

**Faculty Assembly Meeting  
Minutes for September 25, 2018  
3:30-5:00 pm  
Blow Hall Board Room**

*Officers Present:* Jack Martin (President), Tom Ward (Vice President), Chris Abelt (Secretary)

*Other Members Present:* David Armstrong, Mark Brush, Lynda Butler, Carl Friedrichs, Rowan Lockwood, Michael Luchs, Alan Meese, Jennifer Mellor, Pieter Peers, Christy Porter, Scott Swan, Molly Swetnam-Burland, Megan Tschannen-Moran

*Members Absent:* Cathy Forestell (Faculty Representative to the Board of Visitors) and Sophia Serghi

*Others in Attendance:* Katherine Rowe (President) and Terry Meyers (Parliamentarian)

**1. Call to order**

Mr. Martin called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

**2. Approval of the Minutes for May 10, 2018**

The minutes were approved unanimously.

**3. Discussion of Provost Search with President Rowe**

The President suggested this timeline: February, offer made; January, campus visits; December, candidate filtering, early October, committee formed. The search firm that recently did the UVA Provost search has been employed.

Search committee chair. The question of who chairs the committee was raised. There are no best practices here. Presidents have been chairs. It would be unusual for a vice-provost to chair since they would be selecting their supervisor. Other possibilities would be to have a faculty co-chair or for the President to be *ex officio*. Ms. Butler said that since the provost is the chief academic officer, a tenured, chaired professor should lead the committee. Ms. Lockwood pointed out that the committee typically presents a list to the president who then decides. President Rowe would like the list not to be ranked. The President also pointed out that the provost is the second ranking officer of the College whose constituency extends beyond the faculty. Mr. Ward thought that having a faculty chair would give better optics and a bigger buy in from the faculty. Mr. Martin said that not having a faculty chair would raise eyebrows. Mr. Peers was concerned that faculty would not own the process and have a real say. The President mentioned that another possibility is to have a direct-reporting administrator as a non-voting chair whose role was to keep the committee on task. Ms. Lockwood seconded the importance of buy in. Faculty already feel disenfranchised. The President said that she wants to hear the conversation in the committee meetings, especially seeing faculty being persuaded by the dialog. Without some formal involvement, there would be a big loss in the process. Ms. Porter pointed out that the President supports the idea of shared governance and wondered what message is sent if the President is the chair. Ms. Butler added that most faculty do not know the President yet. President Rowe said that there are tradeoffs either way. Administrators

and the BOV are evenly split on the issue. The UVa search was chaired by a direct report. It might also be possible for the President to join in the meetings but not share until a later point in the process. Mr. Brush said that *ex officio* status allows for listening to the conversations. Ms. Tschannen-Moran said that the president must be involved in the position description. Ms. Butler suggested that the President start the committee off with the description then join in the process later, *i.e.*, participate in defined phases. Ms. Mellor pointed out that what was described is how administrative reviews are conducted. The Provost gives the charge to the committee, then lets the committee do its job. Ms. Butler said it would be appropriate for the President to be in the room listening to the faculty discuss and especially watching the interaction between candidates and the faculty. The President asked about describing key success factors, such as leadership style and role, analytical ability and public presence. She will craft these with the search committee and make sure that the search firm is on board. She is a believer in using Skype early in the process to bring fewer to the airport interviews.

Role of the provost. They are the second in charge. The list of duties is long. Ms. Butler pointed out that in the past a Vice President may have disputed this ranking. Ms. Lockwood said that candidates should be aware of our core values and culture and explain how they fit with the institution. The President noted that institutions have common concerns but different local solutions. We should take a wide-angle view of public education, but have solutions specific to the College. Mr. Martin said we should think about the schools working together, promoting the whole school perspective and strategic complementarity. Mr. Luchs said that the provost should inspire groups and frame problems: innovation as process. The President said that digital technology has a future in higher education. The question is how to engage faculty. Mr. Meese pointed out that the provost should have boundaries and not take too close an interest in units, for example with curriculum, NTE roles and course loads. The President said that the provost should be a translator for the faculty to the BOV and vice versa. The role of provost should be clear. Paul Gray, past president of MIT, would always ask whose job he was doing. If he could identify the role, he would step back. Mr. Martin said the provost should be clear on policy, especially those articulated in the Faculty Handbook.

Committee composition. The committee should reflect the institution as a whole. It should have faculty of different ranks, schools, ethnicities, disciplines, practices. It should include an undergraduate, graduate, and a BOV member. Professionals and staff should be represented. The Assembly's recommendations are important. A size of thirteen to fifteen might be a target, but it may expand to include the desired breadth of expertise. The President would like a list of a dozen names together with information on why they were recommended. Mr. Meyers pointed out that the Assembly Bylaws say that schools should send their recommendations to the Executive Committee who then sends a refined list to the Assembly.

Open/Closed. The President would like a closed search that opens up to a limited (and confidential) extent at the end. This search would give the best candidates and the largest pool. She would not have considered applying here last year if the search had been open. Ms. Lockwood said that it is important to explain to faculty why a closed search is the best route. The President would like individuals with the terminal degrees in represented disciplines to be eligible. This includes JD and MBA degrees. While it seems odd that an MBA would decide on tenure cases from PhDs, the reverse is currently the case. Mr. Martin noted that there is no university advisory committee

analogous to the Retention, Promotion and Tenure committee in Arts and Sciences for the provost (though there could be).

The President excused herself and discussion continued on how the assembly would collect search committee member recommendations. Mr. Meyers noted that all units have a right to have a representative on the committee. Mr. Armstrong said that nominees should have a range of rank, large/small classroom experience, undergraduate/graduate departments, and diverse backgrounds. There should be an NTE on the committee. Mr. Martin said the schools should send suggestions (at least three for each constituency) and their demographic information by the end of this week. The Executive Committee would refine the list for approval by the Assembly. All of this could be done electronically.

#### **4. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 pm.

Prepared by Chris Abelt