which I think is one of the things that when we look back and sort of say, what are some things that have made us unhappy and uncertain about what's going on, that's certainly something that I look at and I sort of say, where did this come from? And was it an initiative of the Board or the Provost and who was responsible and why did it go so poorly?

CHAIR COOPER – Yeah, so two questions. One about strategic planning and I have to talk a little bit more about that. And the other about presidential selection. I will say the presidential selection process is really, that's one we need to keep our eyes on very, very closely. So you're right to flag that. I think there are some members on the Board who feel that a case can be made for a more closed process. You can read in the Chronicle pros and cons about relatively open and relatively closed processes. So I don't think this conversation on the Board is outside the norm or the usual bounds of what governing board should properly discuss. The principal challenges, you know, you're, when you are trying to recruit high profile people who are already in positions, where knowledge of their candidacies may compromise their current leadership positions. That becomes very difficult in terms of timing if you have an open on campus process. So advocates for more closed processes feel that you might have better success recruiting higher profile candidates with less open processes.

The case for the open process is campuses need to have confidence in their leadership and the

way you build confidence in leadership in the campus is by having an open and public search with participation of faculty. So I think there are people on both sides of that question on the Board. And I do not know how that conversation's going to play out, but I do know we should, we should keep an eye on it.

SENATOR ABBAS TAVAKOLI (College of Nursing) - Reading the report, there were several places, the role of Board and one of the things was the term. There are some of the Board members with 30 and 12 years on the Board and one of the recommendations was limited term having fresh bodies in the Board. The other thing you mentioned about the old when the Board is politics involved with a politician and board their vote doesn't mean anything. And what the, what is step we take to see what action comes after that. I was curious if there is anything discussion about that or not?

CHAIR COOPER - Yes. And I still have Eric's Part II about strategic planning, which maybe we can get back to. There are no term limits in the statute. So the consultants did try to get some way down the road of getting the Board to voluntarily limit its own terms, and that idea did not go particularly well. It did not receive warm enthusiasm, let's just say that. But there was some real discussion about the difficulty of getting people to run. I mean there is no legal obstacle in the way of people contesting these seats. Right? The process imagines that half the Board will turn over every two years.

So, alongside term limits, there's also consideration of how the process for getting people in the pipeline for these positions works. What kind of attention people are paying to nominations in the judicial districts. How we think about that moving through the legislative process for approving Board members. So that was the nature of the conversation about that.

With respect to the idea that the Board can produce rules, but then it has to be self-policing. That's something that we really need to look at with respect to how the governance committee gets constituted and how its charter is written and then how it behaves. So that's an area where the Board must know that everybody will be looking at its accountability. We should be looking very carefully. It's an accountability issue and two parts of it are important: the way the rules for the governance's committees policing functions get written, and then how, how they act on those rules.

And did somebody want to add on to the strategic planning or is it a different topic?

SENATOR MARK MACAUDA (Health Promotion, Education & Behavior) - So one of my questions is in, it's kind of more of a question to everybody else. It looks like the Board has made some progress towards whatever it is we think they need to make progress towards. And I'm trying to, I'm just kind of wondering from everybody else, like obviously we're still worried about something or we wouldn't be talking about this at all. And I think, like for me it's the trust chasm between us, the faculty and the Board and a lot of stuff you're talking to is coming down to the fact that the message from the faculty is we don't trust you for a various number of reasons. And if that's really the case, I guess part of our question is, is this stuff enough? And if not, what do we want to see as a faculty so that we feel like they're acting in our best interest? And I'm saying that they are or they are not. It's just that I think it's safe to say the, the sentiment among the faculty is that they are not. So I'm just waiting for everyone else. Like, how, what do

they think about that whole kind of like underlying issue and kind of helps me understand where we will go from here.

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah. So I'm happy to hear answers to that question. I mean, they're very concerned about that issue and rebuilding trust with the faculty. And I do think you're asking exactly the right question. I don't think we want just messaging. I think we want to see some steps, but what are those steps that we would want to see and are kinds of things they're doing the kinds of things we want to see, or something else.?

