

University Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

November 20, 2024

3:30pm Jepson Science Center

Members in Attendance: Davis Oldham (Chair), Kim Kinsley, Sayan Sarkar, Christy Irish, Jennifer Walker, Janine Davis, Kelly Swiney, April Wynn (Parliamentarian), Mindy Erchull, Melina Patterson (Vice Chair), Caitie Finlayson, Michael Benson, Jonathan Levin, Patricia Orozco, Karen Anewalt (Secretary)

Guests: Tim O'Donnell (Provost), Keith Mellinger (Dean CAS), Filiz Tabak (Dean COB), Pete Kelly (Dean COE), Nicole Crowder (Handbook Working Group), Chad Yoder (SGA Vice-Chair)

1. Before the meeting was called to order, two proxies were announced. Davis Oldham is serving as Mara Scanlon's proxy and Caitie Finlayson is serving as Elizabeth Johnson-Young's proxy.
2. Call to Order
3. Approval of previous meeting minutes.
 - a. Discussion: Davis Oldham noted that Caitie Finlayson's name was misspelled in two areas.
 - b. Motion to approve the minutes with that correction.
 - i. Unanimously approved.
4. Reports
 - a. President Paino submitted a written report.
 - b. Provost O'Donnell's Report: Admissions is ahead in all the categories that matter and that's good news for this time of year. As long as trends continue when we get into yield season, we should have a solid performance this year. There's no reason to believe at this point that FAFSA will be delayed. Last year the FAFSA delay likely cost us between 20-50 students who ultimately chose to go elsewhere. Admissions is going well, thanks to all that contributed this fall to our three open house events, which were well attended. Open House and Destination Days are still to come in the spring.

Just before lunch, I received notice from the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) that all of our departmental moves have now been approved. Those departments will be formally moved according to SCHEV at the beginning of the calendar year. For us, that transition will happen at the beginning of the academic year as we make progress both with our Faculty Handbook, but also with the way that many things are structured. There will be a lot of behind the scenes work that our colleagues in Human Resources, in Finance, and so on, will need to do in order to make that launch on August 16th.

Third, on Friday, although I was at the Board of Visitors (BOV) meeting, SCHEV held what it calls its IPAC meeting, its meeting of Chief Academic Officers or their designees. There are two important pieces of news that came out of this. The first is that SCHEV is changing its program approval process to make it far less onerous. The first change is that there will no longer be a “raise your hand and get shot down by your colleagues” opportunity, which was the “program announcement” phase. Second, instead of turning in materials on paper as we've had to do in the past, they're going to create a portal to receive program proposals. Finally, there will be one round of inspection by the SCHEV staff, that will provide feedback and then it will go off to council. This is a vast improvement and we should be able to move new programs through much more quickly. The second piece of news from SCHEV is that they are going to increase the rigor of the program productivity review process. Instead of doing it every five years, they will be looking at programs every year, especially those that perhaps aren't meeting what they've set as enrollment thresholds. They're going to change the focus of the review but they have not yet shared the measures or specific formulas at this time, only that they will be looking at the outcomes of academic programs in some way to determine their viability.

The next item that I have is the workload report. The University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC) suggested that we provide some guidance on workload or the way in which courses are scheduled. The Provost and Deans have collaboratively created a first draft and are soliciting feedback on that. The draft reflects a compilation of previous guidance documents along with a few updates to reflect developments. I know that we've gotten a lot of good feedback and if there's more things that you want to share, send those along to me or your dean and we'll be happy to continue to work on it. This is not something that will be “once and done.” This is an iterative process by which we try to provide some guidance to those that have the burden of trying to put together schedules and trying to judge between schedules and as well as to create a little bit of equity between academic programs.

The next thing is that on Thursday and Friday the BOV met. They've introduced a new process whereby they have committee meetings on Thursday afternoons. Those meetings are divided between those interested in administration and finance and those interested in academic and student affairs. I attended the academic and student affairs group and they have a lot of interest in a whole variety of things including analysis of data. They're very curious about the climate survey, both results from the student survey as well as the employee survey. They're interested in the admitted student questionnaire, which is the information that we receive from students that apply and are accepted to Mary Washington but ultimately turn us down. And they're interested in exit survey information. They're interested in hearing more about the NSSE survey. So we're putting together a schedule of all of the various things that come in over the course of the calendar year and we'll share, as appropriate, those results with the BOV. In addition to these reports, they continue to emphasize that they're interested in learning more about are the cost of our academic programs and to have conversations about

what it costs to educate a student from various perspectives (profits/losses, revenues/expenses, uses/sources). I did a brief presentation on the Delaware Study, with the goal of helping them begin the conversation simply by looking at trend lines and looking at the overall cost of the program with the overall student credit hours produced. This is just a first attempt at trying to understand what's happening, but there's so much that goes into those data points that also needs to be understood before you can make informed decisions. Some programs are appropriately expensive. Some faculty generate fewer student credit hours than others for all the reasons that we understand. And so I think as we move through these conversations with the BOV, it will be important to have them have a grasp of the complexity that each academic program really confronts in the way that it serves students.

And then finally, I know that there's going to be some conversation about governance today. I just wanted to say thank you to all those that have really invested quite a bit in this sometimes contentious process. It is important for the future of the university and the president and I continue to hope that we will have a governance body where we can have really important, big conversations about our strategy going forward. And so I encourage you to keep working on this, to make as much progress as you can, because it's important. And I do understand that this is not necessarily easy. But you're all people of goodwill. And I know that you trust each other to do what is best for yourselves in the institution.

With that, I'm happy to take any questions.

- i. No questions.
- c. College Deans
- i. Dean Mellinger submitted a written report and had nothing to add.
 1. Question from Davis Oldham: Have the modifications to the two programs that you mentioned in your report made it through University Curriculum Committee?
 - a. Answer: Dean Mellinger and the relevant committee members present believe they are through the CAS Curriculum Committee but not UCC.
 - ii. Dean Tabak submitted a written report and had nothing to add.
 1. No questions.
 - iii. Dean Kelly submitted a written report and had nothing to add.
 1. No questions.
- d. Student Government Association (SGA) Representative's Report: Chad Yoder, SGA Vice President, filled in for Will Thompson, SGA President. He shared a few items that students have raised concerns with over recent months.

There have been questions about advising and SGA will continue to survey students on what specifics they're looking for related to advising. A lot of students continue to bring up advising as a concern at UMW, just different things such as

questions, the knowledge that their advisors have, and how quickly students are able to get those advising meetings and information. Chad shared his perspective: I know around registration, there are a lot of students that need answers quickly. I know there's a lot of professors that have a lot of students. But just wanted to let you know that this is always a stressful time for students.

