

FACULTY SENATE SPECIAL MEETING 17 May 2016

>> Chancellor: I am told we have a quorum so I'm calling the meeting to order. We're going to lock those doors because if anyone leaves we lose the quorum. For what it's worth, however, I have about 80 people coming in my house at 5 o'clock so I'm really motivated to move this meeting as we go through it. So there are no memorial resolutions since this is a special meeting and we had those resolutions two weeks ago. I have a few things that I want to say just quickly about some things that have been happening on campus before the semester ended and that we all ought to be involved in in one form or another. I do want to thank everyone for coming today and for accommodating this special meeting. I know that so that once the semester is over this is not your first choice of how you probably want to spend this hour but I appreciate and we do need to get through today's business. So, first let me just say a word about campus climate issues. As you all know, it's been a difficult semester, it's been a difficult year and our students of color on campus I think have been particularly frustrated and angry about some of the things that have been happening. There have been way too many hate and bias reports filed in this last semester, in my opinion, and it's made it clear that we have a bunch of work that we have to do. Let me simply go down the list of the things that we are working on and are going to be working on over the summer. The University Health Service is hiring additional counselors, growing our mental health services to meet the demand and to particularly assist students of color who might come seeking services. And there was-- They'd have-- That they're in the midst of interviewing and understand for some of those positions that they're closed. Secondly, we are piloting a community inclusiveness and diversity training module for all incoming students in the fall of 2016. This will be a pilot this first year. We're not going to start by mandating a new program to all students. What we are going to do is try to do a pilot in a way that we can develop it. It's mandated to a subset of students and then hopefully make parts of it available voluntarily to all other students and encourage them to take it as well. And on the basis of this, we will then put together something that will almost surely be more mandatory for all students in the following year. I, Lori Berquam, Michael Lehman are working with the group of students to consider options for a black cultural center. That's one of the requests that has come to us. We're looking at that. And I understand that the Dean of Students Office is also spending some time this summer looking at our reporting process on hate and bias reports [inaudible] I to refining that. As some of you know, I had put out a call for ideas across campus and was pleased to get 102 different proposals, some of these overlapped quite a bit. Everett Mitchell chaired a committee of faculty, students and staff that have looked to this proposal. They've done a really wonderful job in a very short period of time. They've given me their top 5 to 10, right. And we're going through those. None of these are fully implemented proposals, many of them are ideas that one would have to take and turn into an implementable proposal. So we're going to look through these, decide where we have obvious people who can take these and put them together into something that has a little more meat on the bones and, you know, and see what we can move forward and you'll be hearing back about this in the weeks to come. We will be posting all of the proposals publicly, people have asked that, and they are public documents. Many of these proposals involve training options for faculty and staff. And as you know the Faculty Senate passed a resolution on these two weeks ago. The provost is working with some of the faculty here on campus with expertise on this and wants to put together first of all the list of everything

on campus we're already doing with regard to faculty training because there are a number of schools, colleges that are regularly doing things in this area. And then what are the list of resources available so that by the beginning of the summer we can go to the deans and say, look, here are four or five programs that do slightly different things, operate in slightly different ways, but to the extent you want to encourage departments, small schools, the whole school, different units when you're in your group to participate in this over the next year. Here are the resources we have available on campus and information about them, how you'd access them. You know it's-- I said I think it's triple times in the past. There's no such thing as a one size fits all mandatory program that is-- would make any sense at all for this campus. So what you-- You know, different schools are going to want to look at different departments, are going to want to look at different things. But that we hopefully will have available by the end of the summer. There's also been a number of faculty suggested that they would like training and information about how do you deal with difficult classroom conversations when issues come up? And I'm very pleased that Dean Diana Hess and the School of Education are working on that question and are spending some time this summer producing some videos on that topic that hopefully faculty could use and I-- that might well be a resource that I hope a number of you in your departments will also want to try to promote and make available. And then let me note that Patrick Sims' office continues to move forward with some of the initiatives coming out of the diversity framework that have long been in process, including the campus climate survey this next fall. Now, that's a long list. I worry it's a little bit too long a list because there are only so many things you can do in a relatively short period of time. But it is, you know, this is something that I take very seriously and we are going to put some resources on this and see where we can make progress in some of those areas. So, that's a quick report on campus climate. Commencement, I know some of you were at commencement either Friday night with the graduate students and the PhDs or Saturday morning with everyone else. I hope some of you, even if you weren't there, might have watched Russell Wilson's speech. I thought he did a great job as a speaker. He was a very impressive young man. It is always fun to go through commencement, the best weekend of the year in my opinion, and it makes all the work for the rest of the year worthwhile. I was also very pleased on Friday night and thank you to the faculty committee that does this, to do honorary degrees for Governor Tommy Thompson, the biochemist Phil Ruder [assumed spelling], and the photojournalist Lynsey Addario. And those of you who weren't there on Friday night should go online and we have-- we'll have this available at you. Somebody is going to tell people how to access it. Tommy Thompson gave quite a speech of support for faculty and the university. One might say he was talking directly to some other people around the state and he has given us permission to use that speech in full or in part in places where we might and it's-- You'd enjoy watching it. I-- and I-- You know, John, I don't know, where would people find that if they don't want to watch through the whole ceremony and just want to see that speech. You'll send it to Steve and you can send it out, OK. Finally, that brings me to issues of the affairs of state between higher education and our state leadership and state government. A recent [inaudible] article detailed the relationship between the state and the university during Governor Thompson's era and really described the ways in which the university and the state works in partnership. And I know there were tensions in those years. I know Tommy Thompson wasn't everyone's favorite governor, including a lot of people around here, but there really was consultation and conversation back and forth on the budget and in a whole bunch of other issues. There were a lot of buildings that were built during that period and some real support for the research here on campus. That type of a positive and productive relationship is incredibly important. It's important for the university and I would say it's very important for the state. The current relationship is not as healthy in