SENATOR ANDY KRETSCHMAR (School of Law) - Following up on that, I think everybody in here has the same question, but, in reviewing the document this morning, I was really just struck on page five. The word "threat" is used: "The consultants found a fundamentally misguided governance culture – one that is a consistent threat to the university system board's ability to address strategic issues in an effective manner and to its reputation." That's an active word. And that suggests to me that until meaningful changes are adopted, instituted, this university will be continued to be under threat by the body that is charged with running it. So self-policing to me does not seem satisfactory.

And the word "proactive" is also used. I, I think I have a hard time seeing any of these steps taken as being proactive. I see them as reactionary, I see them as, oops, we got caught to be honest with you. So for the Board to take where I think are steps in the right direction as far as I'm saying, we are pledged to not be subject to outside influence after what we saw this summer. That to me says that we're gonna delete our text messages or something. I don't, I don't mean to be so flippant. I think we need to give credit where credit's due. And but again, this Board that this body, excuse me, stated in no uncertain terms that we had no confidence in this body. So I don't know what recourse we have to set up a timeline, a reasonable timeline saying you need to be transparent. Maybe every month as you've been doing, Mark updating us on the progress. But we need to see concrete steps. And of course we have limited measure to say what those are. And I'm not necessarily saying that we say, if we don't see this by 18 months from now, we make this resolution, but I, but I'm not not saying that either. So I'm curious to hear what everybody else has to say about that.

CHAIR COOPER - Me too. And with respect to timeline, I will just say that there is a kind of timeline imposed by SACS who will come for a review visit on campus in the fall in October, I think. And awareness of that timeline is very much driving the Board's responses. So we're not talking about a one year timeline. We're talking about a relatively short period over which we should expect to be seeing some things. And then there is the question of what do we expect to be seeing?

SENATOR VALTORTA - I would like to follow up on the issue of presidential search. In the document and in the cover letter, the issue of creating new procedures for presidential searches is addressed. And then I was impressed that it also in the cover letter by the Board of the Chairman John c. von Lehe, Jr., Chairman, this is mentioned. I wonder whether anything is, is being, you mentioned the discussion, where some advocate a more closed process. The failure of the search that we had was not due to openness of the process. In fact you could argue very, very much that if the process had been more open, it would have been less likely to, have had such an outcome. The failure was due to, you know, frankly opaque decisions by some of the key members, you

know, key actresses and the inability of the Board to adjust to public comment on the finalists, you know, at the end. So there were problems throughout that had nothing to do with open versus closed searches.

There is literature on open versus closed searches that seems to indicate that to a large extent it is a red herring. You know, that there is no clear indication that closed searches provide better outcome than open searches. So, overall it seems to me that it would be better for the Board, if I could suggest that to proactively push for changes that would make it, that would reduce the perceived dangers of open source, searches. So in a recent article in AUP Academe, or the recent report from AUP, someone suggested that there should be a push for state legislatures to adopt a non-retaliatory policy with respect to leaders of state university systems, for example, who put their name in the hat for a leadership role in another state university.

The argument that we keep hearing is retaliation against these candidates. Well, again, maybe this should be nipped at the bud. You know, we pretend that the, our top administrators are linked, tied to our university. And this is not just us, but most universities have this fiction that if you are a president, maybe a provost at a large university, you are, you're in at that university for life and everybody knows that is not the case. It doesn't mean that these people are bad administrators, it just means that they have a career like most of us, you know. So, that's what I will say.

CHAIR COOPER – I really appreciate those remarks. Marco, in answering Eric's question, I kind of went behind the scenes, and I think the items you mentioned are very much on the surface of what AGB was concerned about in the search process.

SENATOR TRACI TESTERMAN (School of Medicine)- I'm just wondering if there might be a way to at least delay the giving, you know, the names of the candidates because I mean, one problem, it's not just retaliation from legislature or whatever, it's a loss of confidence by faculty at that university and other things. And if there may be a way to kind of anonymize, some of the bio's early on such that, you know, you'd give a, you know, like this is a top 10 university or this is a, you know, some class of university, what kind of position they have, what kind of educational background they have and then, you know, give their statement about, and you could have certain things that are available where people could start to form an impression without knowing all of the details and that might serve as some protection, especially getting through the early rounds, you know, without outing these people to their own universities. And then when it gets down to the end, I think at that point you really need to know who these people are and see them in person.

CHAIR COOPER - To me this is starting to sound like it might be an action item. It was not on the short list of things that the Board was going to tackle in the first wave. It was somewhere down on the list. I don't know exactly where, so there would be time, for example, for the Faculty Senate to put together a little committee to describe what it would like to see in presidential search procedures and to make those known. If that were the will of the Senate we could do that.

