Robert: We'd like to call the meeting to order, we do have quorum. The first item would be approval of the agenda for today's meeting. November 13th, the Faculty Senate. Do we have any emotions regarding the agenda? Please come up to the mic.

Speaker 2: Hi Deb, too if you would fully identify yourself for the record. Thank you.

Deborah Moriart: Deborah Moriarty, college of music. Could we move 7.4 and 7.5 to top up after 7.1?

Speaker 2: Do we have a second?

Speaker 4: I second.

Speaker 2: All in favor of the amended agenda, please say Aye.

Audience: Aye.

Speaker 2: Any opposed? The agenda is amended as moved. President Angler is unable to attend due to other business.

Deborah Moriart: Minutes?

Speaker 2: Oh, oops, sorry. We need to have approval of the draft minutes of October ninth as was distributed previously, do we have any motion to either approve or amend the minutes? We have a motion to accept the minutes as written. Do I have a second? Dr. Fleck. All in favor of approving the draft minutes as written, please say Aye.

Audience: Aye.

Speaker 2: Any opposed? That motion carries, the minutes are approved now. In the absence of interim president Angler, we have provost remarks from Dr. [Juniere 00:02:00].

Dr. Juniere: Thank you, just one announcement today. I think most of you have received from our office of research, a survey asking you about your activities related to outreach and engagement. This is part of a review that we're doing at this point in time looking at the ways in which our faculty and academic staff are engaged in a variety of outreach activities and the kinds of things that they anticipate doing into the future. Our office of outreach and engagement. And our whole thinking about outreach and engaged research had a very serious look about 18 years ago and since that time we've really led the country in many ways in both thinking about engaged community research and also trying to assess outcomes and impacts. But it is time to perhaps do a refresh and to look across campus and see the kinds of activities in which faculty are engaged and the kinds of work that they would like to do in which they need support.
Dr. Juniere: Then the office of outreach and engagement should logically both be able to lead some of that work, but should act as a strong support to the work that is going on or it plans to go on and whether or not there is alignment between what's currently being done and what all of you are wanting to do, is really the question that guides the review so there is a steering committee that is helping organize both the focus groups and the survey. Again, if you received one of those surveys, it's really would be very, very helpful if you could complete that and send it back. There's a fairly short timeline of getting all this back and then looking at the information in terms of what opportunities await the university and the ways in which we need to align the infrastructure so that those opportunities can be realized, so thank you. The steering committee isn't making decisions, they're collecting your information and summarizing it so your input is valued.

Speaker 2: Thank you. Okay, I have a few remarks of matters that have come through faculty senate that are either completed or pending with the board of trustees so I'd like to go through those a bit. One of the first more minor matters was there was a suggestion from faculty senate to have notes from the presidential search input sessions be made available publicly. Those are available publicly now on the presidential search website, there has been a few questions raised on who took the notes, but I think the board had a representative there that was taking notes, but we'll clarify that. The other was a resolution from faculty senate regarding the changes to the dismissal for cause policy for tenured faculty that was made over the summer and we had asked the board to reverse the change, allowing a faculty member under discipline to be suspended without pay by the sole discretion of the president.

Speaker 2: We also in that motion, offered to work closely with relevant academic governance committees and the board of trustees itself and crafting a new dismissal for cause and discipline of tenured faculty policy. The board declined to change the bylaws back to the way they were in the spring, however, they remain eager and look forward to proposals coming out of UCFA and UCFT to shape a new and revised a discipline and dismissal for cause of tenured faculty policy over the next month or so. So, that is moving though we didn't quite get the change we wanted there. They were made aware of our concerns there and perhaps those concerns could be addressed in crafting the new policy.

Speaker 2: We also sent to the board the proposal that was conceived of by reclaim MSU and voted on in April by faculty senate regarding having a students and faculty representatives on the board, on a university board and recommending some constitutional amendments that has been forwarded to the board and we await their written response. Also, Dr. Hoppenstein and I went to the University of Iowa for the big 10 academic alliance governance session. And one of the most salient things we learned out there was that the University of Iowa had been placed under sanction by the American Association of university professors for
having poor presidential search practices, and the four year process by which they remove the sanctions after shared governance was made much more clear.

Speaker 2: One of the items that brought sanction on University of Iowa was the board basically double dipping in coming up with the full slate of the finalists and then selecting the search which was timely given the resolution that faculty senate passed about having the board members on the search committee be ex-officio with voice but not vote in terms of coming up with a slate of finalists and then the board then doing it's constitutionally granted duties of selecting the final choice among the finalists. The board is deliberating on that matter, and they promised a written response in the next week or so in regarding to that specific point. And perhaps Mary Finn as she comes up later in the agenda for a reporting out on the presidential search committee, perhaps she has some relevant comments to make at that time. I think that's all of my remarks. I think this is, I don't think my remarks are subject to discussion by Robert's rules of order.

Robert: That's correct.

Speaker 2: Okay, we'll have comments from the floor and item eight. Okay, so we'll move on to new business with the university committee on curriculum report. I invite Dr. Martel to the microphone.

Dr. Martel: Mercy Martel Rue, College of Nursing, the UCC full committee met in October and approved the following for programs to new programs highlighted by a master of science in nutrition and dietetics effective spring 2019 and a quantitative risk analytics bachelor of science effective fall of 2019. And really the focus of this program is to help those not necessarily looking to actuary sciences, but to be very competitive in marketable in the insurance industry. We approved a further of 12 program changes and three program deletions. For courses, we approved 34 new courses, 77 course changes and 13 course deletions. The moratoriums are in geological science, PHD, effective Spring 2019 to spring 2024 as they're doing some reworking within the department, discontinuation of computer science disciplinary teaching minor for elementary and secondary education effective Spring 2019, and ethics development graduate specialization effective spring 2018. There are short reports located within the appendix and you can also click on the long report.

Speaker 2: Okay, this is listed as an action item. Do I have a motion to approve the report? Who made the motion? A second? All in favor of approving the university committee on curriculum report, please say aye.

Audience: Aye.

Speaker 2: Any opposed? The report is approved, thank you. We'll move on now to the new item 7.2 regarding the joint appointment for the orthopedics department. This is an endorsement of the item that has been through governance and I'll ask provost [inaudible] to introduce the item. Yes. Thank you
Speaker 8: Yes, thank you. Before is the question of whether you will endorse the creation of a new academic department of Orthopedics. There has a division of orthopedics for many, many years and it has been in various places in the college of Osteopathic Medicine administered by a variety of different departments. But as you can imagine as faculty, there are all kinds of problems in being a program located in multiple units over time, particularly the inability to have a tenure home in a particular program, but having to have a tenure home in an academic department, The last department to manage the program of Orthopedics is radiology. This would create a freestanding department, it would be a shared department between the College of Human Medicine and college of Osteopathic Medicine.