Another concern that SGA shared with the Provost and Deans is the way that Jepson classes are scheduled. A lot of students feel that the science classes in Jepson are very morning-heavy which leads to lots of conflicts with other courses. Students have expressed interest in having more diverse time options. SGA knows that Monroe being repaired has not helped with trying to find spaces and trying to find that diversity of sections, but that's something that the students have voiced and has been really centered on science courses in Jepson.

And then lastly, a question for the committees of the UFC. SGA would like to know if there are any committees that don't have student reps on them yet. If there are committees that don't have student representatives, there are students interested in serving.

Are there questions?

- i. UFC members asked who the chair of UFOC is. Davis Oldham said he has access to the committee roster and will connect the UFOC chair with SGA.
- e. USC Committee Report: No report.
- f. UFC Chair Report: Davis Oldham shared a written report and added comments about his attendance at the most recent BOV meeting.

The BOV is very interested in the academic side of things and I think it will be important going forward have conversations about metrics, like those in the Delaware and also highlighting that when we have these metrics, they aren't always capable of telling the full story. The BOV comes at things from a very business perspective, so they see efficiency as the goal of each academic program. And that's not always necessarily the metric that we look at, but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't completely discount it.

Any questions on my report? Any other questions about the board meeting?

- i. No questions.
- g. UFC Vice-Chair's Report: No report.
- h. Faculty Senate of Virginia Report: Patricia Orozco reported that the Virginia Higher Education Advocacy Day has been set for January 9, 2025. They have not decided on the issues yet, but they will let us know. At the most recent meeting they brought to our attention the news of the President of NOVA receiving a no

confidence vote from that faculty. They also discussed the meaning of shared governance and there is a plan of organizing a webinar to better understand what shared governance means across institutions in the state.

- i. Davis Oldham shared that Virginia Higher Education Advocacy Day is often not well attended and that it's important to have representatives from UMW there, so if you can participate that would be great.

5. University Committee Minutes and Action Items

- a. Committee Minutes: Davis Oldham shared that some of the committees do have action items that we will address later in the meeting. Are there comments on committee minutes?
 - i. Davis Oldham asked if anyone from UFAC was present. He said they're still working on developing some models for the promotion and tenure process and he has some questions about that but understands that they've met since the agenda went out, so things may have changed. He is interested in whether they are leaning toward a single university-level P&T or more of a department-level model or an individual college-level model.
 1. Christy Irish says that she has a text from Melissa Wells about the UFAC meeting that she can share. Melissa said that they did have a motion that they voted on yesterday that they'll be able to discuss at the January UFC meeting.
 - ii. Motion: to approve all committee minutes
 1. Unanimously approved.
- b. Committee Action Items
 - i. University Curriculum Committee submitted new course proposals, program changes, and new programs.
 1. Motion: to approve the all new course proposals, program change proposals, and new program proposals.
 - a. Unanimously approved.
 - ii. University General Education Committee submitted courses for new general education designations and a transfer credit re-evaluation approval.
 1. Motion: to approve all General Education items.
 - a. Unanimously approved.
 - iii. First Year Seminar Committee submitted adding a variety of new FSEM topics and adding instructors to the existing Thriving in College FSEM.
 1. Motion: to approve all First Year Seminar Committee items.
 - a. Unanimously approved.
 - iv. Honors Program Committee submitted new Honors Program proposals.
 1. Motion: to approve all Honors Program Committee items.
 - a. Unanimously approved.
 - v. Writing Intensive Committee submitted a request for a retroactive approval for two students in a PHYS course.
 1. Davis Olham on behalf of Mara Scanlon stated that the rationale justifying this exception was lacking in this request.

2. Motion: to approve all Writing Intensive Committee items.
 - a. Unanimously approved.
- vi. Digital Intensive Committee submitted new Digital Intensive course designations.
 1. Motion: to approve all Digital Intensive items.
 - a. Unanimously approved.

6. New Business

- a. “Round 1” Changes to the Handbook: Davis Oldham reminded everyone that we have two documents from the Handbook Committee. The first is report from the Handbook Committee and the second is the full Faculty Handbook. And we have a third document that is a list of all comments submitted by faculty in the recent survey. Approving the changes that were made by the Handbook Committee wouldn’t prevent us from discussing the additional items and comments that were submitted by faculty through the recent survey. Davis invited Nicole Crowder from the Handbook Committee to talk about the feedback from faculty.
 - i. Nicole Crowder walked through each item suggested by faculty with the following responses and discussion.
 1. Nicole Crowder: The Handbook Group did not yet update the Table of Contents at all. There is actually extensive work that needs to be done on the Table of Contents to align with all of the changes and the reordering in some of the sections. The Table of Contents will be updated.
 2. Nicole Crowder: We will make sure that any gendered language is removed in the Table of Contents as well.
 3. Nicole Crowder: We can fix the typo. There’s only one in the entire revised Handbook and that’s impressive.
 4. Nicole Crowder: In section 1.7.2, the Honor’s Program Director has been reporting to the Provost, and we will add that to the list of direct reports to the Provost.
 - a. April Wynn: The Handbook includes full-time administrator reports to the Provost, but not special assignments. If we are including the Honor’s Program Director, should other special assignments be included as well?
 - i. UFC member consensus was to only include full-time administrator reports to the Provost and not to include special assignments.
 5. Nicole Crowder: Section 1.9.1 currently mentions School Directors, but should not have yet. There is an additional round of Handbook changes coming from the Handbook Committee that will reflect updates to the university structure. These have already been written in consultation with the Deans. The new language for Section 1 will need to include School Directors and that will come in the next phase of Handbook changes.

- a. April Wynn: So are we saying that the summer work by department chairs in things like first-year orientation, participation in Admission's and alumni events, and strategic planning work should also be removed from the current section 1.9.1 because it mentions that those items should be compensated and discussed with Deans and School Directors?
 - b. Nicole Crowder: I think that addition came from Dean Mellinger.
 - c. April Wynn: I think these are very important activities and it's fine if we want to say those are compensated through negotiation with the Dean but this is new and not in the current Handbook. Have we identified how we will be funding that compensation because I'd hate for any of these items to fall through the cracks.
 - d. Jonathan Levin: I think this language was added as part of Nicole's initial attempt at a 2.0. probably drawing on some ideas that we had talked about with the Deans or someone. But since those lines weren't there, I would suggest we just take those two lines out right now. And then as part of the conversation about the relationship between chairs, directors and summer work, we can sort that out as part of future changes.
 - e. Dean Mellinger: I don't think I wrote those two sentences. I don't doubt that it came from an email with ideas from me, but I don't think I wrote those specifically.
 - f. Mindy Erchull: So am I correct in my general understanding that really this round of Handbook changes is not about content substantive changes.
 - g. Nicole Crowder: Yes.
 - h. Mindy Erchull: In that case, I don't think the sentences about summer work should be there.
 - i. Jonathan Levin: I agree. We should not include those sentences in this phase of Handbook changes because the current Handbook ends after the phrase "calendar year."
 - j. Mindy Erchull: And similarly, any mention of "School Director" should be removed from the version that we're voting on.
 - k. Nicole Crowder: Yes, this sentence is the only place that the role of School Director is mentioned. And it should be removed.
6. Section 2.3.4 must be updated. The Handbook group intentionally did not make changes to this section so that a later revision could correctly reflect larger structural changes that would be made this year.

