The meeting was called to order at 3:05pm

1. The approval of the minutes from the January 28, 2016 governing faculty meeting were approved.

2. The results from the administrator surveys were discussed. S. Selig said that Faculty Council met with the Chancellor for over an hour on Wednesday during the Faculty Council meeting. The meeting was productive. The Chancellor expressed interest in receiving input from the faculty regarding the areas of concern and how we can move forward. H. Wehbe-Alamah stated that the Chancellor reached out to the faculty during the Faculty Council meeting and wants to know what she can do in order to meet faculty expectations. The Chancellor is going to meet with small groups of faculty to solicit their feedback, write a letter to campus to share her plans for the future, and to meet with Faculty Council on a regular basis.

J. Sanders asked about the frequency of administrator evaluations. S. Selig stated that the Chancellor is evaluated every two years.

A. Goldberg suggested that the Director of Research should be elevated to a vice chancellor position, which would increase the status of faculty research on campus.

K. Shellenberg stated that when the search committee met, they looked at the salary range for this position. They noted that a faculty candidate would take a pay cut to take this position.

C. Larsen suggested that an advisory committee be formed after the new Director of Research is hired to provide suggestions and feedback to the person in order to move research on campus forward.

S. Lippert asked the following: how often are the Deans able to meet with the Chancellor; are they getting enough of her time; are meetings with committees in a group (Faculty Council, CAC/BSP, etc); what is the representation of academic affairs in the ‘Cabinet’—is the Provost the only one?

S. Selig: stated that other than the extended leadership team, it is not clear how often Deans’ meetings take place; Faculty Council suggested that there be a faculty representative on the cabinet and increasing the number of times the extended leadership team meets.

S. Selig said that the Chancellor does not regularly meet with Faculty Council.
C. Larsen stated that the Chancellor meets with CAC/BSP about once a month though the committee meets twice a month.

S. Lippert asked if the Chancellor could model best practices in academic governance with regards to administrative searches. She said that the faculty shouldn’t be able to predict the outcomes.

K. Shellenberg stated that when the Chancellor began her term, she made a lot of decisions regarding upper level administrative positions. She stated that faculty would like to know the rationale for the changes, especially the new and expensive hires. What problems are these new people going to solve and how will we measure success in solving them?

B. Veillet said that before the Chancellor began her term, faculty were concerned about the administrator-to-faculty ratio. This ratio must have gotten worse in the interim, so an explanation for what these new people are doing would be good.

S. Banerjee said that some services were centralized without input from the academic units. This may be beneficial, but the units should have been consulted.

J. Alvey stated that faculty would like the rationale behind major decisions and hires. After the hires take place, the faculty want to know what these positions accomplished, especially in light of the declining enrollments.

C. Miller, who is chairing CAC/BSP, said that a couple of the administrative hires are replacement positions (such as that for Bill Webb). Other positions were created after collecting data for various university offices such as the Student Success Center. In order to take these offices to the next level the university needs a vice chancellor. The positions are needed to help with student enrollment and student retention. C. Miller said that the positions seemed justified, but this was not communicated before the positions were created.

K. Moreland said that Academic Affairs needs to be a higher priority for the Chancellor. S. Selig said that during the Faculty Council meeting, the Chancellor reached out to the faculty for concrete suggestions on how she can meet faculty expectations. K. Moreland said that as the Provost becomes more acclimated to the university, he will help increase the voice of Academic Affairs. There also needs to be more structures and avenues to increase the voice of Academic Affairs with the Chancellor.

S. Roach said that there are specific suggestions of the survey. So, the Chancellor should take very seriously the written feedback in the survey. The main issue is that the Chancellor is very disconnected from Academic Affairs. A specific problem with this is that the Deans are not part of the cabinet, but part of the “Extended Leadership Team,” which does not regularly meet.

Q. Mazumder said that as a leader of the institution, the Chancellor should understand the needs of the faculty and involve the faculty in major decisions and initiatives.

H. Wehbe-Alamah said that it was clear in yesterday’s meeting with the Chancellor that she takes the faculty’s concerns seriously. She wants faculty input on how she can work better with us.

H. Laube said that the concrete suggestions are fine, but there is a lack of trust given the way previous administrative searches took place. The Chancellor should explain to the faculty how and why all of these new administrative posts were filled by people who had previous relationships with the Chancellor.

