

2010

AY 2009/2010 FS meetings minutes: 2009-10-21

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2009/2010 FS meetings minutes: 2009-10-21" (2010). *Faculty Senate Archives*. 279.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/279

This Agenda/Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Archives by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

October 21, 2009

President Laurence Branch called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. The first item of business was the presentation of a recognition plaque to Senator Elizabeth Bird for her service as Member-at-Large to the Faculty Senate during the 2008-2009 academic year. It is the practice of the Faculty Senate to recognize its outgoing officers in such a manner.

The Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting of September 23, 2009, were approved as presented. There was one abstention because the Senator was absent from the meeting.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Honorary Degree Recommendations – Bob Batchelor

On behalf of the Faculty Senate Honors and Awards Council (HAC), Dr. Batchelor presented the recommendation of two candidates for honorary degrees: R. Gil Kerlikowske for the Doctor of Humane Letters and Samuel P. Bell, III, for the Doctor of Public Health. Both candidate nominations were endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), and the nominations came with a seconded motion from the HAC. The motion to accept the nomination of R. Gil Kerlikowske for a Doctor of Humane Letters was unanimously passed. The motion to accept the nomination of Samuel P. Bell, III, for a Doctor of Public Health was unanimously passed. The nominations will be forwarded to President Judy Genshaft and the Board of Trustees for review and consideration. President Branch thanked HAC Chair Batchelor for the diligent work of the HAC.

b. Status of Secretary Vacancy – Arthur Shapiro

Sergeant-at-Arms Shapiro announced that Senator Paul Terry was the only nominee for the position of Faculty Senate Secretary. There were no descending votes from the SEC on his nomination; therefore, Senator Terry has been appointed Secretary for the remainder of the 2009-2010 academic year. President Branch thanked Senator Terry for agreeing to serve.

c. Committee on Committees Recommendations – Ellis Blanton

Committee on Committees (COC) Chair Blanton presented a slate of recommendations of fourteen nominees for Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Councils and one nominee for a University-Wide Committee. The slate was approved by the SEC on October 7, 2009, and came to the Faculty Senate with a seconded motion to accept. Chair Blanton thanked the COC members for going through the review process in a timely manner and also the SEC for streamlining a process which reduced the appointment notification time by one month. The motion to approve the slate of

nominees was unanimously passed. President Branch thanked the COC for its work in obtaining nominees to fill vacancies.

d. Report from Vice President Steve Permuth

Vice President Permuth reported on two items:

1. As chair of the Task Force on Interfaculty Council Relationships, Vice President Permuth has the opportunity to consult on a regular basis with members of the governance groups on the regional campuses. With the differentiated status of the regional campuses, each of which will have its own sense of a body called a Senate, one of the real questions is how and where do the campuses get along. The greatest statement at this point is that there is a state of confusion. Based upon the structural map provided, the only Senate that reports to the Executive Vice President and Provost is the Tampa Senate. All other Senates would go around the Executive Vice President to the President of the university who is the only one who would be hearing messages regarding academic affairs from all elements of the university and through the Executive Vice President from the Tampa campus. Vice President Permuth commented that this will cause chaos. There are also concerns of what if the four campuses get together and there is an issue, how does voting take place? Does the Tampa campus get one vote and regional campuses have one vote each? Will the proportionality issue be addressed? He pointed out the grand design has lots of problems and the details need to be dealt with somewhere along the line. It also relates to the question of the role of the Executive Vice President and Provost in terms of how does one become an Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs without some oversight of all the units that are called Academic Affairs. In conclusion, in consultation with the other regional president and vice president there is confusion over what is to be done and why.

Secretary Terry commented that before moving forward too fast with governance on the regional campuses, it needs to be clarified what the governance in the system is. He supports having a system governance structure, but until the role of the Executive Vice President and Provost is worked out, he views it as an impediment to having good governance at the other campuses. President Branch commented that there is a lot of work that needs to be done on sketching out how to implement the evolution into a system.