SENATOR MARK MINETT (English) - To the Board development plan recommended on page

bottom of page eight, top of page nine, starting with, “a participatory process for developing a 12-to 18-month board development plan regardless of the disposition of the proposed governance legislation,” what steps have the Board of Trustees taken to begin this development planning?

CHAIR COOPER – So there's been an Oath of Office and Outside Influence Policy passed. And then the next most consequential thing is the constitution of an ad hoc committee to describe the Board's committee structure and to put in place a governance committee. It's imagined that then that governance committee will devise the development plan or help drive a development plan. So they're at the phase of putting together the administrative structures on the board that will then push this forward. They have also made commitments to ongoing training, and we'll probably continue to retain AGB as consulting firm, but that hasn't been finalized.

SENATOR MACAUDA - I wanted to question what this body can actually do, and it's related to what we're talking about, about the presidential search and it being closed versus open. And it's an interesting sort of logical argument that closed get you this/open gets you this. Great but given the sort of trust issues that we are having with the Board, it seems to me that even talking about a closed search is extraordinarily tone deaf. And maybe we see that, maybe the consultant folks see that, but maybe certain people don't see that. Is there a role for us to help them maybe see how some of these discussions they're having influence our view of them? Because I can't imagine anyone knowing the history of what's going on reasonably making that argument, given the context. Context free, it sounds reasonable, but given the context it really doesn't. And I just want to know like whether we could have a role in, in helping to sort of at least help them understand how we're seeing some of this stuff.

CHAIR COOPER - Absolutely.

SENATOR MACAUDA - So how to do that.

CHAIR COOPER – Obviously I carry that or whoever is your chair of the Senate carries that burden in representing campus in discussions with the Board, and I have. But we could also as a body come up with some recommendations for what we might want to see in, in a presidential search and what we think the liabilities of a closed process might be on campus and present that. We could try to engage a committee that had board members on it. We could try to create some kind of task force on presidential searches or approach them about having a joint task force of faculty and board members, which would accomplish the dialogue. So those are three different things we could do. There are absolutely things we could do and there would be receptiveness, I believe, to any of those courses of action.

SENATOR DOXTADER - I really appreciate that last comment and I want to sort of try and build from it and thinking about the larger conversation as well. We're talking about what the process should be and I think that's appropriate. But I also think we need to talk about what it was and because I think that has a great deal to do with questions of trust and confidence in leadership and how we go forward. And I think for me that's the point at which the president's office has to be brought into the conversation. I don't think this is just about the Board of Trustees. And I said a little bit about this at the last meeting, on April 24th, the Board of Trustees suspended the search and did so publicly and shortly after that they appointed an interim

president with I think a quite a clear expectation provided by them that things would reconvene in the fall.

The problem with the search is not simply that there was undue influence. The problem with the search was that the rules changed, and they changed halfway through the process and they changed when most of us were not on campus, let alone on contract. And President Caslen took the job under those circumstances. This was not a secret. It was no secret that the search had been suspended. It's no secret that there was unhappiness about the lack of diversity within the search. There was no secret that the search was departing from standing protocols. It was simply a question of whether it was undue influence, not whether there was any influence at all. And that produced a great deal of division and a great deal of upset. And the president decided to take the job.

And there's an interesting interview, which I suspect most people have not seen, which was given to the Daily Game Cock on the 7-24-19, which is available online where, President Caslen, then President-elect Caslen, talks about his decision to take the job and he's asked whether he thought it was fair. "The search process is fair" and he says, quote, "I mean, it's fair for me because I was selected to be one of the finalists."

Fair enough. I'm not sure it is fair enough, but I think going forward in terms of building trust, it seems to me that the President has some responsibility, to be part of this conversation and perhaps to concede a little bit more than I think he's conceded that he made some choices within a search that was not playing by the rules, that did not play by its own rules, whether it was open, whether it was closed, doesn't matter. It did not play by its own rules. And I think that's a problem. I think that's something that the President himself needs to address openly.

And I think perhaps that's something that needs to be done in conjunction with the faculty. I think we have a responsibility collectively to make sure that that doesn't happen again. And I'm particularly concerned with the ways in which decisions are made during the summer. I think that was disastrous for morale and for trust. And so, I think going forward that something that has to be added in the name of trying to understand where we are right now relative to what we think the process should be.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. Excellent.