K. Schellenberg stated that the Chancellor was very proactive in winning over the community when she arrived. A similar effort should be made for the faculty.
J. Alvey said her concern is that the Chancellor’s visions are radically different from the visions of the faculty. The Chancellor’s vision is that Student Affairs is the center of the university, rather than Academic Affairs.

S. Lippert asked if the Chancellor could be a role model for administrators with regards to respecting the university’s rules and procedures. With the budget downturn, Academic Affairs should be prioritized in the budget. Faculty are having difficulty getting post requests approved. New posts and initiatives are approved by CAC/BSP, such as in tuition revenue agreements, but funding does not follow.

J. Lawand said that the Chancellor does not ask the faculty what our vision is.

B. Jones stated that a problem is that the Chancellor did not take time to learn the organizational culture and to reach out to individual faculty members to learn about the institution. The perception is that there is a lack of responsiveness to communication and getting a response back to inquiries made to the Chancellor. Perhaps the Chancellor thought communication was taking place, but the faculty on the receiving end didn’t think so.

C. Larsen stated that the Chancellor meets with AAAC/CAC-BSP/Faculty Council regularly. It might be more effective if the Chancellor meets with the faculty as a whole at a governing faculty meeting. S. Selig said that a plan was for the Chancellor to attend unit governing faculty meetings and unit end-of-year retreats. S. Parker stated that perhaps the Chancellor should give an update to the faculty at the Fall governing faculty meeting.

J. Sanders said that a real problem is administrative bloat. We would like to see some results in response to this in a timely fashion (a year or less). We want the Chancellor to acknowledge that she hears the faculty and will act on it.

M. Wolverton said that we need to add a choice for “Library” in school/unit for the administrator surveys.

J. Blumner asked if there will be action from this discussion. S. Selig said that faculty will invite the Chancellor to the Fall governing faculty meeting. The Chancellor will get more connected to the faculty via small group meetings with faculty.

J. Lawand made a motion that we have a follow-up governing faculty meeting in May before adjourning for the summer for a status update with regards to the changes and suggestions in the minutes. The motion was seconded by Sue Talley. A. Goldberg said that people want to know how we will know if the Chancellor is following through.

A. Lutzker said that waiting for a letter of the Chancellor is not sufficient and that an ad hoc committee might be necessary like with the previous Chancellor. S. Selig stated the difference with the previous Chancellor is that she was at the end of her contract. J. Blumner stated that we don’t want to be in that situation again, which is why action is necessary. E. Newberry said that if things were promised two years ago, it doesn’t make sense to wait another two years to see if those promises are delivered.

A. Lutzker offered a friendly amendment to the motion by J. Lawand to establish an ad hoc review committee in addition to having a second May meeting. The amendment was accepted by J. Lawand and S. Talley.

S. Talley stated that she didn’t see a problem with a May meeting. J. Alvey said that perhaps we should have an early September meeting for the ad hoc committee to report their findings.

Faculty Council member said that she did not understand what the ad hoc committee would do. Who
would be members? How is this different from what Faculty Council will do? The Chancellor has already made a commitment to follow up.

S. Lippert stated that since faculty seem to have a lot of concerns and insufficient time to discuss them--an ad hoc committee might allow faculty not at this meeting to provide input and voice their concerns.

A. Dorfman stated that Faculty Council can summarize the concerns and come up with an action plan. Faculty Council could form the ad hoc committee, schedule another governing faculty meeting, and bring an action plan forward. A. Lutzker said that the ad hoc committee could gather the concerns and bring them to the faculty. J. Lawand restated her motion, including A. Lutzker’s friendly amendment.

A. Goldberg asked why Faculty Council can’t do what the ad hoc committee is charged to do. J. Lawand replied that the ad hoc committee would be more focused in its task. A. Lutzker stated that since the ad hoc committee is a one-time committee, it would be freer to investigate and communicate with the Chancellor. M. Mani said that the ad hoc committee would send a stronger signal to the Chancellor that these concerns are serious.

Faculty Council members said that an ad hoc committee is not necessary because the Chancellor is already addressing the issues. They are still confused about what an ad hoc committee would be doing.

S. Lippert said that it important to note that Faculty Council serves the faculty, and that given there will be turnover in Faculty Council, it might be a good idea to have an ad hoc committee to assist in this transition.

The question was called regarding the motion. J. Lawand restated the motion and requested a voice vote.

There was debate between Faculty Council members and faculty regarding how we define substantive votes requiring electronic ballots.

S. Selig made an executive decision in her capacity as Chair of Faculty Council to require a vote by electronic ballot.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.