Provost Wilcox clarified that he is appointed to dual positions – Provost and Executive Vice President for the USF Tampa with system-wide responsibilities which is true of all vice presidents on the Tampa campus. Until those roles are flushed out more fully, the primary responsibility is to the Tampa campus; the secondary responsibility is to the system. What is unclear and unstated at this time is the scope of accountability and responsibility that goes along with that system-wide role, as well as the authority. The Provost agreed with President Branch and Vice President Permuth that there is a lot of hard work to be done, but

this is an evolving “creature.” It will take many more years of effort with wise counsel and input from the faculty to help shape the future.

Senator Donchin recommended that an analysis of the what USF is trying to accomplish be done so that the solutions can be evaluated in terms of the mission. A look at the purpose of the system is imperative.

Provost Wilcox commented that what became apparent a few weeks ago at a retreat that focused on the USF system and the evolution of such was that there is no strategic plan for the regional campuses. It is not only a problem with mission but there is no vision, no goals, or sense of where USF is going or how to gauge performance moving forward. The course on the Tampa campus will not be changed from the strategic plan. Instead, emphasis needs to be placed on embracing the role differential and distinctive missions of the regional campuses as they emerge. As those campuses move forward toward autonomy and separate accreditation, quality assurance must fall entirely on their shoulders. No longer will departments or colleges on the Tampa campus retain responsibility for academic quality assurance.

2. The proposed School of Global Sustainability (SGS) is the first example of looking at a program that is developed under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) reached between the Provost and President of the Senate regarding guidelines and implementation of programs that have significant academic structuring or restructuring. Today, the second version of the proposal was presented after which Vice President Permuth asked that everyone communicate to him directly to the degree that elements of the program as proposed meet the guidelines as established in the MOU. A copy of the MOU may be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office. It has two ingredients: (1) assuring that the guidelines that have been asked for have been administered and are intact in the program, and (2) that the implementation stages work as they should. Vice President Permuth’s responsibility is to ensure guideline adherence.

OLD BUSINESS

- a. Discussion of Proposal for a School of Global Sustainability – Associate Vice President Linda Whiteford

This is the second time that the proposal has been presented to the Faculty Senate. President Branch clarified that based upon the MOU, the Faculty Senate will vote on the proposal at its next meeting which will be November 21, 2009. At this time, the floor was turned over to Dr. Whiteford.

The School of Global Sustainability (SGS), as it is proposed, has changed in many ways but not in substantively. The substance of the school is that it is designed to be an umbrella structure that covers the entire USF campus. Any group or college that wishes to participate in activities related to sustainability are

invited. It is not of bricks-and-mortar, and it will not have a new building. It is a response to ideas and discussions about changing the landscape of American education and the newly reconfigured universities. The School will be an experiment that is anticipated to change and evolve over a period of years if it is agreed to go forward with it. It is an umbrella; it will have minimal administrative staffing (director, assistant director, advisor, staff assistant), it is not the creation of another college, and it does not have all of the administrative structure of a college. It is in response to long-term, serious discussion that students at USF have been having about the desire for an overarching entity with whom they can participate, as well as faculty, across colleges. The umbrella organization will be one in which individuals and individual colleges can choose to participate. Although other universities have different models and structures, what is distinct about the SGS being proposed at USF is the width and breadth of the expertise on this campus that is related to this very wide definition of sustainability.

In addition to the proposal distributed for today's meeting, Dr. Whiteford's responses to the queries from members of the Faculty Senate sent to her by Vice President Permuth were also included (see attachment). She pointed out that the changes in red on the proposal distributed to the Senate are either editorial or housekeeping ones that she did. The blue editorials are specific changes in response to questions from the Senate. The responses in the e-mail document are also highlighted in the proposal. Dr. Whiteford noted:

- it is still a work in progress;
- it is evolving;
- the substance is solid;
- it will not have tenure-track faculty in house;
- it will be an overarching umbrella organization that anyone can participate in; and,
- it will have a minimal administrative staff.