PROFESSOR CHRISTIAN ANDERSON (College of Education and Campus AAUP Chapter President)- Last fall, I don't remember exactly when it was. This all blurs together. Mark and I, and a couple of others met with Chairman von Lehe and Vice Chairman Mobley. And one of the comments struck me and in fact, I'm pretty sure I even jotted it down. I, it was almost like, I couldn't believe what I was hearing. One of them said, this is the first time we've sat down like this with faculty members and von Lehe and Mobley. Neither of them are, you know, novices or newbies on the Trustees. Both of them have years and years of service on the Board of Trustees. Now Mark and I both sat in on lots of trustee meetings, when I was chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, I sat on the Academic Liaison committee or whatever it is and you know, I've been to a lot for the building and grounds for other projects I've worked on and you know, just in general. So, but that's a different kind of relationship than just sitting down and talking. And it

really struck me that they said, well, we've never actually sat down and talk like this. And it was a very productive conversation. Hindsight being what it is. Of course, it would have been wonderful had we had something like that a year ago, not, you know, prior to all of this coming on, you know, just as Erik explain how it all came about. I agree with that. Maybe there might've been a different result. Maybe they might've thought twice about, oh, well we know these people. We've heard their views firsthand. We've had a conversation, we have something of a relationship. You know, who knows how it might've turned out differently.

And I think that that's a lesson that we need to take forward, whether it's from the AAUP, from the Faculty Senate, from both, from whoever that I don't, I mean it was, I applaud them for reaching out and saying, let's meet and have a conversation. And that was good. You know, it was a onetime thing, I think, I don't know that they're going to continue to say, Oh, let's meet regularly. Let's make this happen. I think it might be incumbent upon us to say, okay, we're going to reach out. We want to meet, we want to have these conversations. Otherwise, you know, who knows what the next event to unfold will be.

CHAIR COOPER - So I'm happy to hear from anybody else. I put 20 minutes on this one, we're at 30, so if we could move to steps we might want the Senate to undertake in the future, that would be helpful.

SENATOR VALTORTA - I'm sorry, but I feel that I need to follow up on Christian's point in two ways. The state chapter of the AAUP is looking at presidential searches on a statewide-level. So that could be helpful.

The other thing is that you're meeting with John von Lehe and Hugh Mobley. At the beginning of the presidential search process, I tried to be allowed to share some of the discussions, and then sort of maybe not fully, but at an intermediate level with a committee of the faculty. And that was very quickly nixed. So if indeed, uh, Chairman von Lehe and Vice Chairman Mobley have indicated that they would like to talk to faculty more, that's a certainly a very good thing or broader representation of the faculty. But I think frankly, that this is a development that was spurred by events. Not something that they had a deep conviction about. We have to push for this. You know, they had to recognize that something had to be done.

CHAIR COOPER – Yeah, I agree with you. This is, so you remember we had an ad hoc committee to work with the AGB consulting team as they were reviewing the Board. Von Lehe and Mobley asked to meet with that ad hoc committee that we had formed to follow up on some things that the AGB Consultants had mentioned to them. So it's very, it's directly response to this process. Is there something for the Senate to do here related to presidential search?

PROFESSOR HILDY TEEGEN (International Business) - I would suggest that something tangible that the Senate could do would be to insist that the task force that's looking at the governance questions and the governance committee in particular, involve directly you on behalf of the Senate and that the committee structure that evolves in the subcommittee structure has de facto representation from faculty who are in some way or another elected to serve in those capacities. An open versus a closed process. Doesn't matter if the board who votes on a presidential candidate don't listen to the stakeholders. We saw on the last run that owing to the short timing between the opportunity to provide comments on the candidates and the voting

behavior of the Board, it was humanly impossible for them to have even read the comments, much less considered them from the stakeholder groups. And in fact in personal discussions that I had with three trustees, they admitted that they hadn't read all of the comments but that they had a general idea of the sentiments. So I think that the time is perfect now for the Senate to have a much more routinized regularized way of engaging on governance through this new committee structure.