Speaker 8: There is already a director ... there is in essence an infrastructure with a director of administrative assistance, budget support, all the kinds of things that you would find in a department, so the cost of converting from a program to a department is fairly minimal, I won't say it's not at all, but it's fairly minimal. Ahead of the program, of course, is creating departmental bylaws, doing a search for a chair and the other kinds of things that you would assume, but the proposal as presented, has been reviewed by the University Graduate Committee and if there are questions I'm sure they'd be happy to respond ... by the University Committee on faculty affairs, again, I'm sure they'd be happy to respond.

Speaker 8: I think student affairs looked at it just this last week and reported that there were no concerns among the student affairs. This proposal was vetted by faculty, by the students in the department, by chairs within both colleges and by the advisory committee in each of the colleges and all of them did endorse the proposal and so the creation of a new academic unit has to be voted on, considered and voted on by the board of trustees. It does not have to be approved by faculty senate, but I bring it to you for an endorsement because the endorsement of faculty senate I think is important having again gone through deliberation by each of your standing committees.

Speaker 2: Thank you. Do I have a motion to endorse the creation of the orthopedics department? Do I have a second? Thank you, all in favor of endorsing the proposal to create an orthopedics department in Michigan State University, please say aye.

Audience: Aye.

Speaker 2: Any opposed? The endorsement carries.

Speaker 8: Thank you.

Speaker 2: Thank you. Next step we'd like the report from ... I don't know if you were here for the agenda modification, Dr. Finn, but we'll take your faculty Senate
representative on the presidential search report at this time. Main podium please.

Dr. Finn: Good afternoon, I'm here to give a report, an update on the presidential search committee. We have completed over around 22, probably more campus wide input sessions, the notes from these input sessions are available on the presidential search website. The search committee has met twice with the search firm in the month of October and once via conference call in November. The notes from the input sessions have been utilized and have informed the search committee in our work with the search consultants, our store back in Pementel, to develop the position advertisement. This position advertisement was released on November 5th and it will appear, actually now has appeared in the chronicle of higher education, the chronicle of philanthropy, inside Higher Ed, Higher Ed Jobs, Hispanic Outlook, diverse issues, journal of blacks in higher education and Asians in higher education.

Dr. Finn: Most of those are online formats, and a couple of our hard copies like The Chronicle of Higher Education. The position specification document is currently being drafted, that is a longer version of the actual advertisement and has details on the institution as well as outlines, both the required and preferred qualifications for the next president. The search committee has continued to discuss the role of the members, in particular the role of the four board members that are also serving on the search committee. We have been having conversations about the various stages of the selection process and the role that members would play in both screening and interviewing candidates. The co-chairs of the search committee are preparing a statement for release shortly that are going to describe the process more fully and what has kind of evolved as agreement in response to the concerns, I think raised by this body as well as responses raised by others that we heard throughout the input sessions. That kind of concludes my report and I will entertain questions at this time.

Speaker 2: You have chair's prerogative to ask some questions. What would be the status of our faculty senate proposal that the board members at the initial stage of the process serve with voice but not vote in an ex-officio capacity? Is that still under discussion or deliberation?

Dr. Finn: That is under discussion.

Speaker 2: Okay, thank you. Please. And again, please introduce yourself and the microphone for the sake of the full transcript.

Sheila: I'm Daluna Boyd Sheila James Madison College, thank you very much for your service. I do want to ask you a couple of questions, when I saw the ad, the ad, not the position description because that's a 15 page document, I was very concerned. I was troubled by the fact that one criteria that I and others, including faculty senate thought it would be important, was not made clear as a very important criteria in the ad already, which is somebody who has expertise in
that commitment to addressing issues of sexual assault. I'm not talking about that word in verbatim, I'm looking at notes from various colleges. I've seen it worded in different ways, and to me, and obviously, if you look at the word cloud, people have counted that as well and instead we had some kind of somebody who can deal with personnel and management, which obviously we would assume it would be. Was there a discussion of that? Why is that not foregrounded in the ad as far as you know?

Dr. Finn: The ad came out as a kind of collective conversation with the search committee members and the search firm, and I think as we had that discussion, there were particular points that members kind of brought to attention and rose to be a part of it with the idea being that this is not the comprehensive description of all the qualities and characteristics we're looking for, and that, that will come out more fully in the description of the position that the candidates actually have to respond to. I do think that one piece, as I'm looking at the ... we did include I think the statement around the commitment to equity inclusion and justice was part of that.

Sheila: That doesn't really address the issue of sexual assault and violence with which this university has been really struggling with and I think that this can be very well perceived as concealing something that should be looked at as a priority since we have been attempting to manage and not directly address this issue for quite some time. I'm very concerned about that issue out there.

Dr. Finn: Okay, I can take that back.

Sheila: Thank you, and can I ask one more question?

Dr. Finn: Sure.

Sheila: I was very interested in what professor Raduka brought up, which is the UFI, the best practices right, that they came up with after their university was sanctioned. There are multiple ways in which this search process and the search committee does not fulfill those criteria and I, you know, I can pose these questions later when we talk about the presidential search process to be included in the bylaws, but as we know, we can be sanctioned for this search because of the way which it's proceeded. I would like to ask if the presidential search committee has raised some of these issues in addition to the ones about by first enate to the board. Has the committee seeing the University of Iowa Best Practices and have you brought any of these issues to the board of trustees?

Dr. Finn: If it was a document that was provided by this body to the committee, I have not seen it.

Sheila: Okay, all right. Thank you.
Speaker 2: I did forward it on to the board of the Nikia bar after we went to the University of Iowa, so at least the secretary to the board is in possession of the document.

Dr. Finn: I can follow up with her and ask why it wasn't distributed if this body feels that's a critical piece of information we should have.

Speaker 2: Are there any other questions for Dr. Finn? Yes, please come up to the mic.

Lisa Lupitas: Lisa Lupitas, College of Natural Science. I'm wondering if you can give us the impressions you or maybe your personal opinions about what kind of institutional change questions you're gonna ask of the candidates that don't pertain to sexual assault because that can't be the only issue that we hire on, so what other types of reforms are you guys interested in asking about?

Dr. Finn: We have not gotten to that point of yet as far as what are the guiding questions for the interviews. There's been a host of ... from the input sessions and from the committee members themselves discussion about the direction of the institution.

Lisa Lupitas: I read a lot of the notes from the input sessions and of course it's all over the map so I'm looking for a distillation of what particularly the faculty members of the committee see as the kinds of questions that are being raised, whether they are the questions you wanna ask or somebody else wants to ask, I don't know, but I couldn't quite grasp from the notes what you guys were taking or what messages you were taking away.

Dr. Finn: Right, and I think we're still in the process of kind of distilling the information across the input sessions and coming up with those.

Lisa Lupitas: Is that kind of information going to be put forward to either the faculty senate or the whole university so that we can know what you guys are thinking?

Dr. Finn: I don't know. I can certainly ask because I'm not certain that the ... I mean I knew that the questions that guided the input sessions were certainly shared. I'm seeking your input at that stage, but I don't know at this next stage if the detailed questions around kind of the process of selection of the candidates is something that's going to be shared widely.