The floor was opened for comments. In response to the question about how the \$500,000 was going to be spent, Dr. Whiteford replied that it was allocated to be used for salary for a director, a part-time assistant director, an advisor, staff, travel, and start-up. President Branch pointed out that according to the MOU, a budget should be included in the proposal.

Senator Michael Gibbons commented that he hopes that in the recruitment of a director someone is recruited with a capacious understanding of sustainability and interdisciplinary. He added that Dr. Whiteford's response to Vice President Permuth's query about being consistent with the MOU guidelines was exactly what the MOU is requesting. This, along with the endorsements, reflects the idea that consultation has taken place. Senator Gibbons expressed his appreciation that Dr. Whiteford has gone out of her way to not only make sure that this has occurred, but to doubly make sure that it is understood.

The M.A. curriculum has passed two levels of review. Next, it will go to AAPG and then to ACE. A request was made that the report from the Graduate Council be presented. Dr. Whiteford replied that she did not know whether or not there was an actual report, but that when the curriculum was passed that could have been their report. Vice President Permuth referred the Senators to the third, single page of the original document for the third response regarding the issues of the description which is Component A of the guidelines and related consequences D. This dealt with issues of making sure this is not a certificate program, but rather an academic program, as well as a number of other issues that Senators provided to him as part of the on-going discussion.

Senator Elizabeth Bird commented that this was a very positive movement, and this is really taking it in the right direction. Her concern is the on-line component because it puts a burden on the department to provide these courses. However, what she does not want to see is the details of the program itself derail the initiative because the initiative is much bigger than just whether the courses are on-line or what. Senator Bird pointed out that more detail is needed in order to know how these courses are going to be delivered. However, if the on-line MA is not feasible, that should not be a reason for the entire initiative to be changed.

President Branch commented that the proposal should have all of the components in it; i.e., course proposals, budget, revenue stream, given the fact that the Faculty Senate is suppose to vote on it next month.

Vice President Permuth asked the Senators to read the document again, and respond to him in writing any concerns. He recommended that when reading the proposal to have the MOU alongside with the guidelines. Everything should be sent to Vice President Permuth, in writing, by Thursday, October 29, 2009.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Status of Task Forces – Associate Vice President Graham Tobin

Dr. Tobin reported that a composite task force has been created to pull together and build on the momentum of the five task forces: USF World, Integrated Interdisciplinary Inquiry, Faculty Roles, Responsibilities and Rewards, Global Sustainability, and Community Engaged Scholarship. All of these were faculty-driven task forces, composed of faculty and staff members across all campuses.

The charge was to make recommendations or changes to move the university in its goal toward AAU status. The immediate objectives of these five task forces were to access current activities at USF, to identify the barriers at USF, to document the activities that might take place at public AAU institutions (how does USF compare), and to make recommendations as to how any of these barriers of progress might be overcome at USF.

The charge of the composite task force was to integrate common recommendations of the task forces. That is, not every recommendation, but what common ones would the composite task force like to move toward action items. The task force realized that the recommendations are opportunities for USF to move forward and to bring in innovative practices. Dr. Tobin stressed that the existing teaching and research standards that are already operating will not be replaced.

Goals of the composite task force will enhance the USF experience as it moves forward as an AAU institution. The major theme within this is fostering student success. The university already does a lot of things in many of these areas, but USF needs to build on this foundation through university-wide initiatives in order to move to the next level. Dr. Tobin pointed out that in order for USF to move toward global, community, and interdisciplinary issues, they need to be brought to the forefront through change that provides fresh opportunities to overcome barriers. Such change necessitates community-wide discussion and involvement and that's where the Faculty Senate comes in.

Several common themes of the composite task force recommendations stand out: faculty development, teaching responsibilities, research initiatives, administrative, service and technological challenges.