CHAIR COOPER – Parliamentarian's rising, I'm sure to say that sounds like a motion. No? no? no? Okay. So I would invite somebody to put that in the form of a motion, but we have a non-member of the Senate who would like to speak, and I'd be happy to recognize that person,

PROFESSOR JIM BURCH (Epidemiology and Biostatistics) - I think that the actions that the Board has proposed so far are very superficial. I mean, taking an oath and things of that nature. I think when we're talking about shared governments, governance, we're talking about shared decision making and that's what we should have. Or you know, I'm not familiar with all the rules and regulations and bylaws, et cetera. But that's, I think what we want. We want to be able to at least have an appeal, you know, the right to appeal a decision or something. I mean, that's what I think we should be working towards.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

SENATOR MATTHIAS SCHINDLER (Physics and Astronomy) - I don't remember reading anything in the AGB report about involving faculty and whatever form through the Senate or the Senate chair and any of these suggestions that were made. Were there discussions along those lines from AGB?

CHAIR COOPER – Yes, they were. In this discussion of what a new committee and meeting structure could do, the idea of greater faculty participation either through that committee structure in some formerly defined way or by moving more work into more ad hoc task force or working group kinds of arrangements, which is something AGB in general favors, fewer standing committees, more task-based committees that involve a diverse representation. Faculty participation very much came up in those conversations. That was maybe too telegraphic on my part.

A big feature of the report is that the kind of board structure we have where the committees on the board mimic functional areas of the university--Academic Affairs Committee, for example; Budget Committee, for example--provide recipe for the Board not focusing on what AGB thinks the Board should focus on, strategic cross-cutting issues--how the university is moving for the state, those kinds of questions--and a recipe instead for temptation to micro-manage those areas over which the committees sit. So there's a fairly full philosophy behind AGB's advice there. But very much the idea of shifting the committee structure and having more faculty participation in and also more inclusivity and diversity in Board committees. Those ideas were very much talked about.

SENATOR DOXTADER - I'm in favor of an ad hoc committee but I'm not quite sure what it should do yet. And I, I'd like to urge us to go a little bit slow cause I don't think we have to have this done by Monday. One of the things that I hear is that there's going to be an information

channel that's going to run through the presidency from the Board. That was said earlier in the meeting. Be interesting to see whether or not there could, an ad hoc committee might be involved in that information flow, somehow. It might be the case that we want an ad hoc committee just on presidential selection, but I'm not sure because I think that intersects with a number of other issues that we're talking about and it also depends on what the Board does and how fast it does it and whether they're willing to articulate what it is that they say they're going to do and when they're gonna do it.

So, I also think, you know, not, I'm not sure the full Senate is here, and I think this is something that is important and meaningful and I'd like to see this debated perhaps at a meeting where everyone's here. I'm very much in favor of a motion. I'm just not sure that, this is for me personally, the moment, given all the strands that we're talking about and the importance of crafting at least one committee and maybe two with a very specific charge.

CHAIR COOPER – That point's well taken, let me put some things out there in terms of timetable and then, unless they're objections or a motion to do something, I'll move to the last item on the agenda, that's campus level governance.

So the Board will meet next on the 24th of March. It is likely that this ad hoc committee, which is looking at governance structure, will have something at that meeting to propose and if not that meeting, certainly by the April meeting. So if we wanted to, for example, suggest that there should be some faculty participation on that ad hoc committee, which is looking at the governance structure, our best opportunity to do that would be at the Faculty Senate meeting next week.

Presidential search stuff, we've got plenty of time for that I think. You know, anytime. I know you don't want this vote to happen in the June meeting, but March and April are the General and Faculty meeting in April. That will work I think perfectly well for the presidential search item.

SENATOR KRETSCHMAR - Mark, quick question for you. The AGB recommended a 12-to-18 month strategic plan. Could you remind me, has anything concrete been adopted along those lines where there is a set timeline where the Board presents its findings or gives itself a deadline?

CHAIR COOPER - So yes. I've already mentioned they've done a few top items. The next item is the creation of a governance committee. They've instituted the committee that's going to plan that structure. So I think they have given themselves and, I'd have to really go back and look at my notes, so please, you know, don't tattoo this anywhere on yourself. But I think they've given themselves until April to do that, but by earlier if they can. And then that governance committee once constituted then has to flesh out the rest of the plan. And October 10th I think it is, you'd have to look in that SACSCOC letter, the date as mentioned, but sometime next fall SACS is going to do an onsite visit, as part of their monitoring efforts. And it's pretty clear that they have to have made some concrete changes by that point. The Board I think is very clear on that matter.