- a. Mindy Erchull: So do we need to make those changes now or do those come in the next round of Handbook changes?
 - b. Nicole Crowder: Now that the departments have been moved into different colleges, we are in violation of our Handbook unless we change this.
 - c. Jonathan Levin: But we need the governance piece to be resolved before we're in a position to make those changes, so we're not in a position to make the changes now.
 - d. Nicole Crowder: Because the vote about the faculty governance model failed at the previous UFC meeting, we cannot change this section at this time.
 - e. Mindy Erchull: So we can't alter this section right now.
 - f. Nicole Crowder: Correct.
 - g. Davis Oldham: I guess I'm not a little unclear about that because if the only thing that happened during all of this was that we changed section 2.3.4, then reality wouldn't look that different. It's only about the people that staff the faculty council. It doesn't assume any sort of changes about any sort of committee reporting structure. That's separate. Is that what you mean, Jonathan?
 - h. Jonathan Levin: Well, you're right about the committee reporting structure not being affected by this. But the way the description of the governing body is set up is based on the different areas and having representation from those areas. And now we're moving the pieces around, so I don't see how we can fix this section until we decide what the governing body is going to be and how representation is going to be.
 - i. Davis Oldham: Exactly. Okay, I see what you mean.
 - j. Nicole Crowder: So that's why we didn't change it. But it needs to be changed.
7. Nicole Crowder: For the next point, no, you can't. It's a state guideline. I don't know what happens if you exceed it.
8. Nicole Crowder: Special assignments, this is a fun point. When I was on a special assignment and I had to pick up a class, I got paid for that class. So I think that's just what happens.
- a. Provost O'Donnell: Right, generally, you would not want to but sometimes there isn't an option and you have to.
 - b. Nicole Crowder: So I don't know if that needs to be in the handbook.
 - c. Caitie Finlayson: Do other universities include this?
 - d. Provost O'Donnell: No one goes into the level of specificity that our Handbook does.
9. Nicole Crowder: Are we okay to go on to the 3.3.3.1? I think this does need to be cleaned up, but I don't think it has to be cleaned up today.

- a. Davis Oldham: Would you say that's true for both the eligibility for basically so 3.3.3.1 and the one below it?
 - b. Nicole Crowder: Yes.
10. Nicole Crowder: In section 3.8 we should strike the word “occasional” and wordsmith the resulting sentence. We can do that as long as everyone is okay with me doing that.
- a. Everyone agrees that Nicole can rework this sentence.
11. Nicole Crowder: My argument here is that we don't list out what all the possible special assignment positions are, so these don't need to be listed out either. But I think the bigger point with this comment is that you can apply for these positions without talking to your chair about them. So maybe in the call for these positions, it needs to be stated that you need to talk to your chair before you do apply.
- a. Davis Oldham: Right, so it's an issue of what happens if you have somebody that takes on one of those positions and isn't able to keep up with the workload in class and that has impacts on students. I can see a chair being concerned about that.
 - b. Caitie Finlayson: I think there are two sides. What if you wanted to apply for a position and your chair didn't support the decision?
 - c. Davis Oldham: Part of what is interesting about the Fellows is the Handbook language says there can be a stipend and/or course release. And the course release option obviously impacts scheduling. I would expect there to be some chair approval. But because there also a possibility that it doesn't involve departmental resources or departmental offerings, I can see the argument for not needing chair approval.
 - d. Mindy Erchull: I would not want to see a requirement of chair approval to apply for one of these roles because it should be an equal opportunity open to everyone who is at an appropriate role in the faculty, and it shouldn't be departments that can spare a person. Otherwise you are inherently disadvantaging some people who might be seeking paths into administration through these positions.
 - e. Nicole Crowder: The Handbook language doesn't say that you have to get approval from your chair, only that you're supposed to discuss it.
 - f. Mindy Erchull: Notify and discuss is fine.
12. Nicole Crowder: The language on 6.7 just says that the Provost will work with the UFC to develop a process, so I don't think that this language precludes that.
- a. Jonathan Levin: We decided to save this just in case merit pay becomes possible again.

- b. Provost O'Donnell: I think we're obligated by the state to have a provision for merit pay so it's important to include this.
- c. Nicole Crowder: We did move something from section 6 into section 3 because it was about salary. So that was just moving it to a more appropriate place because it didn't have anything to do with annual evaluations.

13. Nicole Crowder: And then the last point, I just missed it. So we'll fix that as well.

- ii. Davis Oldham: I think it's really important that we discuss all of these while remembering that some of these comments weren't in response to the proposed changes. So at this point I would make a last minute call for somebody to say they shouldn't have done "this", something that was referenced in the report that says what the Handbook Group proposed to do to section four and section five and so on and so forth because if nothing else arises then I would suggest approving as a block all of the Handbook changes that the committee put forth.
- iii. Motion: to approve all Handbook changes as a block with the friendly amendment of the deletion of the reference to the "School Director," fixing the gendered language, and fixing the various typos noted in this discussion.
 - 1. Unanimously approved.

- b. Faculty Governance Models: Davis Oldham shared that the three college governing bodies did not unanimously approve the changes to the Section 2.3.4. CAS did approve the model, almost unanimously, but COE and COB did not approve. And I do have from College of Education something to consider. But I think before we jump into that, it would be useful to hear from the representatives from COB and COE that voted no and specifically what was their college's issue with the proposal and how close are we to finding a working model.
 - i. Kim Kinsley: Is this on the agenda?
 - ii. Davis Oldham: No.
 - iii. Mindy Erchull: We can move from the floor.
 - iv. Motion: I move that we discuss the lack of consensus around governance models.
 - 1. Approved (Yes:12 No: 3 Abstain: 0)
 - v. Janine Davis: I'm not opposed to discussion, but could I request that we end the conversation when the meeting is scheduled to end because people often have to leave at that time, so it will not be fair if we keep talking.
 - vi. Davis Oldham: Yes.
 - vii. Alex Dunn: Can I also just point out that we in the College of Business asked if this could be on the agenda and so it would have been helpful to have known about this discussion while we were in our college meeting so that we could get feedback.
 - 1. Davis Oldham: I didn't put it on the agenda because if the model had passed, there wouldn't be anything for us to talk about and if

it didn't pass, we didn't have any other alternate model at the time that the agenda went out.

2. Alex Dunn: But then we could have just said, the motion passed and there's not much to talk about. But we would have had time to have a conversation about the points that we agree on while we were in our respective college meetings. We are now speaking from anecdotal information.
3. Jennifer Walker: To answer your original question about where are we, the consensus in College of Education is that we haven't had a chance to talk about it in this group. It's frequently the last thing on the agenda and often it is after 5:00. So as UFC, we have not had a lot of time to have dialogue. So we have a lot of questions. The entire College of Education had a lot of questions that we couldn't answer necessarily for our faculty in terms of what we had discussed in UFC. Not having that opportunity has really hindered our ability to continue to move forward.
4. Janine Davis: The minutes are good and I think you could go back and point to some of the comments we've made along the way with specific concerns. I'll just recall off the top of my head, concerns about the specific role of the governance group, which I think has kind of been discussed, but not really in specific terms. Other issues that are unclear are what happens with proxy if departments that are smaller cannot staff a representative position as they're being asked to do? I don't think we are far from agreeing on a model. I think Christy did a lot of work to brainstorm a possibility that I think we could get behind. It just has a little more detail. So I don't think COE is far. But I can't speak for business.
5. Mindy Erchull: Can you just explain what you mean by your first question?
6. Janine Davis: We had brought up that in the past when there was a faculty senate, all the business of the unit as a whole was done in that group. There was no separate CAS FC. And so there was the question about what the role of the CAS FC is if we adopt a new senate model. Is it replicated and what committees do what? And there were some comments stating that not much changed with the move from Senate to UFC. But other people say something did change and some people say things aren't working well now. Perhaps part of not working is because things were not clearly laid out before. So we want to fix it in a way that truly does fix it.
7. Caitie Finlayson: So are you willing to share how you see us being able to move forward or what either theory or model you would be in favor of?
8. Christy Irish: I'm willing to share what I have with the understanding from all of you that this is a first draft. I thought if

we brough something to the table then we could all talk about it rather than talking about changing back to UFC or back to a previous senate model.

9. Melina Patterson: There were three proposals put forward at the beginning of the semester.
10. Christy Irish: And we did push back on those. And what I'm passing out is not far from the model that CAS approved. This is a faculty senate model. And I'm happy to explain. The biggest change that this model only gives the School of Arts two representatives. I understand that that means that as a School, they would have to decide what departments those two come from. I guess we felt like they're small enough that two seems like an adequate number and that they could communicate. That then brings UFC to 20 members. We felt like if it was 20 members and we required a $2/3$ majority vote for things to pass, that would be 14 people. That would mean that CAS has 13 votes. Education, Nursing and Athletics has 3 votes, which could be decided within the College. Business, Economics, Computer Science, and Mathematics have 4 votes. So if $2/3$ majority were required to pass a motion, that would mean that at least one person from another college would have to agree with CAS to pass a motion.
11. Melina Patterson: And on what basis are these numbers distributed?
12. Christy Irish: Each of them is by School. In general, it is about 10 people per representative, except for the humanities, I will give you that they have about 50 people and they're only getting four representatives, but all of their departments are represented.
13. Melina Patterson: How did you decide that Nursing and Education are combined with two representatives and Athletics are separate and have one representative?
14. Christy Irish: Athletics has 15 people in it. Honestly, they directly report to the President. They should get their own vote. Nursing has three people in it. I put them with Education to give them the option of not sending a representative, but if they want their own representative and vote, we will give them that. I put them together just to really let the colleges decide where those votes come from.
15. Mindy Erchull: We organize under Robert's Rules of Order, which does not require a $2/3$ vote to pass most motions. There are only a few circumstances where $2/3$ majority is required. So this would require a wholesale change of not just our governance structure, but the parliamentary procedure under which we organize. And I'm not actually aware of a parliamentary system that requires a $2/3$ vote as the default.

16. Christy Irish: I'm just trying to get somewhere where all of the colleges may agree. And relative college representation in votes seems like a sticking point.
17. Caitie Finlayson: I appreciate the model and the work that's gone into it. I don't know that this is that far from the Senate model. And I wonder if it why there's a continued focus on colleges and college representation rather than just each department having a representative. And if COE or COE needs two representatives or needs an at large position, like we had discussed, I think many of us are open to that. But some of our departments were moved to schools where we did not support the move and were vocally against it. Some of us have been moved to colleges and we were vocally against that move. And so to me a bit frustrating and I've heard from others in CAS that are frustrated that again there's a continued focus on college representation rather than giving each department a seat.
18. Christy Irish: I guess when we look at it, we're not looking at it just as this is UFC, but we really want change across all of the systems to make it streamlined. So when we looked at this and we divided it up, we were looking at committees as well. And when we organized by school like this, then it kind of flowed down from there. Does that make sense? We're trying to look at this as a big picture. We don't feel like we can just go to the senate model. And then, honestly, if we look at all of the changes we've made so far, as you mentioned, they're teeny tiny. I think if we really want to fix things, then we kind of have to blow things up just a little bit more when we're rewriting the same book. I know everyone doesn't want to hear that. Curriculum's not working. P&T is maybe a mess. We have to rethink how we're doing all of it and not be so stuck on these little tiny changes. We have three colleges. We just feel like there should be some representation or balance among them. And so that's why we are stuck on that representation.
19. Caitie Finlayson: I appreciate those points I think my frustration with this and others I've talked to in CAS in particular is that COE has been vocal about concerns about service burden. And I think that we've all been very open to making changes and addressing those concerns and easing the service burden. And so my feelings frustration is that, CAS has come to the body repeatedly and said, look, this isn't working. This isn't how we're structured. We're structured, really how COB and COE are structured, as departments. And then we come to this body saying, look, we have this problem. We want everyone to have a seat at the table and it's hard to have that either not be understood or repeatedly shut down.

20. Christy Irish: But everybody has that in this model except for the School of Arts. So I'd kind of like their opinion on it.
21. Caitie Finlayson: But why can't they each have a representative?
22. Karen Anewalt: In a senate model, they can opt out if it's a problem.
23. Melina Patterson: And they're not complaining about their service burden so maybe it's not an issue for them.
24. Janine Davis: Well, we're not either, right now. We're all here. I mean, all three of us. We also don't have departments in the college.
25. Caitie Finlayson: But when we talked at the last UFC meeting, we talked about how COB and COE, while they're colleges, function as departments. So you meet as a body in a way that CAS as a whole does not.
26. Alex Dunn: And we've asked multiple times in UFC meetings why there are not meetings CAS meetings like what we have in the College of Business and the College of Education.
27. Melina Patterson: Because we have 200 faculty.
28. Alex Dunn: I know, but you all are saying, that we operate the same way as departments. So what is the missing piece then?
29. Caitie Finlayson: We have department meetings. So do you have a department meeting as COB and a separate college meeting, or do you just have one meeting?
30. Alex Dunn: We have one meeting right now. However, we voiced this in UFC meetings previously, that we have not had the chance to talk to the people who would be joining the College of Business about how that would look for the next step when we have multiple departments. Right now we only have one department and one meeting. And we've tried to get that question answered multiple times in these meetings about how we can talk to the people who would be joining us. But the moves were only just approved today. So we felt like it was premature to say that we agree to this model when we haven't had a chance to talk as the new college.
31. Melina Patterson: Karen is right there. She's an elected representative and can speak for them.
32. Christy Irish: But you guys have said in all of our meetings that you don't talk to everybody and might not know the opinion of everyone who you're elected to represent. If each representative here could really speak for everyone they represent, then this body would be working fine as it is.
33. Melina Patterson: What I heard from College of Education in our last meeting was, are you going to make us have another meeting?
34. Christy Irish/Jennifer Walker: No, we never said that. In fact, I said, we will not be adding meetings.

35. Melina Patterson: CAS could decide to have an additional meeting. In general, we have found that faculty do not want to add another meeting to their calendars. Already the calendar for the UFC gets pushed way out. We already have a meeting where we talk about things. That meeting is with our departments. That's why we want departmental representation.
36. Caitie Finlayson: I appreciate Alex's point. The idea that it's difficult to talk to other departments that you might be representing or that might join you. And I think like that's a great example of why the current model isn't working for a lot of us. I'm the social science representative, but I don't see people in other departments. And we had heard from COB members at the last UFC and in the UFC before that, that the same argument that they hadn't talked to people. So they don't know yet. And so again the way this body is structured with fairly arbitrary clusters of departments and then having a representative for the cluster isn't a way that any of us seem to communicate.
37. Alex Dunn: I want to clarify what I said. I don't think we're saying it's difficult to talk to other people. We have not done so because the restructure wasn't approved yet. So we did not feel like we should be having that conversation before it was approved.
38. April Wynn: In my understanding what you just said was you didn't talk to the folks that might be changing into the college because it wasn't approved. I represent in my role in this body that group of people that are heading other places and intentionally, because I knew and I don't see people all the time, had a series of meetings with Computer Science and Math, because I represent them right now. And they nearly universally they said the department-level is where the communication is, but also where the identity is. And so it feels important for folks that are getting re-homed to have something familiar which is that department and that how they're used to having those conversations. Their expectation is that we're going to still have departments in the new college. That may look a little bit different, but that's where that identity is going to be. And they all support a senate model where they are represented at the department-level. So I needed to know what they thought and that's what they said. And Karen doesn't have to speak for them because she's an at large member. I'm the one that represents them.
39. Alex Dunn: This is the first time that we're actually hearing this.
40. April Wynn: We were pretty clear that that's what everybody said when we discussed the model at the last UFC meeting. We didn't have meetings at that point, but I had asked those folks before, so I apologize if I wasn't clear enough. At the last

meeting and the one before that, the folks I represent, which are many of those displaced departments, want the senate model. So I apologize for the lack of clarity.

41. Kim Kinsley: So do we have representation from Economics here? How did they vote?
42. Melina Patterson: Econ is a social science. 98% of CAS voted for the Senate model.
43. Kim Kinsley: But they're going to be coming to our organization.
44. Melina Patterson: But they voted in CAS. That's where they could vote. And so they voted for a senate model.
45. Kim Kinsley: But this is a different structure. It's not going to be CAS. It's a different organization. Also, BUAD is not a department. It's listed as a department in the model but we're not a department.
46. Davis Oldham: What are you?
47. Kim Kinsley: We have many disciplines in the College of Business. We could split up into multiple departments, but we're not. So how can we be fairly represented in a model that just says BUAD is a department?
48. Davis Oldham: I would have to check with SCHEV, but I think if we asked SCHEV, they would say you're a department.
49. Kim Kinsley: Is that what they would say? Do we know that for sure?
50. Provost O'Donnell: What SCHEV has most recently said to us is that we have mathematics, economics, computer science, and business, 4 degree programs located in a college. That's it.
51. Kim Kinsley: But business has many disciplines. In fact, at one point we had several departments. We had Management Information Systems, Management, and Accounting. But then for convenience, we decided once we became the College of Business, we merged all of the departments. So this BUAD department label does not describe our College of Business. Listing us as a single department is not consistent with our identity.
52. Nicole Crowder: I have the SCHEV report with our majors and our degree programs. BUAD has single CIP code, which is how we are classified by SCHEV. So that would be a single department to SCHEV.
53. Karen Anewalt: There are lots of departments that represent multiple disciplines. We just made a new department that houses Art History, Classics, Philosophy, Religion, and Anthropology. Those disciplines are very different, but are all together in the same department. And so I don't understand how it's different.
54. Mindy Erchull: So one of the benefits of the senate model that was voted on is that it is the most flexible model because we did not list out every department. We said each department gets a

vote. And so as departments change and shift, which they will continue to do throughout the life of the university, the model would adjust. It wouldn't have to be voted on again each time departments change. With the model that we're looking at today, if we have any reorganization, the whole model would need to be voted on again because it doesn't work.

55. Christy Irish: Will school still exist? Because we could change this model to say schools. I'm fine saying that.
56. Mindy Erchull: The schools don't all exist yet. Only some of them have been proposed.
57. Christy Irish: I guess this is COE's other contention is that something has to come first, but it's hard for us to make any of these governance decisions in isolation from the other pieces.
58. Caitie Finlayson: I think many of us in CAS would argue that we need a change regardless of the reorganization and support a change regardless. A senate model can happen regardless of what the all of the structures look like. And if nothing changes and we keep a UFC model, everyone doesn't necessarily have representation. For example in COB, you could have three spots for your faculty council representatives, none of whom are in Business. You could have a computer science, economics, and mathematics representative. So you're not guaranteed representation in a UFC model. The same is true for Education. You might have two representatives from Athletics and one from Nursing. So is there any model that resembles a senate model based on departmental representatives, but perhaps with some differences for Education and Business? So is it that you need 2 representatives? What is the representation that you would feel is fair to represent you?
59. Kim Kinsley: I think one of the issues is that we have 21 people right now in the College of Business. We currently have three reps with 21 people. And this new model does reduce and dilute our representation. So I think that that's an obvious issue. Some people in the College of Business did want to know what Econ thinks. For example, if they came to our meeting yesterday, what would they have voted on?
60. Davis Oldham: I think we got that from April.
61. Kim Kinsley: If they were sitting around the table with us and we heard from them as individuals, what do they want? Math? Computer science?
62. Davis Oldham: Statistically, they are likely to have voted for the senate model.
63. Kim Kinsley: Statistically, you have the vote, but they're going to be in a different organization. I think we would be happier in the College of Business if we could meet with them and also if we

had more representation. I think reducing it to two representatives for Business is a challenge.

64. Davis Oldham: Christy, I don't know if this came up in the discussion, but I think as this model is written, it doesn't solve the communication issue. But if you specified that no more than one representative could come from the same department, I think that would be more amenable, but that is basically a senate model.
65. Christy Irish: I wasn't saying this was not. This is a Senate model.
66. Davis Oldham: And I would also echo Mindy's earlier point about the change to the 2/3 majority for motions to pass.
67. Melina Patterson: We haven't proposed schools yet to SCHEV and I am not convinced that those are going to be long standing. And yes, Business is the largest department, but I represent 40-something faculty. You have three representatives for 20 faculty and I represent 40 faculty. It feels like a big-state, little-state kind of thing. So yes, a senate would decrease your representation but also it would make representation more equitable.
68. Alex Dunn: I want to emphasize that in the College of Business, we want to make this work and we're not opposed to a senate model. I think we got in the weeds talking about department versus whatever else for a few minutes there. I think where the frustration in our faculty meeting was what Christie said in the beginning of this whole conversation. We haven't had a chance to have this discussion really, where we're talking through things like this before right now. And so the College of Business faculty had questions that we did not feel like we could accurately answer. And so that was part of the reason why the vote went the way it did. That's not all of the reason, but that's part of the reason. During our last UFC meeting, we actually had come with ideas for how to change the model that we voted on that we would have been okay with and was hoping to discuss amongst the group and we didn't have time to actually talk through any new suggestions. In the last UFC meeting, it was just, we're going to vote on the same model that we had already voiced was probably not going to go over well with the College of Business. So we felt like we were voting on something that we had already come to UFC trying to say we have some issues and things that we want to talk about, but we didn't have the chance to actually talk about them and make any changes. So that, to me, that's why it feels like we're a bit in the same place. I don't know if that helps. But that's what I want to clarify, that we're not saying no to a senate model, but we want to be able to talk through suggestions. And again, we're at 5:02, and this is the thing that

- we probably needed to talk about the most and we're out of time. And that seems like that's happened now at every UFC meeting.
69. Melina Patterson: Don't we go until 5:30? So can you tell us what some of the questions are?
 70. Karen Anewalt: Or the concerns or your alternate models?
 71. Alex Dunn: That's the point, honestly. I can say again that when we asked for this to be put on the UFC agenda, we were hoping that it was going to be on the UFC agenda so that we would have the conversation in the College of Business. But we just did the vote and didn't discuss alternatives because we weren't told that we were going to have this discussion today. So we would have to go back and flesh out a model.
 72. Melina Patterson: Okay, but if you had questions and ideas at the last meeting, could you share some of those?
 73. Alex Dunn: Sure.
 74. Sayan Sarkar: As Kim said, we have three representatives now and I don't think we do in the senate models. I think we would like to keep the 3 representatives because we represent a lot of students. If we go back to how many students we are serving, that's also important.
 75. Melina Patterson: And do you feel like all of those three representatives go to business?
 76. Sayan Sarkar: Yes.
 77. Melina Patterson: So you think business gets three? Does, does computer science get anything?
 78. Karen Anewalt: We have 300 students. Do we get any representation?
 79. Mindy Erchull: In a faculty senate model it's not actually about the number of students or individuals. That's a completely different discussion.
 80. Melina Patterson: But also can you address what you're saying. So if you have three representatives in the College of Business and something, whatever the new name is, does it make sense for all of those to be held by business people? Does Computer Science get representation?
 81. Sayan Sarkar: Yes, definitely.
 82. Melina Patterson: So does the new College of Business have four? Five? Like how many?
 83. Alex Dunn: We haven't gone into that level of detail in our discussions.
 84. Kim Kinsley: We were told this would not be on the agenda today. I reached out to Davis and he told the three of us it's not going to be on the agenda. Just take the vote and that would be it. And we weren't told to go into detail. We weren't told to ask our faculty for a model. We were told it would be a vote and then I

don't know what's going to happen after that, but that was the end of it. So we just took a vote.

85. April Wynn: So I guess I'm a little confused because it was on last agenda and I felt like that that was when the discussion was had. So I prepared for last month's meeting by talking to people and figuring that out and what are they like and I went to my department meeting and had those questions because my understanding was it was on the agenda last meeting and so I was ready to go for that.
86. Kim Kinsley: I can show you the email.
87. April Wynn: No, not today. I guess I'm confused because I've talked to the people and asked what's going on and been very proactive, I think, about talking to those folks that I represent, particularly the ones that are going to be moving somewhere else, because I didn't want them to feel underrepresented in any way because I think that this affects them more. So I guess I'm just a little bit lost now because we're talking about it today. But at what point did we not have these conversations ongoing? I've been having the conversations for eight weeks now. I thought that was what we've been doing basically since our first meeting this semester.
88. Kim Kinsley: At UFC?
89. April Wynn: Yes, at UFC.
90. Melina Patterson: And in our department meetings.
91. April Wynn: And so I guess I missed something. I'm new to UFC but I've been having this conversation for eight weeks.
92. Kim Kinsley: To be fair, we did not know until today that two colleges voted down the model and one did not. So how are we supposed to know in advance what was going to happen today? We didn't know. We didn't prepare our faculty because on our agenda, it was merely for a vote not to then take another 45 minutes to hash out what we should be doing next.
93. April Wynn: Well, we got an email that told us the results a few days ago.
94. Davis Oldham: Yesterday I think, because COB voted on Monday.
95. Kim Kinsley: Well our meeting was Monday, so we didn't know when we met as a college what the outcome of the vote would be. We didn't know that we were supposed to put it on our agenda as a college that we were now supposed to come up with some new model. It just wasn't something that we contemplated.
96. Melina Patterson: In my department meeting, we talked about the models that were put forward in the first meeting of the UFC. I think that Handbook Group brought different proposals and we talked about it at the UFC. I am sorry that people feel like we

did not talk about it during the last meeting. I felt like we did talk about it.

97. Janine Davis: I feel like something that happened at that point is that we ended the discussion at UFC talking about the need for a model 1.5. We said we like a little bit of this and a little bit of that. And then the next thing that happened is I think UFC Exec met and talked about it. And in the past, we had representation on UFC Exec. We're not jumping up for additional service opportunities sometimes, but I will say sometimes when that group goes to the BOV, and reports about the nuances of what's happening in a group or hears from the President's Leadership Council or talks about something that then comes up again, we are out of the loop. Because the thing that came back from UFC Exec was just model 2. It wasn't model 1.5. And so that's, I think, where it started breaking down.
98. Christy Irish: As we end our time, I would like us to talk about what our plan is to figure this out. Maybe it's not going to happen tonight at this meeting, but can we make a plan of what would work and when we're going to talk about this? Who needs to be there? We need to have a plan.
99. Janine Davis: And tell the whole faculty, because there are lots of seats at these tables, and I would love for people who feel strongly to come and have their voice be heard, especially the people from the groups who will be most affected.
100. Jonathan Levin: I'm glad we have a proposal that you brought and that we have something to talk about. I think you both suggested that some version of a faculty senate is good and maybe we can maybe find a path forward. So I'd just like to keep us focused on the sense of possibility, whatever that may be. I'm concerned about the Arts representation here, but we've got to find something that's going to work to move us forward together. I think it's going to be really important to figure out how the new configurations actually find a way to meet and be in the same room together and have the conversation. I'm not sure we're going to be able to advance the ball very much here if that hasn't happened. So, we weren't going to solve this problem today, no matter whether it was on the agenda or not on the agenda, but we need to be having this conversation in a more robust way with a mutual sense that we're going to solve this problem.
101. Mindy Erchull: My question is around the timeline, because I know we had been told back in August that this was our meeting that we needed to have this decided by, which we clearly don't. What guidance do Nicole and Tim have for us about the timeline because we don't have another meeting scheduled as this body until January. And it feels like that may be too late. I was here when we got this governance structure handed to us and it didn't

go really well. I don't want to see it have to go up the chain to administration to decide for us because we aren't able to get there in a timely manner

102. Jonathan Levin: Because that is how it was resolved when we revisited the size and shape of UFC at that time.
103. Janine Davis: Can I ask that group if we had a special meeting the last week of classes, is that too late?
104. Jonathan Levin: This is driven by Handbook approval issues.
105. Nicole Crowder: It has to be approved by the BOV in February. Right? That is if we want to staff the committees in normal election times.
106. Provost O'Donnell: The handbook changes are approved. What I think we hoped to do is to give the BOV a clean version.
107. Nicole Crowder: Which we just approved. Right? But if we were able to get this ironed out and have it to them by February, then that could also be included.
108. Provost O'Donnell: It could be assuming we follow all other appropriate procedures with a full faculty vote. That could still happen. And you can always schedule more meetings. There are some delivery questions that have been raised that you could put off for next year. It's been a really good process. But what structure would be in place in what handbook beginning in August of this year has to be decided.
109. Nicole Crowder: If you want a UFC-type model and we have to run elections, we need to know on one timeline. If you want a senate-type model and you just select a representative within your department, then it doesn't have to be as early.
110. Provost O'Donnell: Right. Historically, elections have been held everywhere from end of March through beginning of August.
111. Nicole Crowder: We're trying not to make people work when they're not on contract.
112. April Wynn: I like the idea of another meeting. I think the last week of class is probably too early for folks to get together substantively, particularly if we're trying to get folks from units that are moving into new colleges together. So maybe finals week?
113. Janine Davis: I think we should invite anyone who wants to be involved in the conversation.
114. Mindy Erchull: I would request that if we have a meeting during finals week, that it be virtual. I think that it would be a scheduling challenge to find a day that everybody could be there when many people do not plan on keeping their regular class week schedule during exam week.
115. Davis Oldham: I think it almost would have to be like multiple listening sessions just because the chance of getting everybody together at one time, I think it could be a challenge.

116. Jonathan Levin: I recommend just having one time.
117. Janine Davis: I agree.
118. Jonathan Levin: I'd much prefer to have the meeting in person but I think you're right. At that point we're going to get a much better crowd as we open it up virtually.
119. Caitie Finlayson: Can we vote at that meeting?
120. Mindy Erchull: The handbook is written for colleges, so it has to be done in a way that college-level voting will be tracked.
121. Jennifer Walker: Just to be fair, I just went back and looked at our last notes. There are still a number of questions from COB and COE that are threaded throughout the entire set of notes, and we still haven't really touched on all of them. So I think it's unfair to say that we weren't trying. I just think there was so much and we just had more questions because it changes the structure of how we're running. So there was like this desire to get more clarity on how it was going to look for all of us. But I don't see why we couldn't each create links and then shoot our votes to the respective areas at that time. I don't know how that would work, but there must be a way to do it. Could we break off afterwards, I don't know? But we need to figure that out before we meet so that we're ready to execute.
122. April Wynn: And I'd rather make that decision now. There are some folks that really need to think about things before they do that, and also folks that can't be there and they're just out of conversation and the vote. But I want to go back to what you said about having the chance to talk to the folks that are coming into your college. I don't want to skip that step because I think that's really important and having a big faculty meeting does not allow that.
123. Alex Dunn: Right and if we're going to have this large meeting what is the purpose of that meeting? Are we talking about various models or is it that we are coming together to discuss one revised model? So that we can talk to people, what is the timeline and what would be the purpose of this upcoming meeting?
124. Christy Irish: Would we be amenable if there was maybe two or three people that talk? This model is based on schools but pretend it's broken up into departments. If we talk to Business and Arts about representation? I guess if you look further into the model it gets into the weeds but we talked about having each school represented on a committee and if you leave Arts on their own, then the service burden is just exponential. So I guess I really want to know from the Arts departments, could it work for them to have 2 representatives? And from Business, how many seats would you want? If we had those answers, then we could talk about it.

125. Melina Patterson: But also, I want to clarify, are you talking about the Department of Business or the “College of Business and other people”?
126. Christy Irish: Both. They need to meet. Alex just said they’d like to meet with the departments joining them in the reorganization.
127. Melina Patterson: But I mean, in terms of how many reps they want, that's what I'm not clear about. So when you say you still want three representatives, I’m not clear about whether you’re talking about for the Business Department or the “College of Business and other things,” that's what I'm not clear about.
128. Sayan Sarkar: This is an individual question that's coming from me as a faculty. This is a University Faculty Council. We say the group represents the university and there are three colleges in the university. Right? Each college should have equal representation. We are not talking about departments. Departments are under the colleges. Each college should have equal representations even if we are calling it a senate. That is how I'm seeing it.
129. April Wynn: The committee piece and the that part to me is less important than the structure. So I don't want to get in the weeds of thinking about too much service burden for departments by going down to the committees and those details at the moment. unless that is something that is absolutely critical to the redesign. Because to me, that part and the committee at large position, I think that those will follow suit under what we decide. But if I'm not thinking about that correctly and it is all a package deal, then I think we won’t be able to get that all hashed out in one big meeting.
130. Christy Irish: Right. We’re just talking about the top. We were just saying that all of these other things were part of how we got to the model at the top.
131. April Wynn: You just said that the service burden for the Arts is exponential in all of these places and I just want to make sure we're really just talking about at the Senate.
132. Christy Irish: I guess my point was that for the Arts, if each departments has their own senate rep, then that leaves three to four of them left to represent the Arts on all these other university committees.
133. April Wynn: But we haven't necessarily decided the representation for all of the other committees. I think that's a lot to decide at this point. I just want to clarify if that needs to go hand in hand with the governance structure.
134. Caitie Finlayson: I appreciate the idea that we have three colleges and they should be balanced. I would counter and say that I'm curious like why COE and COB feel they need so many seats. Like for COE in particular, it's like 11 people.

135. Christy Irish: I don't think we feel like we need seats. We just wanted answers.
136. Caitie Finlayson: That makes sense and is fair. I think our question from CAS is what number of seats is appropriate and to Sayan's point, why should some departments have no seats, none at all, and COB have three. And I think in CAS, we're open and flexible and appreciate the concerns that have been raised the questions and want to answer them. I think we have similar questions as to like why a college representation model is better. But I think at the last two UFC meetings we've been flexible on asking how many seats and what model would you be okay with that would still address our underlying concerns that we would like departments to have a voice who don't have a voice right now.
137. Kim Kinsley: I think for the College of Business as we exist, we really need to get back with our college, and that's not going to happen until January, where we can actually sit down with the entire college and say, now our new task is to come up with a different model. I'm not sure another meeting on Zoom is going to accomplish that. Now we meet here at UFC on the 17th of January. Right? And so the College of Business meets that week, I imagine. So if we could have the time to put that on our agenda, I think we might accomplish something. And we could even invite Econ, Computer Science and Math to that meeting.
138. Nicole Crowder: I'd just like to reiterate Tim's point that sometimes you have to have more meetings. If there's a deadline and there's a timeline that we're trying to meet, sometimes you have to have more meetings. And that means you may have to meet before January. And if that's over Zoom, that might be what needs to happen. My second point, which is a totally different thing relating to the committee structure, is that a lot of the committees are set up still with college representation. So if we don't have college representation at the senate or the governance model, you still will have college representation at the committee level, which then reports to the Senate. And that would also alleviate the Arts question because there's a bunch of people in CAS that would take that college representation roles. Some committees, like maybe P&T or something else, may need school-level representation. And then those roles would be the priority for the Arts to fill. So I think that you can have both departmental and college-level representation within our governance structure.
139. Davis Oldham: Overall, it sounds like there was more interest in having a meeting, an additional one, open to all faculty during final exam week. So I'm thinking we may have to pick a day and

time that spans across different exam times so that people can come and go.

140. Alex Dunn: I just want to reiterate that I think the conversation regarding College of Business, I think is getting a little bit confused between college and department. We've never said in the College of Business that we don't want anybody who is joining the College of Business to have zero representation. That is not something we believe. I think like Jen said, that part of why this is special is that we feel like we still have questions. And I know that a lot of people are asking what are we, the College of Business, going to put forward. And we are going to go back and ask the College of Business to do that. I don't want the message leaving here to be that College of Business is saying we want people coming into the new college to have zero representation. That is 100% not the case. The second point is that if we're having this meeting at the end of the semester, can we talk about what the purpose of the meeting is? What are we trying to accomplish in that meeting?
141. Davis Oldham: I think one of the things you mentioned before is that you said that the College of Business has questions. So I think this meeting would be an opportunity for you to ask those questions, the ones that have that you haven't asked already.
142. Alex Dunn: So we're collecting questions but not brainstorming a new model?
143. Melina Patterson: We have the first three models that I assume everybody talked about with their colleges or departments. And so there should be that starting point.
144. Alex Dunn: Right, we have that starting point. But we said we like option one. And then everyone else said no we're not doing option one. So I think we have to do something. We need to do something different than we've done before. We can't keep having the same conversation.
145. Janine Davis: I think we need model 1.4 or model 1.5. We need to come together in a group that is willing to develop this and have three or four options that this group, this meeting will discuss. And I think business is going to have to talk about it before the big meeting so that everyone who's there has something to look at and amend in a friendly way if they have constructive suggestions. That's the only way anything useful will come out of that meeting.
146. Melina Patterson: I do agree with that. And so are people from the College of Education and the College of Business willing to meet with the UFC Executive Committee?
147. Janine Davis: Yes.
148. Alex Dunn: Yes.

149. April Wynn: Can I Just clarify? You're going to talk to the College of Business as it is now or does that include the folks that are headed into your college. I want to make sure they don't get left out.
150. Alex Dunn: So, I agree. I guess that's why I'm still asking what are we trying to accomplish at this next meeting? So first it sounded like we're going to ask questions, but then now it sounds like we're talking about models. So which is it?
151. Christy Irish: Both. I would think if you could talk to the college and the new departments under your college about what would be acceptable and what you want.
152. Alex Dunn: So we're not trying to develop a new model. We're just coming and we're working off of the model that we voted on.
153. Melina Patterson: The UFC Executive Committee and representatives from the College of Business and the College of Ed are going to meet and see if we can hammer out possibilities for a model that everyone can agree on at the meeting during finals week.
154. Christy Irish: Okay, and it sounds like COB would need to meet as a college first with Econ, Computer Science, and Math to come up with your basic want list.
155. April Wynn: It is 5:31 so we have to stop.
156. Davis Oldham: We are adjourned but we're meeting with the Executive Committee ASAP.

Meeting adjourned at 5:31pm