Action items in terms of opportunities and challenges: faculty development models, recruitment and hiring, retention of faculty, promotion and tenure, and different models of teaching and research; teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels, incentives and rewards programs, international exchanges, study abroad programs, community-based service initiatives, undergraduate and graduate research initiatives; models for sharing new programs in student credit hours, internationalizing the curriculum, recognition of community engaged scholarship, recognition of interdisciplinary and global initiatives, recognition of the intense level of time involved in some of these initiatives compared to working alone in some areas, new models for sharing research credit across departments, new models for sharing indirect cost recovery money.

Administrative service and technology: recognition of community-engaged scholarship, recognition of global and interdisciplinary initiatives. In order to track some of these, initiatives will entail new technology and support. It requires changes in administrative and input, bureaucratic, and technological assistance.

The web site for the five task forces is: <http://www.acad.usf.edu>.

The composite task force report will be published on the web site in the near future. In co-sponsorship with the Faculty Senate, town hall meetings have been tentatively scheduled: November 5, November 17, and November 18. It is hoped that promulgation can begin in the spring in order to move some of these areas into real action. Dr. Tobin emphasized that these action items are building upon

what is already working and not replacing the standards. He encouraged the Senators to participate and get involved in the town hall meetings.

b. Textbook Affordable Issues – Monica Metz-Wiseman

President Branch announced that due to illness, Ms. Metz-Wiseman was not at today's meeting. Therefore, the Student Government representative was asked to make a statement on this issue. Mr. Michael Keane, Chair of the Senate Rules Committee, announced that the resolution on textbook affordability has been reviewed by the Student Senate. There was a motion passed at that meeting to send it back to committee. It is still in committee being researched and debated.

President Branch announced that a volunteer from the Faculty Senate is needed to serve on the Textbook Affordability Committee. Interested Senators should contact him.

**REPORT FROM VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEACH AND INNOVATION
KAREN HOLBROOK**

Dr. Holbrook was invited to today's meeting share with the Senators some sense of where the research program is in terms of support. To aid in her presentation, copies of the 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 Research Administration Budget Report Summaries were distributed. The following background information was provided before reviewing the summaries. The Office of Research and Innovation (the Office) is funded almost entirely by returned overhead from grants. Although the Office does receive some E&G funding, its funding largely comes from F&A (Facilities and Administration). The F&A percentage for the university is 47 percent on federal grants, but the real functional F&A percentage is only 14 percent. An estimate is done by the university comptroller as to what the F&A amount will be for the upcoming year.

Dr. Holbrook pointed out that the Office now has a real operating budget which did not exist two years. The new format is that a budget is built, the bills are paid, and what is left is returned. This follows the State DSR statue that by law says all the indirect costs that are returned to the universities will be spent first to fund sponsored research, and whatever is left in that budget will be returned to the faculty academic unit for the support of research in whatever manner it needs to be used. The budget is overseen by a Research Advisory Board of administrators and senior faculty members.

At this time, Dr. Holbrook reviewed the line-item Research Administration Budget Summaries for 2008/09 and 2009/10. Of particular interest, was that there will always be a floor of a minimum 5 million dollars in funds that will go back to the faculty. The intent is that if there is significant money left over, that will be enhanced every year. At this time, almost all RIA funds have been returned. Dr. Holbrook commented that if things go according to plan, there could be a carry-over of 1.1 million dollars, but it could be significantly more if there are no emergencies which would be added to what goes back in the upcoming year.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT JUDY GENSHAFT

President Genshaft congratulated the Office of Research and Innovation and all the researchers on the Research One Week. The kickoff began with a new format called the Academy of Inventors consisting of 131 inventors from USF. The idea came from the Office of Research and Innovation and particularly Professor Paul Sandberg. An Academy of Inventors will be set up in other schools headed by USF.