SENATOR KRETSCHMAR - Okay. The reason I was asking is as far as concrete steps that we can take. And I wouldn't say this is concrete so much, it's just mud that's kind of sitting in the sun right now. But once that is more cut and dry, that timeline, I do think that this body, unless it can

be addressed during regular meeting times, I do think this body should convene again as it is right now with the sole agenda item being an evaluation of whatever report they produce, whatever reforms they suggest. And we basically give our feedback and our opinions on that.

CHAIR COOPER - Would you like me to invite some members of the Board to deliver that presentation?

SENATOR KRETSCHMAR - Yes.

CHAIR COOPER - Okay. I've been trying to figure out when the right times to get the Board to come. That's a really great suggestion that we have a meeting that's just devoted to this, whatever they come up with in terms of governance structure, if hopefully it's done within the boundaries of the academic year, we can have a presentation to the Senate and a discussion at the Senate of that. That's a great suggestion.

PROFESSOR TEEGEN - One other comment. I don't believe I can make a motion. I'm not a Senator. In my experience, if you wait until the ad hoc committee has decided what they're going to be doing on governance, there will be zero degrees of freedom for this body or any faculty member to influence any change. I would strongly urge getting faculty representation now on the ad hoc committee to work alongside those trustees who are inclined to make a difference in terms of how the institution has governed.

CHAIR COOPER - The point is well taken. I'm not in a good position myself to insist that I be added to that committee, but if the Senate wanted next week to pass a motion to that effect, I would be in a stronger position to ask that I be included in those conversations.

Campus-level Governance

Shall we pivot now to talk about campus level matters, survey results, et cetera. Erik had mentioned strategic planning earlier. I will say that the strategic planning process this time, led by our President, is more open than any strategic planning process anyone at this place can remember ever having happened. I'm in the room., there's broad representation from deans, administrators, folks from throughout the system--and conversations are lively and a little messy and to me that seems like a pretty healthy process. I don't know how it's going to wind up yet. I think it's moving a lot faster than a lot of us with like to have it be moving. But there's a lot of participation. A lot of a lot of voices are being heard in the process. Other thoughts about survey data? QEP? Yes, Senator Valtorta.

SENATOR VALTORTA - I really appreciate the hard work in the strategic planning that you're doing it and others are doing. I know this is, I don't want to sound critical but I've been around a long time and I remember early on in my career here as strategic planning process that involved a lot of town hall meetings, and anonymous reports and I don't think I've quite seen that kind of openness yet or open request.

CHAIR COOPER – Well, they did collect input, and I believe they will again, and if you want town hall meetings around the strategic planning we can do that. If that's a suggestion that people

will find that helpful, we can certainly advance that. The town hall meeting format is not quite the same as making the sausages. And my impulse has been to try and get faculty involved in the teams that are making the sausages, but I'm happy to consider other formats that might feel more transparent or participatory.

SENATOR VALTORTA - I'm happy to withdraw my comment and leave it as a historical. At the time we didn't use the web.

CHAIR COOPER – A computer scientist who predates the web.

SENATOR CHRIS YENKEY (International Business) - Mark, I'm curious regarding the community insights survey, have we seen the last of the dissemination of results? This was a question that was posed to the president and the representative from the, from the consultancy, they gave us the top 10 and the bottom 10. And somehow releasing the 40 questions in between was seen as giving out too much information to a body of people that might not be trusted and how they would use the whole, the answers were wholly unsatisfactory. So have we seen the last of that or...

CHAIR COOPER - Absolutely not. It's my understanding, Tayloe may want to say some words about this, but it is my understanding that we're going to get a big dump of data on Monday on a website, including some comparative data across colleges and complete answers. So no, the answer is we have not seen the last of it. There's more coming. I did release, I don't know if you had a chance to look at it, but some comparative data on shared governance questions were released with the agenda. That was circulated for this meeting. Tayloe, do you want to add anything?