Lisa Lupitas: Well, let me explain what I'm thinking here. It's not a transparent process, we won't have no input until they announce the person. We will not see any of the candidates, we have no way of judging them, so at this point we're blind and so what I'm really interested in knowing is, as you're our proxies, what are you going to be looking for? That needs to be made clear, maybe not to the whole university, maybe it should only be to this body, I don't know, but that's the kind of transparency that we're looking for, not just a whole bunch of stuff posted on a webpage.
Dr. Finn: Okay, thank you.

Speaker 2: Do you have any other further questions for Dr. Finn?

Jennifer Johnson: Jennifer Johnson, College of human medicine. I'm curious in the process so far, what gives you the most hope in what's giving you pause, if you feel comfortable saying that? I'd love to hear what you ... Yeah, what gives you hope and what gives you pause?

Dr. Finn: What gives me hope is that I have seen this collecting a group of individuals brought together on the search committee to be a group that is really listening to each other and in that regard, I think the common messages that are coming from across the campus about what is important, particularly not only for what the community would like to see in the next president, but also with regard to the importance of the process. At the beginning I wasn't certain that that message was being heard by some members of the search committee, but I do believe that it has been heard and that I think there will be a response to it and that I hope when that is shared, that there will be ... that you all will view it as a positive step forward.

Dr. Finn: What causes me pause is that if you look at the notes from the input sessions, while there are some common themes that come across, there's also not. There are times when it's difficult to see the commonality in the threads of what is on first and foremost on individuals' minds and that makes it more challenging as we move forward with the selection process, the interviews, and coming up with those potential candidates.

Jennifer Johnson: Thank you.

Jennifer Mariarty: Jennifer Mariarty, college of music. Since you are the sole representative of the faculty on the search committee, would it be helpful for you if this body were to pass a resolution asking for the transparency that Lisa Lupitas was talking about, the way we passed a resolution about the people at the board with voice and not vote at the initial stages?

Dr. Finn: I think the more that bodies on campus express what it is they want, the easier it is to get movement in that direction. Silence is not a good thing at this point.

Jennifer Mariarty: Thank you very much.

Angoelina Bouchilla: On this note, I'm going to bring it up now and we brought it up before.

Speaker 2: Angoelina, would you-

Angoelina Bouchilla: Angoelina Bouchilla, James Madison College, sorry. Faculty senate endorsed the proposal that might be dismissed for many reasons by the BOTs, but when key part of that has to do with transparency in the presidential search and there are
a couple of key elements there, so I know the proposal is going to go to the board of trustees should have, will go and, but I would like for the presidential search committee to hear, we've made this comment before that part of that transparency is having open forums with community members and which we actually get to ask questions. Also, as part of the proposal we endorsed was that if our community considers the candidate selected to be inadequate, that we have the opportunity to express this through vote and that the BOT who have the final authority can go back to the slate of candidates then and give us somebody that we don't feel strongly opposed to. Thank you.

Speaker 2: Thank you. All of that has been submitted to the board as the resolution approved by faculty Senate in April and we await a response.

Dr. Finn: Thank you.

Speaker 2: Thank you Dr. Finn. The next item on the agenda is the new 7.4 on the high risk travel process with Dr. Steve Hanson, is he here?

Deborah Moriart: I wondered if there was miscommunication about when he was supposed to be here. I sent him a text a few minutes ago and I haven't heard a word, I haven't heard anything.

Speaker 2: Okay, so we'll move on to the bylaws revisions and this is an extensive item that's gonna take us a while because the sentiment expressed to me as these bylaws revisions have gone through lots of various standing committees, but this is faculty senate's opportunity to approve items on a line by line basis.

Deborah Moriart: They haven't gone through any.

Speaker 2: Oh, they haven't.

Deborah Moriart: They haven't gone through any standing committee.

Speaker 2: Except for UCAC, okay.

Robert: This is an information item because the university council approved bylaws.

Speaker 2: Okay, great. Thank you for the clarification. So we'll be going through these bylaws revisions that we can then make note of potential changes and bring those to university council next week.

Robert: Make recommendations.

Amanda Tekna: Hello, my name is Amanda Tekna, I am the chair of UCEG, such a great acronym, University Committee on Economic Governance. Last spring UCEG was given the charge to form an ad hoc committee to meet over the summer to come up with some bylaws revisions. Some specific highlights specify a faculty senate
procedures for emergency meetings, which is included in this, so that was one thing that was definitely called for and that was addressed. So they met over the summer, worked very hard, I believe it was 18 meetings, is that right?

Deborah Moriart: 13.

Amanda Tekna: 13, I'm not exactly how I would want to spend my summer so hats off. I thank them for that, and they've come up with some revisions. In the notes that you got today. The executive summary of those revisions is on pages 72 and 73. If you don't feel like flowing through the rest of the document and you want an overview, that would be a good place to go. At this point I would like to turn it over to Tyler Sylvestri and Laura Dilly who were on that ad hoc committee and hopefully they can answer your questions if you should have any.

Laura Dilly: Hi, I'm Laura Dilly, I'm an associate professor in the Department of communicative sciences and Disorders College Communication Arts and sciences. I was also the interim chair of UCEG heading into the summer when there was so much interest across the university in trying to figure out what happens and how can we collectively as a faculty be empowered to have a voice, how can students be empowered to have a voice and out of the discussions between Faculty Senate, University Council and UCEG, the charge was put on UCEG to convene a committee that would meet over the summer to review bylaws.

Laura Dilly: I was a part of that committee, there was a diverse set of about 13, 14 members of faculty across the university and student representatives that really dug into bylaws informed by the various perspectives they brought and the end result are the proposed bylaws revisions that you see. We are looking today for your input and insight into how these bylaws proposed changes can be put forward for consideration by UCEG. So your role today as I understand the processes to reflect on the intent of the changes which I can try to summarize for you and then reflect and propose any specific changes to wording that you think would further improve them.

Amanda Tekna: I don't mean to interrupt. I am interrupting, sorry, I apologize. But having sat through steering committee, I understood this slightly differently and if I'm wrong, anyone who was there speak up. Because the changes are very significant and many, I understand that you all were going to overview the process, explain what was here, we were going to send this back to the various committees to dig into it, and then come back for real changes. If that's wrong, somebody correct me, but that's what I understood.

Speaker 2: So committees like UCFA, UCFT, et cetera.

Amanda Tekna: Yes, because there's pretty deep content for our committees to look at it and I think we'll want to look at. So again, I don't mean to ... correct the record if I'm wrong.
Laura Dilly: I appreciate the clarification.

Speaker 2: Deb Mariarty, do you have something to add? Please come.

Deborah Moriart: No, I prefer to sit here.

Speaker 2: Yeah. Okay, great.

Deborah Moriart: Anybody else can stand.

Speaker 2: Yeah. All right, we'll bring the discussion back to the UCEG representatives.

Laura Dilly: The proposed bylaws changes are organized into marked up university bylaws, marked up board bylaws, a full rationale for the proposed changes, that is a supplemental document, and finally a two page executive summary of the proposed changes which range from everything from putting forward procedures here too, for unspecified faculty senate day-to-day operations and providing for a committee on administrator review all the way down to missing periods and commas and typos. I wanted to focus your attention if I may, on the more significant proposed changes. The documents that you received for this meeting involved pages 18 through 111 corresponding to bylaws related documentation for today. Tyler, would you like to say a couple of remarks?

Tyler Sylvestri: Sure, yeah. My name's Tyler Sylvestri, I'm a law student here second year. I also graduated from James Madison College in 2017, I'm the vice chair of UCEG now, and I served on the ad hoc committee as well along with, I think your esteemed colleagues, Martin Crimp and Laura McCabe and legacy in western, the undergraduate representative in the back so there are plenty of people here to ask questions if you have them. I'll just say broadly the goals really were to find ways of cutting down institutional barriers that are there between communication with students and the board and with faculty and the board, that was part of it. Part of it was creating mechanisms by which faculty and students can really make their voices heard in a way that's institutionalized rather than sort of passing things to ourselves and then hoping somebody looks at them.

Tyler Sylvestri: Many of these changes sort of forced the board or forced administrators to hear because it's teamwork. This is not I, I'm speaking for myself my characterization of it, but I don't see it as sort of an anti-administration proposal at all. I think it's very much a call for teamwork and it expresses a hope. I think that faculty students and administrators can work together to really make the university the best that we can. We've come off a really hard time and I think that what happens here goes a long way towards improving shared governance. We looked at a lot of different schools in the big 10 as well as others who have sort of ... they're sort of renowned for their shared governance systems, we called them up, we really went through to try to figure out what the best avenues for what
they don't like about their processes are and how we can improve on that. Are there specific questions about any of it or should I just talk generally?

Speaker 2: I'm not sure.

Deborah Moriart: You mentioned going from page-

Speaker 2: Introduce yourself.

Deborah Moriart: I'm sorry, Deborah Moriarty, college of music. You mentioned starting at page 18, but I'm looking at the preamble and it says the faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum subject matter of methods of instruction, research, faculty status, appointments, reappointments decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure and dismissal. The board has just changed their policy so that is no longer the case, so if we're gonna ... I think that's something that needs to be discussed. I think also it would be helpful to just go through and look at all of the red line things.

Laura Dilly: Absolutely [crosstalk 00:41:03].

Deborah Moriart: Some of them are just periods and commas, but you know, that's the first one that struck me.

Laura Dilly: I don't know if we could get the overhead to display the documents from.

Tyler Sylvestri: I should, I had a point about it's dated wrong if you want to use the next slide. I think there's a little in depth compared to [crosstalk 00:41:22].

Laura Dilly: To get oriented to the documentation, I would encourage this scrolling through and you can see where their rent red line passages. You will come across a couple of swaths of read. The two main items that involve the most red lining, the most new change would be faculty senate operations, and then the proposed committee on administrator review.

Speaker 2: Sorry, just a second. We have a presentation we weren't actually intending to give it, and that's why it's dated wrong and addressed to the wrong people, but we'll do it. There's some jokes so strap in a, that's me in there.

Tyler Sylvestri: So here's what we did, 44 proposed changes to the bylaws of faculty governance, 18 to the bylaws of the board of trustees. Furthermore, we identified six issues in the academic governance bylaws that deserve further attention and UCEG has expressed a desire to do that, but we didn't have time or the wherewithal to develop actual language and we did the same thing with three issues in the board of trustees bylaws. There's a big asterisk on this count that this is sort of my way account, it really depends how you count, but this is the gist of it. You guys got the long presentation, so continue. Starting with the bylaws faculty of governance, the preamble we outlined these things that ... sort of faculties
primary responsibility is. Professor Moriarty I was curious, when you said that the board changed our policy, are you changing to ... Are you referring to the dismissal for cause that part of it.

Deborah Moriarty: The faculty no longer has responsibility.

Tyler Sylvestri: That'll absolutely be addressed. So also a broader process question

Robert: Could you repeat her statement.

Tyler Sylvestri: Sure, she said that she was referring to the recent faculty dismissal for cause policy and so the fact that he no longer has that sort of authority over dismissal. For process we want to get all these and UCEG will be sort of considering the feedback we get from various groups. We've also gone to COGS and ASMSU and incorporating them at UCEG so that's what we're looking for from you.

Laura Dilly: Page 20 of the agenda document with appendices that was circulated. Has the red lining for the preamble if you'd like to follow.

Tyler Sylvestri: I think honestly the best way to do this is if there's going to be ... If there are questions, I think interrupting the presentation is probably the way to do it because like I said, there's a lot. If you want to just come to the mic.

Laura Dilly: Could you pass where we've got the actual red line.

Tyler Sylvestri: Oh, yep. I agree, we can do that.

Speaker 2: Sorry, rather than us as a body trying to wordsmith these bylaws changes, I think if people have broad statements about things that's fine, but if you have specific wording, you send that in an email to, to our UCEG representatives so they can deal with it more properly. I don't think we're intending an hour long wordsmithing session on maths here.

Laura Dilly: Typo, section 1.3, which is on approximately page 23 of your document clarifies modes of participation. There are four modes of participation of faculty and students in university governance, which are consultation advisory, shared responsibility, and delegated responsibility. Delegated authority, can't see it. Page six of your document, thank you for the clarification. The red lining, you see, they're merely clarifies the motor participation in some cases I'm specifying the way in which faculty and students are empowered to participate through that mode of participation. Do you want to speak to that?

Tyler Sylvestri: Oh, no.

Laura Dilly: Okay.

Tyler Sylvestri: So you're on part two.
Laura Dilly: I'm going to skip over some of the rather minor things that relate to small changes to clarify things that are fairly, I think uncontroversial, which what we have in this particular case is the statements of seeking information and advice rather than passively, more passively receiving views from administration.

Tyler Sylvestri: This business about the administrators' designee, it was a redundancy. It says elsewhere that anytime administrators ... a designee so this is just a redundancy. This part is something that I think that there has been a lot of consternation about, the fact that the current bylaws don't articulate a process for that presidential search. And so what we did is we put one here in the University Council section saying University Council will develop procedures with sort of this statement of principles in mind and then there's weird language in our proposal to the board's bylaws. You can read it, but essentially what we didn't do is set a strict sort of procedure, this is exactly how you have to follow it, because it's a very fluid thing and that's a very difficult thing to codify that way, but these are sort of broad principles that we think ought to be considered in doing so.

Laura Dilly: One of the things that we observed was missing specificity with regard to how governing bodies operate with regard to principles for, in this case, a mode by which the presidential search should take place. So this particular passage represents a case of omission of details regarding presidential search. Yes, please.

Speaker 19: [inaudible 00:47:59].

Laura Dilly: I'm sorry.

Speaker 19: Question, how are they-

Tyler Sylvestri: I'd prefer it now personally, but it's your chair's call.

Speaker 2: You have one question on 3247, is it the provost that's the chief academic officer of the university?

Tyler Sylvestri: That is so true, that in this bylaws change is reverting to the president so I think that needs to be addressed.

Laura Dilly: We're happy to make note of these observations that observations and insights.

Andona Bochura: When you're done with the presentation-

Speaker 2: Introduce yourself.

Andona Bochura: Andona Cheraps, sorry, James Madison College. I'm going to bring us back to the BOT bylaws eventually when you're done with the presentation but now this is about the presidential search. I'm wondering whether or why we can't write
something that we've endorsed in terms of what we wanted to see in the presidential search in the bylaws here. This still leaves things pretty vague follow upon a cooperative search by the board of trustees and the faculty taken into consideration the opinions of others were appropriately interested. We've already endorsed language that's really much more specific as to how we want the community to be inclusive and included within that, so I'm just putting that up there. We've already talked about that and I think it's important to continue to press for that.

Laura Dilly: Thank you very much. Yes, these bylaws changes are merely intended to enhance specificity relative to what was already there. They're not meant to be comprehensive in any way. I think that other documents amply have attempted to further do that. Thank you so much.

Speaker 2: Dr. Caplewitt's, you have concerns at this point?

Michael Caplewitt: Michael Caplewitt's, College of Agriculture and natural resources. No, I was just getting ready for 3-3-2-1-1 and wanting to make sure that there's some sort a definition of what an administrative responsibility is.

Laura Dilly: That's a good question. We would cross reference with respect to modes of participation and look to you for further guidance as to if any language should be enhanced and specificity.

Tyler Sylvestri: I'll say also, I particularly remember what this point, this question was raised during our ad hoc sessions and because I am not a faculty member, I'm a lowly student and so I had asked is this a term that will be widely understood? The feeling in the room was that it was, I feel differently in this room I'll tell you. If there are proposals to sort of better define that because I think everyone sort of understands what we're after, what we're getting at. If people had better proposals, UCEG would love to hear them as far as specific language on it.

Deborah Moriart: Deborah Moriarty College of music. Is there a definition in the University of what an administrator is? I'm assuming there is somewhere and I don't know what it ... maybe somebody could tell us what it is, whether it relates to pay or contract or because a lot of people have appointments where they are in charge of something but it's not ... doesn't reflect in their reappointment or promotion or tenure and different colleges are very, very different in terms of what they do.

Dr. Finn: These are examples of why I thought committees were going to spend a lot of time looking at this, give it to everyone after it was cleaned up and then have these conversations because I think we could spend a long time on each one of these things. So yes, there is a definition, it's in the faculty handbook and fact and it can be cross referenced and pulled out, but yeah.

Laura Dilly: And that may be something to do relative to this document. We tried, but clearly they're going to be additional enhancements and improvements that we see.
Dan Gold: Dan Gold, College of education. Apologies because this just dawned on me, but it's not about a specific more generally the process and I understand this is faculty driven, but there seems like early on in the process maybe to vet this from former department heads, former deans that don't have skin in the game that say this makes good sense from faculty, but as an administrator this ties you in knots and you can't move. It's sort of like at this juncture in some ways it sounds like we're competing with administrators. We want to get a voice because of things that happen so the idea of maybe getting input from them at the front end, not approval, but input about desk could be problematic or that might ... And then as you're revising go forward, that might be a useful step.

Laura Dilly: Thank you for that input. There was a wide range of experiences with administration and the faculty around the table. We had a current chair, we had a former chair, we had a current administrator. Those folks did bring their perspective and helped head off what might otherwise have been sort of a faculty versus administration dynamic that could have emerged.

Tyler Sylvestri: Moving on, that part in case people have been looking at there was a concern about administrative appointments, folks with appointments have more than 25% serving as the chair or vice chair of steering faculty and Academic Congress so this essentially just loops that off. I assure you that 25% was not chosen arbitrarily, it was about an hour's discussion on those two numbers right there. This is where we sort of settled but that is one point specifically UCEG would love to hear more about whether that's sort of where the feeling in the room is. There is another analog to this later on for the chair and vice chairs of standing committees as well.

Laura Dilly: If I may encourage you to cross reference in your own documents between the red lining that you see in these bylaws and the rationale document which is double spaced and lays out the thought process behind the specific changes. The section that you're looking at now relates to faculty senate procedures which were by contrast with university council procedures quite vague and unspecified. The attempt was to provide for specificity relative to frequency of meetings, also providing for some procedures that could be followed in the event of emergency meetings or time sensitive topics needed to take place. There was a lot of confusion in university governance about what do we do, how do we make these votes, how do we present the results of these votes to faculty senate and other arms of university governance. This language attempts to provide for flexibility of faculty to respond in crisis without being hamstrung by university governance.

Laura Dilly: On that note, if you refer to the language in 3.3, this would be page 18 of your documentation, what this language does is to specify faculty senate procedures in special meetings as well as to clarify UCEG and faculty senate's relationship regarding amendments. Tyler, would you like to talk to these points?
Tyler Sylvestri: Sure, yeah. I think the one of the most remarkable and I think important things we did was this special meetings for faculty senate. I think it’s kind of crazy that it wasn’t there anyway, and I think certainly members from last academic year knew it caused a lot of problems. As it stands, president standing committee or a two thirds vote of the membership can call this special meeting. Now in exceptional circumstances, one third of the membership can request in writing so email to one of the at large faculty members of the steering committee to have a special meeting, they’ll propose sort of what the topic is on, that will prompt an electronic vote, then all of the Faculty Senate will vote on that, and it has to pass by two thirds approval and that will sort of forced the special meeting.

Tyler Sylvestri: Again, I assure you numbers, we’re not arbitrary, what we were really worried about was a special meeting every week. We assumed you would not want that so we think what we've done here is with the one third at the steering committee level is to make an attainable bar, but still substantial bar to calling the vote. Then the two thirds is a substantial bar where really the issues that deserve special attention will get it so that’s where those numbers come from. Then otherwise the language has largely taken right from university council and then changed to match. Please.

Deborah Moriart: So the same thing is in university council?

Tyler Sylvestri: I don’t believe so. It’s just sort of the nature of that body. I think people-

Deborah Moriart: Can you repeat the question.

Tyler Sylvestri: Oh, sorry. Professor Moriarty had asked whether that same language was in university council. I don't believe we had put it there, but a lot of that was because of sort of the nature of that body. People didn't see it as necessary as opposed to faculty senate, which is a little more, I don't wanna use the word reactionary but I'll say action oriented, but it’s certainly a good point that we should consider further.

Deborah Moriart: Deborah Moriarty.

Speaker 2: We can, we need it on the mic.

Deborah Moriart: Deborah Moriarty, college of music. Actually the university council is the body that approves the bylaws so they are the ... I mean in terms of approving things the only thing that faculty senate can actually approve is the curriculum committee report and university council does the bylaws. So in terms of actual things that can be done, I think that the university council is as significant and I would think you might want to have the same language for university council for an emergency meeting. I don't know that there will be emergency bylaws, but it seems highly unlikely.
Tyler Sylvestri: That's a great note, thank you very much.

Laura Dilly: I'll comment that that's a wonderful observation and it would be welcome for this to go forward with specific language suggested for example, relative to university council. There was considerable discussion coming to a point about the faculty senate emergency procedures, what would be the right threshold for a matter to be considered, one which has enough broad support to be brought forward. So as you can see, I think from the document line ... I'll pause and take the question.

Angoelina Bouch: I just ... just to kinda like make-

Tyler Sylvestri: Are you [crosstalk 01:00:42]?

Angoelina Bouch: Angoelina Bouchira, James Madison College. Yes, I am, Tyler Sylvestri, very nice to meet you too again. For people who weren't here in the spring, I think this would really be helpful. Just to just clarify just for a couple of minutes we had a couple of different instances. One was when we wanted to ask for ... put forward a motion for a vote of no confidence in President Louanna Simon and the other one was with a vote of no confidence in the board of trustees. If you could just explain to us for a couple of minutes what this does that we didn't have the flexibility to do then, or mean ... there was a lot of unclarity there as to who can call such meetings and when I think this is what this wants to address and if you could clarify for us just a little bit that. So for people who weren't here, we had an issue with this last semester.

Laura Dilly: I was not part of the faculty senate at that time, I'm not a member of faculty senate now so I think that um, folks who were here will have some feeling about things that were challenging and we were at the ... what is here is a proposal that as in.

Speaker 2: I think [crosstalk 01:02:01].

Laura Dilly: Okay, I'd love to take ... good comment, thank you.

Laura McCabe: Laura Mccabe, College of osteopathic medicine. I think that the idea was transparency because the faculty didn't know what to do, so we wanted to lay it out in a document so that it's a step by step process. So you want to have a meeting, what do you, do? You could go the bylaws, it wasn't there originally and most ... I think this was one of the issues that everyone on the committee was supportive of as we started.

Laura Mccabe: I came a little bit later in the summer to the committee, but it was on the list of things that we came up with to address and then while I'm here, so the 25% idea was the discussion of just making sure that people in positions, leadership positions in academic governance don't have a conflict of interest. We ... actually I had talked to one of the administrators that was on the committee trying to
figure out what was our rationale because we did discuss it for over an hour and we picked 25 at that time and I think this is a great idea to make it more specific in the bylaws.

Laura McCabe: But the rationale was something about that it's a significant administrative duty like assistant dean or something significant where you had a stake in a college position and that way that would conflict. But as I can see, but as I'm looking, well what does that mean how do you define that percentage and I think we were thinking in the listing of that, uh, where your salary's coming from or something. But anyway, those were a couple of the things that we had discussed but those are two big ones, you know, conflict of interest, transparency and I think you'll get to a couple of those.

Laura Dilly: Thank you. Just briefly to point out the specific clauses of the Faculty Senate related language that you might reflect on. 3.3.5 and 3.3.5.1 provide for the procedures relative to essentially emergency meetings and timely issues. 3.3.5 says that when there are urgent matters that should not await a regularly scheduled meeting, these may be called ... a special meeting, may be called by the steering committee, or by a two thirds vote of the members that membership of faculty senate in a regular session. However, 3.3.3.5.1 just below, provides that in exceptional circumstances between meetings of faculty senate, one third of the voting membership of faculty senate may request a special meeting either in writing or in electronic form to an at large member of the steering committee, and that this appeal shall immediately prompt and electronic vote by the full voting membership of the Faculty Senate on whether to hold a special meeting on this date of issue, which would then require two thirds approval.

Laura Dilly: These thresholds did require to generate considerable discussion in our summer meeting and the mode by which these votes could be brought to the attention of the wider audience for consideration. Any questions, comments? Thank you for the engagement thus far in reflecting on the language here and what can be before it and improvement. Next?

Speaker 2: 3-3-4-9?

Michael Caplewits: Michael Caplewitts, College of Natural Resources. Didn't we agree that this was going to be going to committees for detailed consideration of language and might we want to defer our review of the language until our committees get to review them?

Laura Dilly: Speaking for myself and my understanding, it was a thought that the broad input at this juncture, if by getting some detailed thoughts at least getting you get, getting into the language of specifics might assist with fostering the best outcome in parallel.
Michael Caplewi: That may be helpful, but I wonder whether my colleagues in the room have had time to actually look at this language to provide such input at this time.

Speaker 2: I think what we need is the rationale for the major changes and not worry about all the little minor ones that are coming up.

Deborah Moriart: Moriarty, college of music. I think that what we decided was that we would get people's feedback in terms of what we thought did not strike us as working and then in terms of language, that would go to committees and then go back to UCEG and then come back to us, so University Council or going to university council I think is a long way off. I think this is just a session where we talk about things that strike us as being not something that needs to be reexamined.

Michael Caplewi: Thank you for the clarity.

Tyler Sylvestri: I'll say that was my understanding from leaving steering. I did not realize it was going to go to the standing committees. We certainly wouldn't oppose more input that, that was not, I think most of our understanding on the UCEG end of it but we welcome it. So I guess Professor Duke, I'm going to ask you how we are your humble servants right now. How do you think, what do you think would be most helpful? I will go through every line I will go through ... Ideally I'd like questions.

Speaker 2: Some of the most salient points of the bylaws changes that directly affect faculty senate are what we can go through now.

Tyler Sylvestri: Okay, the biggest one is absolutely going to be the specified procedures in the emergency meetings. I think that that was such a big deal coming out of the end of last year and I think that's absolutely what we did. In my opinion these are the key things, we changed term limits for balance of academic governance. Rather than three, two year terms, we want people to have more time and really get to know their committees to go to their committees. We didn't change the overall six year term limit, but we switched it, so now it's two, three year terms is what we're proposing. One of my personal biggest gripes is that the students ... rarely are students on the standing committees over and over, the same ones because of the nature of being students and so we sought to sort of alleviate the analog and the faculty by growing it a little bit.

Tyler Sylvestri: The committee on administrative review, it would be not a standing committee but a university wide committee in the five points of the bylaw academic governance bylaws for the bylaws nerds. It would be eight faculty members chosen by faculty senate, to undergrads and one graduate student and they would essentially review the performance of administrators, the provost president and steering committee, and the chair of the ca, as we affectionately call it, would meet to sort of determine where that need is, what three administrators would be appropriate, and then that committee would sit down
and meet with folks with whom the administrator interacts. Are they doing their job, are they ... it's sort of two levels.

Tyler Sylvestri: On the one hand it's personal, is this person effective, do you feel empowered to make your voice heard and are the goals of the office being accomplished? Then there's a second level to it of just more broadly the office itself, which is, does this office makes sense, does its role in the hierarchy, makes sense, are we going toward good goals? That's the gist of it, they issue sort of a report and it's not binding on anybody, it's just sort of, hey, we've done the work, we've done the research, this is how we're understanding this person. Of course, all the regular mandatory reporting obligations were there and such but that's the gist of the car.

Laura Dilly: This Section on committee on administrator review is by far the longest stretch of a text changes to bylaws. Section 5.4 is where you can find the proposed language that would create and specify the procedures and responsibilities of this committee,

Deborah Moriart: Not to interrupt, but to interrupt, something before that which I think is rather significant. 3.4.2.11 that says the chairperson and the vice chairperson of the steering committee shall represent the Faculty to the board of trustees in the event that urgent action is anticipated by the board and that there is inadequate time for calling a formal meeting of the faculty senate. I think that is a very big problem. As the vice chair of the steering committee, we have had many, and I think everybody here recognizes this, we have had many, many, many instances where the board of trustees does things in the summertime and it's a question of who considers this urgent and who doesn't consider this urgent.

Deborah Moriart: If the board of trustees decides it's urgent and then you can simply talk to one or two people, I don't think that that is a very good idea at all. I think the board of trustees should be something that is much more representative of the faculty senate. I mean perhaps it's all the at large members who then consult and then see whether or not it's something that needs to go to faculty senate but if it truly is an urgent matter, my guess is it needs to go to faculty senate. I can't imagine an urgent matter that would be ... I mean, for me, urgent is life or death. So maybe I'm ... dismissal for cause is what happened. I just think that this is a very big problem.

Speaker 2: Comments by Professor Moriarty.

Laura Mccabe: I'd like to follow and say that that's appropriate. That I completely agree-

Speaker 2: Identify yourself.

Laura Mccabe: Laura Mccabe, college of Osteopathic medicine. I think we talked about that but somehow we there's no checks and balances in that statement and it slipped
through and so I really don't think that we want that. The chair or vice chair needs to have a balance and shouldn't be the voice of this so I totally agree.

Laura Dilly: Very good.

Jennifer Johnson: Jennifer Johnson, college of human medicine. Also, just to make communication clear, we've asked the board, the at large members have asked the board if they need to communicate with all five of us. That's something that we've asked them to do just so that it's because we didn't have had a couple of instances where like, oh, I talked to so and so who said it was fine and that's not really a governance process. So I don't know-

Tyler Sylvestri: That's us being the at large members.

Jennifer Johnson: Yeah, or more even, but at least we've asked them to communicate with the five of us together, I think.

Tyler Sylvestri: Excellent. Were there questions about the committee administrative review? I think that's going to be a key thing. Does anyone have ... Okay, we'll come back to it of course later. But the other one is, this is sort of a broad theme I can't point to any one particular one, but the hope is that faculty would have more sort of autonomy in their affairs and insulating them from excessive administrator influence so that their opinions are theirs and it's clearly marked what are faculty opinions, what are administrative opinions. That's sort of a broad theme throughout I think you go through many of them and that's what you'll find. At the bylaws the board trustees, there's one in particular, so as the bylaws of the board of trustees stand, the faculty are supposed to ... if they want to talk to the trustees, it's supposed to be through the president.

Tyler Sylvestri: We identified this as sort of a really big barrier to communication and what we did was amend it so that faculty could absolutely contact the trustees and I wouldn't violate the bylaws, but they would have to cc the president, essentially send a copy with any written communication which I think is a big improvement from where it stands now. Then of course the setting sanders for president searches we talked about, it would create an annual orientation for the trustees with the steering committee so that they are sort of briefed on academic governance, shared governance, what their role in that process is and what the faculty's role in that process is.

Tyler Sylvestri: We got a little bit of a criticism saying an annual orientation and this is incorrect because it's biannual elections, but of course their appointments and frankly if they meet unnecessarily, I think that's better than the status quo if that happens every, every year. Then we discouraged the board from acting on items not on the agenda, right now it just says they can and we added it to say that should not be the norm, it should be sort of only in the most urgent situations when that happens. Those are in my estimation the key points, is there question?
Andona Bochura: Andona Bochura, James Madison College. I'm never going to for-get my name, ever. Okay, I might forget other things by not my name. I'm back to the big points here, so I mean, I have specific wording for various things that ... I mean, you might want to consider, you might not, I can happily send it over to you or not very happily, but first, I mean, so first of all I want to thank you all for all this work. I really do and I think there's some really important stuff here. I'm still a bit unclear about whether or not the procedure for emergency meeting is cumbersome. Like I can't yet quite figured it out, but I want to thank you for all the work you've done and I think the cards and just specifying the procedure for the emergency meetings is really great and there's other really good stuff in here.

Andona Bochura: I just want to bring up some specific aspects of concern and I can provide feedback and praise you later. I think that the BOT bylaw requests that we see here can pose a problem. I quickly want to say why, the committee was not charged with focusing on this because the committee was charged with having the flexibility to address these. But in my understanding since the committee was not charged to focus on these, therefore not a lot of attention was spent on them. Having said that, at the same time the changes are very small so we're in between a rock and a hard place here because having these really minimal changes that we propose to the BOT in term of bylaws, I mean they can only change their old bylaws, but that could really distract from some issues that we have of substance with them.

Andona Bochura: They might say, okay, whatever, we'll include language about cooperative, but that doesn't help us specify anything in terms of the presidential search or we'll let members of the steering committee come to our subcommittee meetings but that doesn't move us forward in terms of shared governance. If they reject our BOT bylaw proposal that we endorsed, we want to ask them for more than this even if it's less than that, you know what I mean? So I think that these BOT bylaws request, they really need more work and I just don't want them to be used in their minimal form as a way of saying not that they, you know, oh, this is done, we've resolved the issue of shared governance. I just want to put that out there.

Laura Dilly: I really want to thank you for offering up that perspective and I would like to clarify that within the committee there was some uncertainty or ambiguity about the extent to which the charge was to and be encompassing of board of trustees bylaws as opposed to strictly university bylaws. The charge from UCEG was somewhat unclear or ambiguous relative to how much people should focus in the summer effort on board of trustees bylaws. That did necessarily limit the attention span or the ability to focus uniquely our time on those bylaws so it would be within the scope of input going forward to consider the extent to which the board of trustees proposed bylaws changes are enough or sufficient to pass that threshold that they're even put forward.
Andona Bochura: My suggestion would be that we decouple them for this unless the ones that are absolutely necessary that we make in order to implement what you've asked for and that we continue to work on those, and my additional suggestion would be in terms of the presidential description, perhaps you can consider adding the specific language that we've endorsed that will bring us closer to shared governance. So those are two specific suggestions and you whatever, you know, I just want to put them out there. Thank you.

Laura Dilly: Just real quick and is very much the thought that we are decoupling the university bylaws proposed changes from the board of trustees bylaws proposed changes and the dynamics with which those two separate documents are subject to consideration is expected to similarly be decoupled as they advance through governance.

Tyler Sylvestri: So those are the key points, we also had a note from steering about the 25% administrative appointment, a lot of playing that as well to at large members. That was brought up at the steering and that is a note that UCEG is taking and will be considering. Otherwise, that's the key stuff. If there's still questions, we'd love to take them, otherwise I think we'll stop talking about bylaws.

Jennifer Johnso: Jennifer Johnson, college of human medicine. This is a bigger picture question, as a newly elected faculty senator this year, I have been working to learn the rules and how things are done and there's a decent amount of turnover among faculty senators and so to some extent it feels like many of us are trying to figure out how things are done. One of the thoughts that I've had that we've talked about a little bit is something much less formal than bylaws, but almost ... I think of it like in one of my studies, manual of operating procedures, how you buy something, how you get new keys, how you do things or informally academic governance for dummies you know how does, when the board of trustees wants to engage faculty senate, one, two, three, four, how did they do it? I guess I see that as nonbinding and a whole lot more if you're confused here's a quick primer. Do you see that as inconsistent with this potentially valuable, not potentially valuable?

Tyler Sylvestri: Absolutely, we very much consider it inconsistent with this. That was something that was specifically talked about during our ad hoc sessions. I would point firstly to the annual orientation with the trustees on academic governance questions so that'd be a big part of this. I know some of the trustees I think have displayed a shocking on name names, but it's shocking unfamiliarity with the process, that's why we have the annual orientation to talk about shared governance so that's part of it. Otherwise like you said, it's not a bylaw change, but we did very much talk with our secretary for academic governance over here about doing essentially just what you've described and that effort continues. It's very much not inconsistent.

Laura Dilly: Really appreciate the question and comment. I would hope that part of the discussion going forward from today's meeting would be how can procedures be
more generally communicated in a simple way that could assist with orientation, ultimately good operation practice for governance.

Andona Bochura: All right, great. A follow up, is that something you guys would want to spearhead or want us to spearhead or should we just talk later?

Tyler Sylvestri: We'll do whatever the steering committee tells us to do.

Andona Bochura: Well if you'll do work. All right, well we'll be in touch. Thanks.

Tyler Sylvestri: Okay, great. Anyone else?

Speaker 2: I'd like to give faculty senate round of applause for them for all their hard work. Thank you, we move to item eight on the ... first of all to clarify regarding the high risk travel office, the high risk travel procedures, there was a bit of a miscommunication with our office. Dean Hanson will come in the January meeting of faculty senate to present that. That got put on this agenda mistakenly so that's our error. Item eight, comments from the floor. You would like to come up, we have comments from the floor. Come on. No, it's got to be on the mic.

Angoelina Bouch: Angoelina Bouchera, James Madison College. Thank you very much for the document you sent about the University of Iowa best practices and I wanted to ask you when you, you know, talked about it briefly, like what have you noticed that we don't align with? I asked our representative on the search committee, I'm surprised she didn't see the document, it wasn't sent to them because I know you sent it to the BOT. I've looked at it too, but I'm just, you know ...

Speaker 2: I can send that to any fact ... I'll send it to the whole faculty Senate on request so I can do that so everybody sees it. It was a document that the University of Iowa came up with as part of the remedy for getting themselves off of sanctions. One of the key things that Gary and I noticed was basically the sanction large part was put on due to lack of transparency during the presidential search and the fact that the board could stack the slate of finalists with their preferred candidates and then vote on a preferred candidate. That's something I think our board was headed straight, long into and almost would be inviting sanctions on Michigan State University, which is the last thing we need.

Speaker 2: I think that is part of what has given the board pause and is causing them to deeply deliberate as to whether they should adopt the faculty senate proposal about serving as just ex-officio members of the search committee until the very end of the process where the constitution of the state says they have the final authority. I think we'll be hearing back soon on this matter, but I think it has given the board pause and they are deliberating on this point very seriously.

Gary Hoppinstan: If I could add to Rob's point, this is Gary Hoppinstan, the secretary for academic governance, the final issue with University of Iowa and the selection of the president was the four candidates were put forward, three were recommended,
one was not recommended. Three were from academic positions, the fourth that was not recommended was from a business position and it was the fourth candidate that was selected. The thinking was that the board of trustee participation on the search committee perhaps unduly influenced the final selection of the candidate.

Angoelina Bouch: Could I just add, from looking at the documents, I noticed two other things, which is how community input was not taking into consideration after community members were thought about, were asked about what they thought about the candidates, the top candidates. Then it's not that the people weren't given the opportunity to have the key feedback, but the issue was it wasn't taken into consideration, so this is your beard and also the chair and the co-chair of the ... I mean the chair should be faculty of the Presidential Search Committee. That was an issue if I remember, thank you.

Speaker 2: So Gary could I ask your office to send that best practices document to all the faculty senate?

Gary Hoppinstan: Yes, we can.

Speaker 2: Thank you. Okay, do we have any other further comments from the floor?

Speaker 27: We were asked to visit the various college advisory committees throughout the year and I visited one this week that asked me what is the procedure by which faculty, senators communicate with their faculty members in the college, how do they give information to the faculty members in the college, how do they bring information and concerns back and raise issues from the faculty in their colleges, and I said, I don't know. And they said we don't know who our faculty senators are and I said I can look it up on the website.

Speaker 27: I think maybe there are colleges that have figured this out and have a good system, but I guess I just wanted to put it out there to invite the faculty, senators, maybe huddle within your college and figure out how it makes sense to bring back the information you have to the faculty members in your college. And how it makes sense to get concerns from them and bring them back to us. They can do that online. We have a website, you can email us, we can put them on the agenda for the steering committee. There's lots of ways to get them back up but um, if there are good models for this I am ... In a couple of colleges I know I don't know what they are. So if you have them please share them and if you don't maybe create them and let us know. Does that make sense? Because it ... we really do want it to be representative and if there is a good somewhere elucidated about how to do that, I don't know where it is. Thank you.

Robert Ofoli: Robert Ofoli, College of Engineering. This is something that I've also thought about because I'm not quite sure how to handle information back to my college. I was actually going to ask you, Gary, the minutes of our meetings, can those be distributed to faculty or are those documents limited to just our committee?
Gary Hoppinstan: No, no, the benefits or are open to the public. We do post them on our website and anyone can have full access to them.

Robert Ofoli: Okay, thank you.

Speaker 2: Further comments from the floor, yes.

Joe Slade: Hi, Joe Slade, College of Osteopathic Medicine. I'm interested if anyone has any information on the healing assistance fund. I've heard nothing in terms of administrative feedback, but I've heard from others that are very concerned and I'm very concerned. I haven't received any answers except this kind of thing, taking notes, so if anyone in this body has information I would love to hear it.

Speaker 2: We can address this, the at large members of the steering committee meet regularly with the president and provost so we could put that are on our agenda for the next meeting and get some answers. Do we have any other further comments from the floor? Then do we have a motion to adjourn? Any second?

Deborah Moriart: Second.

Speaker 2: All in favor, please say aye.

Audience: Aye.

Speaker 2: Thank you. Please remember to return your clickers, we didn't have any controversial votes so we didn't really need them today. Thank you.