The previous night was the opening announcement of the “USF: Unstoppable Campaign” with a goal of 600 million dollars to fund the university’s academic enhancements, capital, faculty, scholarships, and miscellaneous budgets. Even in these hard, economic times, the USF Foundation Board unanimously decided that USF should move ahead with this campaign. This is a time when USF needs this continued resource for faculty, scholarships, equipment, and initiatives.

A retreat on the USF System was held with administrators, deans, and President Branch representing the faculty. Dr. Steve Portch was the facilitator. The retreat focused on (1) the USF System brand and strategic plan, (2) the system structure, roles and responsibilities, and (3) faculty governance systems, such as campus/institution/Faculty Senate. After a series of workshops has been held, a simple strategic plan will be put together for the USF system based upon themes that come out of these workshops.

One of the areas that President Branch will be working on with the heads of the other Faculty Senates and Councils is looking at the structure of the Senate and the Constitution for the overarching University Senate as to whether there will be a system-wide Senate or a Senate from each of the accredited campuses. The kind of structure will be up to the faculty. However, there are some initiatives that do need to be worked on across the system, i.e., distinguished professors and honorary degree. This year is devoted to creating the system in concert with the faculty through workshops.

President Branch commented that one structure option was to return to the Faculty Senate that existed five years before USF St. Petersburg became independent. That would be a Senate that incorporates representation from the other institutions based upon the size of their faculty rank. The other option is a hybrid of the system set up a few years ago of having an intercampus faculty council consisting of the presidents or chairs of the Faculty Senates or councils from the four institutions. President Branch asked the Senators to give some thought to these options and send him feedback on these models.

REPORT FROM EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST RALPH WILCOX

Recognizing the hour, Provost Wilcox yielded his time to the remaining speakers.

REPORT FROM STUDENT SENATE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE MATTHEW DIAZ

Mr. Diaz reported on the following items:

- This is the 50th year of having a Student Senate at USF. A kickoff was held commemorating the milestone.
- A mid-term election has recently conducted with 54 out of the 60 seats filled.
- He has been appointed as Chair of the Academic Service Recommendation Committee (ASRC) which is in charge of annual funding for Student Affairs, Student Organizations, the Marshall Center, and Campus Recreation.

Initiatives the Student Senate has been working are textbook affordability, and addressing student concerns via surveys and forums. In addition, the Senate is working on its funding and updating and amending its rules and regulations.

REPORT FROM USF UNITED FACULTY OF FLORIDA PRESIDENT SHERMAN DORN

President Dorn announced that USF is in the best shape of any of the other public universities in Florida by being able to avoid furloughs. His primary fear is Legislative appropriations next year. There are a couple of grievances in the process with several being settled. The next collective bargaining session is November 20. Although a number of proposals were put forth during the summer, nothing has been heard regarding those proposals.

REPORT FROM FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT LAURENCE BRANCH

President Branch acknowledged the fact that USF as the only large university in Florida without faculty layoffs is not an accident. It was due to difficult decisions that the administration has been making over the years. Everyone is grateful that prior decisions that have been made have led this year to having stability among the faculty ranks and stability among the educational programs for the students.

He also acknowledged the fine, working relationship that the Faculty Senate enjoys with the Provost's Office. President Branch recognized that Provost Wilcox "really gets the concept of shared governance." When it is important, there is always an e-mail or telephone call saying this is something that needs to be done together. He feels this bodes well for the future and is grateful. In addition, he commented that President Genshaft has shown great growth over the past year in thinking through the implications of shared governance and, likewise, was complementary on that growth and looks forward to continued growth and development as USF moves into the new system.

ISSUES FROM THE FLOOR

Dr. Karen Holbrook and her staff were acknowledged and commended for the positive work done during the last two years. In addition, during the process of the national search for the Provost's position, Dr. Holbrook was very responsive, along with co-chair Dr. Michael Barber, in suggestions that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee had on the process.

The question was raised that when issues come before this body that are not policy or innovation oriented but are possibly grievances, such as the case that was presented from the College of The Arts (CoTA), how is the Senate to respond? Why was this issue presented to the Faculty Senate? President Branch responded that the Faculty Senate should serve as a vehicle of sharing. He explained that the Senate was asked by a Senator to allow a representative from the CoTA to make a statement on behalf of a colleague. Due to the fact that it was a statement, the Faculty Senate was not asked to follow through and make a response. If due process had been violated, then a response would have been required of the Faculty Senate.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m. The next meeting of the USF Tampa Faculty Senate is November 18, 2009.

ADDENDUM
Follow-Up Items

1. Provost Wilcox asked to provide FTE for the 2001 and 2008 benchmarks, as well as dollar support for people listed on the Institutional Growth, AY 2000/01 through AY 2008/9-Selected Measures handout (FS Mtg. 10-15-08).
2. President Branch to appoint an ad hoc committee to examine whether or not due process was followed in the dismissal of a faculty member (FS Mtg. 02-18-09). Graduate Council Chair Strange accepted the responsibility of looking into this matter.
3. Provost's Office to look into whether a policy exists on what constitutes a dean search committee (FS Mtg. 02-18-09).
4. The CEOs of the USF Polytechnic and the Sarasota-Manatee campuses will be invited to attend a meeting of either the Senate Executive Committee or Faculty Senate to discuss organizational structures and issues that influence their campuses (FS Mtg. 02-18-09).
5. Vote for proposed SGS in light of MOU (FS Mtg. 09-23-09).
6. Volunteer to serve on Textbook Affordability Committee (FS Mtg. 10-21-09).

Completed Items

1. Secretary vacancy (FS Mtg. 09-23-09); filled 10-13-09.
2. COC nominations to Senate (FS Mtg. 09-23-09; FS Mtg. 10-21-09)
3. Creation of task force on student enhancement – Provost Wilcox (FS Mtg. 09-23-09); nominees sent to Provost Wilcox on 10-12-09.

To: Branch, Laurence
Subject: FW: LMW responses to Senate queries
Date: Thursday, October 15, 2009 11:15:22 AM
Attachments: SGS Proposal Senate 10 15 09 Tracked 1025am with letters.pdf
Importance: High

Larry:

These are both the responses to the queries from members of the Faculty Senate that Steve sent in written form, and as an attachment, the revised proposal for the School. As you can see, I've tracked changes and tried to respond as fully as possible. I hope you will be able to distribute both the email and the revised proposal to the members of the Senate as soon as is possible so they have time to review them before we meet on Wednesday. I think this process has been - and is - most productive,

Linda

From: Permuth, Steve
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 9:24 AM
To: Whiteford, Linda (Provost Office)
Cc: Branch, Laurence; Wilcox, Ralph; Permuth, Steve
Subject: Comments on 10/31/09 dated draft of SGS proposal

Linda-

I am sharing a number of responses to the latest draft of the SGS proposal. Please forward to me the Senate comments you mentioned at the SEC meeting regarding the proposal so that I might have the entire package of materials at hand as we move forward. Let me share some of these concerns in specific reference to the MOU and others of a more general nature:

A first concern raised is the need to return to the proposal a clear and measured statement that would comport with MOU Guideline (c.) which calls for " [A] reasonable statement of the financial and budgetary implications of the changes ." A recurring question is not only the specifics but some discussion of the sources and implications to other academic departments and colleges regarding financial issues.

I see two primary questions here: 1) will the resources needed for the proposed School be taken from existing resources from existing departments and colleges, and 2) what is the estimated budget for the proposed School.

To the first question: Let me assure the Senate that the resources required for the proposed School are NEW resources and represent just one part of Academic Affairs' STRATEGIC allocation of funds in AY 2010/2011, along with new permanent faculty and staff lines (already allocated to existing colleges), minor PECO renovation funds, new graduate fellowships and GA positions, and enhanced value of graduate fellowships and GA stipends. Accordingly, these funds will NOT be reallocated from existing departmental/college budgets.

To the second question: The estimated (initial) budget for the proposed School is approximately \$500,000. It should be noted that the primary investment will be in faculty administrator appointments (Director and Asst Director), as well as faculty and student support. This is consistent with USF's strategic plan to re-shape student enrollment as we seek to achieve our strategic goal of 25% graduate headcount and FTE on the Tampa campus. This is important because, as the program matures, I expect that the proposed School will generate additional revenues through graduate tuition, private giving and competitive, external research funding. As such, the initial budget investment may be viewed as non-recurring "frontloading" (which is common with the general "startup" of new programs/departments/schools/colleges), with the high probability expectation that the budget will be self-generating in the near future.

A second, and perhaps, the major concern raised to this point in time requests that there is critical need to more fully address MOU Guideline (f.) which calls for "[A] brief description of the nature of consultations with the academic entities affected by the changes, including a summary of their units' responses." There is **strong** desire that the proposal and the academic credibility and reality of the proposal would be made much superior by articulated and meaningful discourse/exchange with the departments and Chairs affected directly and not only with the advisory councils of the respective colleges and Dean's Council. There also needs to be an attached summary of the unit responses to be added to the document for SEC and Senate approval.

As you acknowledge, we have engaged in meaningful and on-going consultations (since January of this year). We continue to have pertinent conversations with all parties. Your email raised two issues I will address: 1) the nature of the consultations, and 2) a desire to have departments and chairs engaged in these continuing discussions.

To the first issue: In addition to formal presentations to the Council of Deans, the Council of Associate Deans, the Council of Chairs, and other stakeholder groups, I have consistently made the offer to come to individual departments and meet with faculty. In addition, the SGS Faculty Advisory Council is made up of faculty who have related research and teaching interests and wished to be included as we moved forward. Also, in many cases, Deans have passed the proposal for the School on to their chairs who have, in turn, shared with their faculty. I know of several cases where departments have included a discussion of the proposed School in their faculty meetings. I have also met individually with chairs and deans who have requested such meetings, and in at least one case, I met with all of the directors of a college to discuss the proposed School. In several cases, I have come back to groups so that they can ask follow-up questions. In each of these situations the feedback was provided orally. And in every case, the response was positive to the concept of the proposed School of Global Sustainability, with questions about the details of its operation. In terms of those 'academic entities affected by these changes,' each Dean of the colleges directly and presently affected by the proposed MA in Global Sustainability have provided a letter of support to Karen Liller which I will attach to the proposal. Karen included these letters in the MA degree in Global Sustainability proposal to the Graduate Council.

To the second issue: I am continuing to reach out to as many groups on campus as I can to discuss the proposed School, as I have done for the past several months. So far, this engagement has been both productive and illuminating. As you can see in the 10.14.09 version of the proposal, comments and ideas from the faculty have strengthened the proposal. In your email you suggest a broader discussion with faculty and chairs and not just with the members of representative councils. I think this is an excellent idea and while I have offered to meet with all interested departments, I will reinforce my offer. Today I will send out an invitation to meet with departments who wish to know more about the proposed School. I think this is an important means to continue the shared evolution of the idea of such a School.

Let me conclude my thanking the Senate for engaging in this productive process. I welcome and deeply appreciate the interest demonstrated by these discussions, and recognize that the shape of the School will reflect the commitment of the participants. What I find most appealing about the proposed School of Global Sustainability is its ability to provide a place for meaningful engagement and scholarly pursuit for any faculty member from any department who wishes to participate.

Linda

A third specific regards the writing of the document in substance and articulation that might best be achieved by a meeting at your earliest convenience. We might also discuss some other rising issues including elements of the description (a.) and related consequences (d.). It would be my suggestion to set up a meeting either tomorrow or Wednesday before noon if you have the time this week. After that, I am available next Monday or Tuesday before leaving to present at a national convention on Thursday. It is **always best to contact me on my cell at 625-1835**. I will have my calendar at hand.

Steve