my opinion and, you know, the [inaudible] confidence votes have obviously raised the ire of some legislators, the response by the governor in-- is recent press release I thought was neither healthy nor productive and it makes me really worried going into this budget round about how we maintain a civil and a useful conversation. Let me say clearly that we are a world class university with world class faculty and you are among the most important employees the state has regardless of what anyone else might say. Keeping this university on the cutting edge of education and research is the most important thing we can do for the state. And making sure that we communicate that is deeply important.

[Applause]

All of that said, we desperately need the state support for this university to do what it needs to do, not just to avoid budget cuts but to grow strategically to invest in areas that we all can name the need investment around this. I, you know, suspect no one here needs to be reminded of what it is we bring to this state but I'll remind anyway, \$15 billion in economic impact annually, research funding of more than a billion among the top five organizations in the country in terms of research dollars spent per year. We've been there for almost 40 years, awarding more degrees at this point than anytime in our history. We have freshmen retention rates of nearly 96%, [inaudible] graduation rates at 85% and debt repayment defaults that are below 1%. We are a very healthy and effective organization and don't believe all that stuff people tell you about how terrible it is for students out there, not our students. Average time degree is 4.13 years, the lowest since we started to measure it in 1980. With dueling press releases, with dueling op-eds, we are engaged in precisely the wrong conversation in the state. This is dangerous should this continue. So, many of you have asked how you can help be involved in telling our story and participating and what moves forward and you know, we will be reaching out to you in the next several months. You know, I could imagine for instance those of our faculty who grew up in Wisconsin, still have relatives and connections, particularly if it's outside of the Dayton County area. We might ask some of you to go talk at a rotary in your hometown or, you know, go back and write an op-ed or, you know, be part of that conversation. I think we'll want to identify people both because of the outreach work they're doing or their own family personal history who might be particularly effective as members of our faculty going out and talking to people in the state and communicating with them about some of the things we want them to hear. But we are working hard on putting together a whole strategy. We've already started some of that. I've been out there, some others have been out there and we need to change the conversation to one that is about to feature the state and not about sniping at each other. So let's hope that we can move forward from where we are right now and watch this space. I am-- We just can't afford to go into this next budget year with quite the same feelings we're in the midst of right now. So, that is my report. And it's summer time, the semester is over. Hopefully everyone will go off, take a vacation some time over the summer, take a deep breath and come back in the fall ready to go to go back to work. I know you're all working over the summer, but to go back to the normal semester type work that takes place. Is there anything that UC wants to say?

>> I have no announcements.

>> Chancellor: Are there any questions, issues that people want to raise before we move on to the next item.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: One brief comment. Noah Weeth Feinstein, Community and Environmental Sociology. And this is something to be aware of and I say this to everyone around-- everyone in this room and to the UC and the chancellor as well. The climate issues have placed a particular burden upon our faculty of color and many of the aspects of that burden are very difficult to measure but they include not only direct attacks on their time and energy personally, but as well the work that they do, much of it invisible in supporting our students, faculty and staff. I speak on behalf of our pre-tenure faculty of color in particular. And the way that the system works, if you feel like you're under undue strain and you wish to ask for an extension of your tenure clock, you have to make that request. And that is an uncomfortable position to put untenured faculty in when they feel like it may be difficult for them to demonstrate exactly what it is that they are doing, to bear this load for our campus. So I would request for those in various positions of authority and their departments and the administration to find ways of communicating to those untenured faculty members, faculty members of color that their work is appreciated and that that appreciation can be measured in part with consideration for the impacts on their tenure clock.

>> Chancellor: Thank you, I appreciate that. And it's on my list to talk about that and some other closely related things. The department chairs will meet pretty soon right at the beginning of the semester in the fall and I think that's very appropriate topic to be on the agenda for that. Are there other comments or questions?

>> Mark Etzel: I'm Mark Etzel [inaudible] District 11. So, I have a question for you. I heard the governor talk on a TV-- a radio talk show the other day about how they-- he was going to fight for further tuition freezes in the future. And I think that if I think about last year at this time when Dave [inaudible] got up at that summer meeting, we had talked about how [inaudible] for university is this going to play out. And here we are a year later and basically all the bad things that we feared might happen have happened. And so, I'm going to fast forward to next year and we have further tuition freezes and another \$250 million budget cut. How do you think that's going to impact the university?

>> Chancellor: Well, I couldn't say that I think there is very strong belief that the system in particular cannot take another budget cut this year. I hear that from, I promise you, the regents and the leadership in the system. I hear that from our business friends, and I do hear that from some legislators as well. So I can't tell you what's going to happen over this next year. I do believe the governors likely have asked for another tuition freeze. But I think we are really going to have to fight for some additional funding that, you know, we need around this university and other universities. And we'll have to see how that plays out. If there's no one else moving to the microphone, I'm going to move on. I'm going to recognize Sherry Boeger. Is she here? Of the Employee Assistance Office, who's going to submit for informational purposes only the reports of the Ombuds and Employee Assistance offices. There's no vote required here. Thank you Sherry.

>> Sherry Boeger: Thank you, Chancellor Blank. Good afternoon. I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here. You have in your materials faculties document 2620, the annual reports of both the Ombuds and the Employee Assistance Office. With me today is Dale Burke from the Ombuds Office and Charles LaTorre from the Employee Assistance Office. There will be opportunity afterwards for them to answer any questions you may have about either of our offices. I'm going to spend a few minutes going over the other document that you have in 2620, which is the difference between our two offices. The Ombuds Office and Employee Assistance Office met several times over the last few months and came up with a

document to identify what are the similarities between our offices, as well as the differences. And we identified four key difference between our offices. Those are around staffing, the audience or people that we serve, how cases are initiated, as well as how meetings are scheduled. So when it comes to staffing, the Ombuds Office is staffed with retired faculty, academic staff and university staff. Combined, they have over a hundred years of experience on our campus, being familiar with both policy, processes, and procedures. The Employee Assistance Office is staffed with clinical counselors and practitioners who have experience in both counseling, as well as organizational effectiveness and leadership coaching. The audience that we serve, for Ombuds they serve any employee who works for the university and this does include postdocs and graduate students. For the Employee Assistance Office, we serve that same population including postdocs and graduate students and all employees. In addition, because of the personal counseling we provide, we provide services to family members who reside in the employee's household. That would include spouses, significant others that reside in the household, as well as family members that reside in the household. Regarding how contact is initiated with the Ombuds Office, it's simply a phone call is made and an appointment can be schedule for a phone consultation and do our face to face meeting. Those meetings can take place at a place that is convenient to both the staff member, as well as the Ombuds. For the Employee Assistance Office, contact is made via phone or email, and for counseling, for the personal counseling that we provide the faculty and staff, that would take place at the Lowell Center where we are located at during business hours. And then the workplace consultation which we offer to both employees and people in leadership roles on difficult conversations or communication issues or concerns they have about the workplace, that can take place of the location where the person works on campus, at their unit or division. Lastly, as far as how the case is initiated, it's in the Ombuds Office the case is always-- This is not the last, there's two more things. Sorry about that. In the case of the Ombuds, it's always initiated by the employee contact with their offices initiated by the employee. In the case of the Employee Assistance Office, contact could be initiated by the employee, as well as employees can be referred by their supervisor, by their human resource contact or someone in the leadership role. These other referrals are made when in the course of working on performance or addressing issues with the employee they disclose some kind of personal concerns going on that would warrant that additional support. In the case of scheduling meetings-- I already covered the scheduling meetings, how those are schedule. I'd like to disclose with say the overall, both of our goals is to be a resource to all employees so that they can be healthy, productive and respectful members of our campus community. At this time, I would take any questions you have about either of our offices, as well as Dale and Charles would be happy to answer questions.

[Inaudible Remark]

Thank you for that. The question was how is confidentiality dealt with between the two offices and Dale, I'll speak to mine if you can speak yours. All contact with the Employee Assistance Office is confidential. We are counselors, so the exceptions to that are safety. If a person is at risk of harm to self or others, if other members or the person's work here are involved in a workplace interaction where there is two people in conflict or group in conflict, certainly they have signed written permission to communicate with others the specific information that is allowed. So, we don't release information without that permission. If a supervisor refers an employee, the employee signs something that says that we can release attendance only but no personal information. We don't keep any records that would be put in a person's personnel file. Dale, if you want to speak too.

>> Dale Burke: Yes, confidentiality is--

>> Sherry Boeger: Wait, you need to--

>> Chancellor: You got to move the mic.

>> Dale Burke: Confidentiality is paramount with the Ombuds as well. We do not either talk to anybody else or share information with anybody else without the permission of the visitor. We do, however, within the Ombuds team, we will talk about different visitor's issues, whatever, because we strategize among ourselves to try and come up with the best options and alternatives for that individual. We do not-- We cannot fix anything. We don't have the authority to fix things. What we try to do is help the individual find resources or come up with ways to fix things themselves. So it's about helping the individual visitor make things better for themselves and we try to provide the best information available in order for them to accomplish that. We do work very closely with employee assistance. Sometimes people that come to us first, we refer them to employee assistance. Likewise, employee assistance may refer people to us. It's, again, it's like what we all do here at the university, it's about connecting people with the right resources here on campus. We have a wide variety of resources on this campus. There are people waiting in a variety of places to help individuals. It's all a matter of getting them to the place that best suits their needs.

>> Chancellor: Are there other questions? Right. Thank you both very much. I appreciate you coming by. Let me recognize Assistant Professor Matthew Bakkom who will present for informational purposes the annual report of the Archives Committee.

>> Matthew Bakkom: So you have enclosed faculty document 2625, the 2014, 2016 University Archives Committee report. I'm submitting on behalf of Joseph Kemnitz. I think the document is before you, also detailed here. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them. Hearing none, I hereby submit the report.

>> Thank you.

>> Chancellor: Thank you very much. Thank you for your brevity. Let me recognize Professor Beth Meyerand who will submit for informational purposes the annual report of the university.

>> Beth Meyerand: So you have in your agenda materials the annual report of the University Committee for this year. The other members of the University Committee and I welcome any questions or comments you may have.

>> Chancellor: Are there any questions or comments on that report? Thank you, Beth. That was quick. [Inaudible] next page here. Let me recognize Professor Judith Burstyn who will present the results of this year's faculty elections. This is on pages 15-18. You may want to look at these.

>> Judith Burstyn: OK. We often have this on the screen. So I present to you the report of the elections to faculty committees for 2016-'17. The incoming members of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits are Amir Assadi from mathematics, Bruce Thomadsen from medical physics, and Jason Yackee from law for a second term. For the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, Steven Nadler from philosophy. There it is. His department was left off. Gloria Mari Beffa for math, and Pilar Ossorio from law. The Library Committee you can now read, Catherine Arnott Smith and Sarah Thal are our new incoming members for four years terms. The incoming members of the University Committee for three years terms, Rick Amasino and Barbara Bowers. Incoming on the Committee on

Committee, Ivy Corfis for a second term. The Divisional Executive Committee in Arts and Humanities, Florence [inaudible], Amaud Johnson, [inaudible] and Peter Vranas. For Biological Sciences, David Baum, Susan Thibeault, David Wassarman, and Jodie Waters [assumed spelling]. And for one year terms to fill in, Barbara Ingham and Lauren Ritters. The Physical Sciences Divisional Committee incoming members for three-year terms, Laura Albert Mclay from industrial systems engineering, Robert Anex, Julie Mitchell and Izabela Szlufarska. Social studies Marcy Carlson, sociology-- excuse me Jason Fletcher, Kristine Kwekkeboom and Lauren Peck [assumed spelling]. On the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee, representing all the four divisions, Christa Olson, Monica Turner, Parmesh Ramanathan, John Pfothenauer, and Stephanie Tai, and those are the elected faculty.

>> Chancellor: I would ask for comments and questions but the election is over, so this is who's there. Thank you very much to you, that I appreciate all of your work on this. Let me recognize Professor Parmesh Ramanathan who will submit for informational purposes the annual report of the Advisory Committee to the Office of Equity and Diversity.

>> Parmesh Ramanathan: Thank you. And as part of your material you have the report from the Advisory Committee for Office and Equity and Diversity for 2014 and '15 years of-- I'll just take 30 seconds to just summarize few activities that we are involved in. There is-- as most of you are aware that the campus is always under increasing mandates on both federal and state on various issues, right. For example, recently veterans-- staff veterans, those people with disabilities, we have to provide increasing report on how they progress through various stages of their career here. I mean, similarly, Obama administration had one on gender equities, so there we have to provide lot of statistics on gender pay and many of those data are not available on campus. How do we-- manually collected lot of these things constantly they come and most of you-- including one of these responsibilities falls to Office of Equity and Diversity and the campus is dealing with that in various ways and the Advisory Committee focuses on how we are addressing some of those issues, right? Including now we have the office of compliance. We've just been recently created for the campuses or deal with a variety of issues including some of these issues that are originally under the Office of Equity and Diversity. And similarly, there are many initiatives that this campus has to provide support for equity and diversity and this committee end up with how-- have various units come and report to us and how they are handling them. And finally, there are as you know many new initiatives on education, for example, sexual assault. Freshmen have new training programs that have been [inaudible] them and there was a large campus survey, not just this campus, across the country. On our campus we found that 25% of students reported that there was some unwanted sexual contact during their four years here. And the campus has started various initiatives to address those kind of things and this committee is monitoring progress on how those things are being deployed and they are being effective and so on. That I'll take any questions.

>> Chancellor: Thank you very much, Parmesh. Now is the time for-- we get to things that we get to vote on. Let me recognize Professor Beth Meyerand who will present a motion to incorporate the University Research Council into Faculty Policies and Procedures. OK.

>> Beth Meyerand: I move adoption of faculty document 2615. It's been revised to incorporate the University Research Council into FP and P and make other related changes. This revised proposal incorporates suggestion and input from senators and others based on the first reading that we had in March.

>> Chancellor: There's no motion-- no second needed? Is there discussion?

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: I would like to propose an amendment.

>> Chancellor: OK.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: And this amendment-- Actually, this is Noah Weeth Feinstein from Community Environmental Sociology. This amendment is actually being addressed on behalf of the Committee on Committees. And I believe there has been communication about this in advance but I'll read out the exact text. It's an amendment to 6.59A1B, here it is. You can all see it. That that clause would now read one faculty member appointed from each of the four divisions by the University Committee from a slate of nominees presented by the Committee on Committees. I don't believe I need a second to this from the committee, do I?

>> Chancellor: I think you do need a second.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: Do I need a second?

>> Chancellor: Yeah.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: Second.

>> Chancellor: OK.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: So may I now speak to the amendment?

>> Chancellor: Yes.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: So there were two relatively straightforward reasons for this amendment, one is practical and one is principles. The practical reason is that running nominations to the Committee on Committees will help avoid making multiple asks to busy people. The Committee on Committees is the nominating committee for the UC, in that role, we spend most of the year identifying great candidates from important shared governments committees. If we haven't asked you yet let me know and I'll make sure to get you on the committee as soon as possible. Candidates for the URC are likely to be on our lists for other important committees as well. Working to the Committee on Committees will help avoid frustration and redundancy on that support. The principled reason is that it seems more appropriate to use the Committee on Committees which generates faculty appointees and candidates for most of the most important shared governance committees than to allow that most powerful faculty committee on campus to directly appoint fully half of the faculty members of another very powerful shared governance committee without consultation. In practice, we recognize that the UC may need to exercise an extra bit of guidance based on its understanding of the vice chancellor's needs and agenda. The UC does and should work closely with the vice chancellor, and this is why we don't object to the UC appointing for people. But allowing the Committee on Committees to generate holistic nominees would provide one degree of necessary balance and consultation to this important process.

>> Chancellor: All right, we will have discussion on the amendment only, not on the larger motion. Tom.

>> Tom Broman: I hope you're [inaudible] end of semester. Tom Broman of University Committee. I want to actually propose an amendment to Noah's-- Noah's amendment, which would read with input from a slate of nominees presented this. So, the motion would be with input from-- There you go. The intention and just-- until you second and then I'll explain it.

>> Chancellor: I need a second to the amendment, OK. It's now amendment to the amendment, you all got that?

>> Tom Broman: Yes. OK, so let me explain. First of all, I think it is both a good idea for the reasons Noah explained for the Committee on Committees to prepare a slate of the sort he described, in my opinion anyway, I don't think this is necessarily universally shared. However, it should be recognize that this is a fairly significant departure from press-- past practice. And just to give you a couple of examples. Two other important committees such as the university APC and the athletic board are appointed directly by the University Committee. So, this would mark a fairly significant departure from existing practice in terms of major policy making committees. Now let me offer two other reasons why I think it would be useful. And by the way, the intent of this is to have a looser sense of how restrictive is the slate meant to be. That's the key question here. Let me offer two reasons why I think the slate should be looser. One is that it-- There is no specification of how large the slate would be and it would in that for that reason conceivably, although I doubt very much this would be the case, possible to have a slate that would give the UC no trace-- choice at all, that is if there were two positions and that the Committee on Committees produced a slate of two people, then it would simply be the Committee on Committees appointing the group. I-- as I said, I don't think that would happen and I speak as someone who has been on both the COC and the University Committee seemingly forever. The second reason is that for the reason that Noah explained that people drop out of the consideration for positions for one reason or another. And although I agree completely that we want to avoid duplication, I also think that the time dependence of getting these appointments done means that it would be advisable for the University Committee to have the freedom to choose someone not from the slate, and I think that, that freedom is both practical and important in part because the University Committee does regularly interact with the VCRGE and might have some knowledge of why a particular member for the URC would be useful. And then finally, I just want to point out that the-- There is a-- If you've been on either the COC or the University Committee, people drop out of consideration all the time. So it is not the case that this-- that any group of nominees presented by the Committee on Committees would be simply ignored, it's too hard to get people to do stuff to do that. So I can tell you that any slate that was prepared would certainly be a part of the consideration for the URC and would probably form a major part of it because the vetting done by the COC would in fact be taken seriously. But I think a somewhat less restrictive sense of it would be useful. Thanks.

>> Chancellor: Right. Comments on the amendment on the amendment?

>> Judith Burstyn: Judith Burstyn, District 48 and a member of the Committee on Committees. I would like to speak against the amendment to the amendment. In my opinion it is unnecessary to make that amendment. The slate of the nominees can be of an appropriate size by consultation of the University Committee with the Committee on Committees and we deal with the issue of nominating people to committees all the time and the Committee on Committees typically nominates candidates for election, in some cases makes appointments to committees, and in other cases such as this one, may make recommendations to the University Committee and I think that's perfectly reasonable and there is no need for these extra words with input.

>> Chancellor: I take that there's a response.

>> Tom Broman: Yes.

>> Chancellor: Identify yourself.

>> Tom Broman: The response might only be a syntactical--

>> Chancellor: Tom, Tom, identify yourself.

>> Tom Broman: Tom Broman of the University Committee. Sorry. God, I don't do this much. I-- That's the great thing about being up here, you mostly just listen. I think what we meant to say is-- and, Steve, forgive me for the confusion. I think the-- Let's see, for division by the University Committee-- Help me guys. Input from the Committee on Committees on the slate of nominees, right, with input from the Committee on Committees-- I don't like any of these formulations even. Input in the form of the slate of nominees presented. That's unless we-- That's a nonrestrictive sense?

>> Chancellor: Yeah. Yeah. This is not-- As it's written, it's nonrestrictive.

>> Tom Broman: Right, it doesn't, yeah.

>> Chancellor: You will get, you will get names from the Committee on Committees but then you may choose amongst those names or add another if you-- That's the way it's written.

>> Tom Broman: Right, right. That's the intent.

>> Chancellor: Well, I think it's fine as it is. All right, before Noah speaks again, is there anyone else who hasn't spoken who wishes to speak? All right, it's you.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: I promise I'll keep this brief.

>> Chancellor: Identify yourself, sorry.

>> Noah Weeth Feinstein: Noah Weeth Feinstein, Community and Environmental Sociology. There were two members of the University Committee who sit on the Committee on Committees. If there's anyone who they want on the slate, that person can be on the slate. The notion that a slate would advance from the Committee on Committees and then need to be added to or diverged from the University Committee strikes me as a little bit odd. The Committee on Committees has a lot of work and isn't really interested in generating a slate that could potentially not wind up with anyone on the URC. And so, I opposed this amendment to the amendment and ask for your consideration.

>> I want to speak on behalf of the amendment of the amendment.

>> Chancellor: Identify yourself.

>> Amos Ron: Amos Ron, District 52. We want to simplify methods for the University Committee's-- our executive arm. It is loaded with responsibilities and I don't want to see them being delayed because of some technical reasons. We want to give them the prerogative to make decisions per the circumstances. And to tie their hands by saying, look, there is a list in front of you and if things do not work, you need now to invest your time and to communicate here and to communicate here and to go here and to go there because you have so much time to spend on that issue because there are no, there are no other things on your agenda on-- I don't think it's beneficial. So we are advocating for the University Committee to make the choice from the people that are recommended by the Committee on the

Committee' but they are not making mandatory for them and we are leaving that to their discussion. And if we don't trust the people on the University Committees and we really don't have a function on the senate.

>> Chancellor: Is there anyone else who has a comment on the amendment to the amendment? Otherwise we are ready to vote. We're voting on the amendment to the amendment which is the words with input prior to from a slate of nominees. All right, everyone is clear? All those in favor of the amendment to the amendment signify by saying yes.

>> [Simultaneously] Yes.

>> Chancellor: All those opposed.

>> [Simultaneously] No.

>> Chancellor: I think we're going to have to call for a show of hands. Steve, you want to bring your minions out to count? All of those in favor of the amendment to the amendment please raise your hand and keep them raised. Keep them up until we got the count. Did you get the people at the front table? Yeah. All right, everyone opposed to the amendment on the amendment, raise your hand.

>> [Simultaneously] No.

>> Do you want to try counting again or to verify numbers?

[Inaudible Discussion]

I am going to call for another vote of hands just to make sure we've got the right numbers. In which [inaudible] OK, so you're sure about numbers. All right, this case the amendment to the amendment fails with a tie, so we are back to voting about whether you are limited to a slate of nominees presented by the Committee of Committees, that's the amendment. Without that amendment the UC will make the choice. Everyone's clear about what the amendment says and what we're voting on? So it's we're back to either it's the Committee on Committees or it's the UC. All right, the UC will be choosing from a slate. Yeah.

>> Dan Vimont: All right, [inaudible] Dan Vimont, Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences. I just-- can I ask for a clarification. The University Committee does have an opportunity to consult with the Committee on Committees if there's somebody they have in mind. Is that correct?

>> It happens a lot over the course of the year. Yes.

>> Beth Meyerand: Beth Meyerand. I'm a senator by way of the UC. I think now in the recent past, we've had a really good Committee on Committees that's been really--

>> Chancellor: I am told that we have redone the math and the math was wrong. It passed by one vote. It was by 10 votes, we were really wrong. Never mind, as they say. Are you sure of your math at this point? You have redone it. You've shown it to someone else.

[Inaudible Discussion]

All right. So we're back to the amended amendment which reads with input from the slate of nominees.

>> Wasn't it supposed to be with input in the form of, didn't that get changed? I'm sorry, that feels like not the-- not the thing that was-- OK.

>> Well, we did that.

>> Chancellor: Yeah, you can speak to this. All right, so everyone knows we're back to an amended amendment and we're voting on it in this form, OK, and we're now speaking for and against this amendment to the motion. So the motion now gives leeway to the UC to make a choice with the slate of nominees from the Committee on Committees in front of them.

>> Beth Meyerand: So I'm Beth Meyerand. I'm a senator by way of the UC. So, I'm in support of this amendment. As I was saying, I think now and in the recent past, we've had a really functional Committee on Committees that met, took the job seriously. But when I served on it years ago, it was very difficult to get people to serve on the Committee on Committees. We didn't meet very frequently, we almost never had a quorum, meetings were scheduled when one member of the University Committee couldn't make it because she was teaching. So it was problematic and I just wouldn't want any of these committee appointments to be help up waiting for the Committee on Committees to make a decision on who was going to be selected. So I think it's important that the UC have some leeway in order to get some of these nominations made.

>> Chancellor: So you are in favor of the amended-- the amendment in this form?

>> Beth Meyerand: Yeah.

>> Chancellor: All right. Judith, you are next.

>> Judith Burstyn: I would just like--

>> Chancellor: Identify--

>> Judith Burstyn: Identify yourself. Judith Burstyn, District 48 and member of Committee on Committees. I'd like to make a couple of points of clarification and I preferred the original amendment but will support this version. The-- there are members of the University Committee on the Committee on Committees. There are always members of the University Committee on the Committee on Committees, and they are welcome as all committee members to have input into the selection process of nominees. The Committee on Committees in terms of its function is the body that's responsible for coming up with the individuals who you elect every spring and if the Committee on Committees can't do its job, then there's larger issues than this particular committee.

>> Chancellor: All right. So if we're ready to vote on the amendment, the amendment then would have the UC making a choice with the use of the slate but if they can go outside that slate, the original-- if you're for that amendment, if you're against that amendment, you're going to have the UC making a choice without input from the Committee on Committees. Is that clear what the amendment is? All those in favor of the amendment indicate by saying aye.

>> [Simultaneously] Aye.

>> Chancellor: All those opposed? The amendment carries. We're now looking at the full proposal. Is there any further discussion on the full proposal itself? Seeing none, are you ready to vote on the full proposal? All those in favor of this change, the faculty policy and procedures, indicate by saying aye.

>> [Simultaneously] Aye.

>> Chancellor: All those opposed? Motion carries and it is passed with this amendment. Thank you all. I now recognize Professor Beth Meyerand again who's going to present a motion to create a shared governance budget committee as seen on page 22.

>> Beth Meyerand: I move adoption of faculty document 2616, revised, to create a shared governance budget committee in FPP and make other related changes to dissolve the Budget Planning and Analysis Joint Subcommittee. This revised proposal incorporates suggestions and input from senators and others based on last month's first reading.

>> Chancellor: Does not require a second. Is there a discussion of the Budget Committee and its proposal? Seeing none, if you are ready to vote. We require [inaudible] majority, all those in favor of the FPP changes to establish this Budget Committee indicate by saying aye.

>> [Simultaneously] Aye.

>> Chancellor: Any opposed? That passes. Let me again present, recognize Beth Meyerand who will present recommendations on the academic calendar. This is a first reading for discussion only, no vote.

>> Beth Meyerand: You have in your materials faculty document 2632, which consists of a summary of recent activity on the academic calendar, the report and recommendations of the ad hoc committee on the academic calendar, and proposed modifications to faculty legislation and the 2017 through 2021 academic calendar which will come up for a vote in the first Senate meeting in the fall. Along with the chair and some members of the ad hoc committee, I'm available for any questions you may have and I look forward to your comments.

>> Chancellor: Any discussion on these and I should note that if you've not had a chance to read this in depth, you may take it home and read it and send comments in to the UC between now and our next meeting in October.

>> Mark Etzel: Mark Etzel, District 11. So, I think this is a really horrible idea to do this. I can see it's driven by money but I think it's bad for the students, here is why-- And it's bad for the teachers. Here is why I think it's bad for the students. You're trying to reduce the number of days that they get taught. You're going to drop it from 70 to 72 days in the fall to 69 days or 70 to 73 days in the spring to 69 days. So the students get less, less days of instruction. You're also trying to drop three days off of the time period that I have to deliver grades. And so instead of having this Friday to get my grades then, grade all of the project reports and get all the grades made out, maybe I've got a class of 100, I have three days, I had to do it yesterday. Then you're also cutting one day out of the final exam period. So, all of us that had students that come in, that have two days, two exams in a day or three exams in a day, that makes it more often that that's going to happen, because the students have fewer days to have their final exams. And so, it's bad for the students, they get less days of instruction, they get-- their finals jammed into fewer days, and there's more students having two or three back to back exams on a single day. It's bad for teachers, because now I might change the way I teach my class because I have to get all those project reports graded and my grades in in three days. I don't have till Friday. So I might say, back with the project reports, I'm just going to have a multiple choice exam. And so, this is not good for the teachers, it's not good for the students. So, there's-- It's just there's money in it because now you can start to have teaching in the summer. So I think that's just a really bad idea.

>> Chancellor: I just want to be clear that this calendar does not differ substantially in terms of the time available for the summer from the previous calendar. So, I don't think that is an issue here. But I would [inaudible]-- if any of you-- I know that there was a long discussion about this, I've been told. So if any of you want to at least indicate why you said that you might want to go to a [inaudible], why it's in this form you-- whoever who is on this committee might want to go to the microphone. Yeah?

>> Laura Hernandez: Laura Hernandez from District 8. My biggest concern is for those of us who are heavy research employment but also teach full classes in both the fall and the spring semester which I do, so that's selfish, I'm going to say but the time cut between semesters, if there's not enough time to be doing these things, it really-- at least as far as the grades and such go, it makes it difficult to turn it around and like completely start over. So that was some of the things that were kind of disseminated when I briefly heard about it. Maybe I'm incorrect looking at the math but that--

>> Chancellor: Yeah. I don't believe there's any difference in time between the two semesters over the winter break.

>> Laura Hernandez: OK. Because that was something that was mentioned to us at a meeting. And so, it was a concern for someone who's trying to turn your grades around on December 23rd and then coming back on a shorter time scale, and all the things that mentioned before as far as doing innovative teaching things and how you do that and maybe report things, so--

>> Steve Smith: I hesitate to get up here and talk about numbers. Steve Smith, secretary of the faculty and chair of the Advisory Committee on the calendar. And I don't know how to carry a one when I'm counting votes, so. The-- this proposal actually returns winter break to the way almost the way it was. In October when you changed the calendar, you actually shortened the winter break. So that the between semesters part would actually go back to almost the way it was. The shortening of final exam period has already happened. We made a decision, a decision was made. It came from on high to not have exams on commencement day. So commencement day was removed from the exam schedule. So this would just officially implement that. Grade delivery is an issue. This would shorten it from 144 hours, which is the significant outlier compared to our peers. Technically the rule right now is 144 hours from your exam. It's only enforced from the last exam. The proposal is to change it to 72 hours from the last exam. So, the only people who would really be affected by this change are those getting exams in the last couple of days and there are provisions for exceptions, exemptions, extensions. The reduction in number of days, I don't know if the provost or somebody from APIR would like to talk about it. We are also an outlier in terms of number of days of instruction. We're well over our accreditation needs and we're well ahead of many of our peers in terms of the number of days that we give classes.

>> Judith Burstyn: Judith Burstyn, District 48. I'd been trying to understand what the implications are for a department like mine which is teaching enormous numbers of students in very complex scheduled ways where our laboratories, we try to fit things in for many, many students with many different schedules in order to get them all in and I don't understand what the implications are from the documentation that you've given me.

>> Chancellor: So, this is clearly some-- One reason to have a first reading and why I think any of you with these concerns need to consult closely with committee members and see what you think the answer is to that and then make suggestions that's appropriate. Is there other discussion about these proposed changes? If not, there is no vote on this. We have one final item of business. Let me recognize

Professor Beth Meyerand who will present a revised Shared Governance Values statement on the last page of your document.

>> Beth Meyerand: So as the chancellor said, on the last page of your materials you have a modified version of the values statement on shared governance. It was approved by the Senate with amendments at the April meeting. This revised version incorporates amendments drafted by representatives of all four governance groups and approved by the academic staff assembly just last week. I move adoption of this revised version.

>> Chancellor: Beth, let me be clear since the Senate adopted a version of this last time. The main issue here is to merge all of the governance groups into a single system document that's why it's coming to them again.

>> Judith Burstyn: Yup, exactly.

>> Chancellor: OK. Is there a discussion of this document? It is quite similar to what you've already passed. Don't let that influence you, however. All right, are you ready to vote? All those in favor of the values statement as written indicate by saying aye.

>> [Simultaneously] Aye.

>> Chancellor: All those opposed? Seeing no other items on the agenda, we are adjourned. Thank you very much for coming today. Thank you for your service over this entire year.

>> Thank you.