INTERIM PROVOST TAYLOR HARDING (Dean of the School of Music on Leave) - I would just add that part of the reason that it's a March 2nd before the release of material that had, has been in part released for any number of weeks to different audiences largely because the last time we had a CAD meeting with all the deans and well I shouldn't say the last time, the first CAD meeting we had after all of that information was available from ModernThink, which was right about the time that we had the fellow here to talk to us that day in the Senate and all those other meetings. At the soonest possible moment after that with CAD, we had a conversation about the data and I allowed the deans to take the time that they felt was necessary to determine how best to communicate to faculty in their colleges about that data and to give the deans also the time to look through all of the comments because I had argued that Nathan Strong and his office and the ModernThink people should give the deans access to every single comment and then the deans could then come with assistance if they wished it to determine whether or not there were individual comments that might reveal themselves as associated with a particular faculty member. We should have a chance to have that reviewed before it became largely public and to give them that time, it felt like March 2nd was the right day. At the time or just before that time this particular Senate meeting was scheduled, I had already made that decision. Had I known or had I remembered that this meeting was scheduled today, I would've given the deans until yesterday to get all that work done. That's why the dump isn't until Monday. And we need to remind Nathan Strong to do the dump because it's been a couple of weeks and this is something he could have easily forgotten.

CHAIR COOPER - I think it's in queue.

SENATOR THERESA MOORE (Exercise Science) - I was curious in looking at the results that we were given for the survey and then the announcement that tenure track faculty's salaries would be going up and clinical was definitely brought into the survey. You know, the non-tenure track clinical, but right now we seem to be left out of the planning and that has been a problem for many years since I've been here. And I'm wondering can we be involved in the process somehow of getting our salaries reviewed, promotion criteria for promotions, you know, we're required to do research as well as everything else and you know, we need kind of to push our representation a little bit more. Can we be involved in this process?

CHAIR COOPER - You are. I don't know if you were at the last Faculty Senate meeting, but Bethany Bell who chairs Faculty Welfare reminded us all that half of the Faculty Welfare Committee is professional non-tenure track faculty. So that committee has been consistently conveying the message that something has to happen for a compensation for that part of our community. It's very difficult to provide the kinds of benchmarks that exist for tenure-track ranks to do compression raises. So the hope there is on the merit side. This also came up during the strategic planning process: the need to try to identify some additional resources to, to help non-tenure track faculty. So on the compensation side, that conversation is pretty well advanced and we'll keep working on it.

On the promotion side, we have an ad hoc committee on non-tenure track faculty who's looking at that very issue. Stay tuned. Some things likely to come to the Senate this year, maybe not next week, but then maybe by April that would be if create a parallel process like tenure promotion process and more formal process for promotions in the professional faculty ranks. So both things are underway.

SENATOR MOORE - That sounds good. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER - Other thoughts about the survey?

SENATOR MACAUDA – How do you think we did?

CHAIR COOPER – How do you think you did? My insight is that answer probably varies pretty widely by college.

SENATOR DOXTADER - I wanted to speak to that question of variation by college because one of the charts that you sent out, it breaks things down by college. And my sort of wonder in terms particularly of your shared governance initiatives is what role, if any, can the Senate play in thinking about what's happening within and across different colleges?

Just in terms of the six questions that were released, the levels of satisfaction vary wildly from college to college. And you know, while I don't want to put a proposal out right now, I think it might be an interesting idea to have an ad hoc committee with representatives from every college to look at the question of what's happening at the colleges and how are different governance structures within different colleges, related perhaps to levels of satisfaction.

CHAIR COOPER - Yeah, I think that's an apt suggestion. There is a paragraph in the Faculty Manual which describes what shared governance at the college level should look like. It's very minimal. In Arts and Sciences, we took advantage of the little bit of language that was there to ask that the Dean call a meeting of the faculty. That's one of the things that can be done under that section. But it does not, for example, say that there should be a formal governance structure in each college that looks like "X" or there should be bylaws or any of that. So in terms of what the Faculty Senate could do, that would be a place. We could look at that part of the Faculty Manual and try to describe what we think effective shared governance structures at the college level might look like and the way to get there I think would be precisely through an ad hoc committee that had some representation from as many of the colleges as we could, could reasonably get in a room to do that.

So that would be another motion someone might bring this meeting or a later.

Thoughts about the QEP. Vice-provost Kelly is in the back. I know she's having a meeting next week where she's hoping that the campus will be able to narrow its emphasis in the Quality Enhancement Plan. Thoughts, thoughts about that you wanted to bring up? Any other thoughts?

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed.