

Minutes  
Executive Committee Subcommittee to Select Faculty Representatives for the Presidential  
Search Committee  
December 10, 2013  
214 Clark Hall

Present: Ilkin Bilgesu, Lesley Cotrell, Sandra Elmore (by conference call), Virginia Kleist, Mike Mays, Roy Nutter, Jennifer Orlikoff, Nick Perna, Judy Polak (arrived at 1:20 PM), Alan Stolzenberg, and Lisa Weihman. and Jean Woloshuk  
Absent: Bob Bastress (Excused).

The meeting was called to order at 12:34 PM by Virginia Kleist, chair of the subcommittee.

Dr. Kleist reminded the committee of its charge – to select a ‘balanced’ group of three faculty representatives to the Presidential Search Committee. One or more of these representatives will be a current faculty representative to the Board of Governors, in accord with BOG Chair Jim Dailey’s request, and voted on by the Ad Hoc Executive Subcommittee in the November 20th meeting.

Prior to the meeting, Secretary Stolzenberg had distributed documents that included the statements provided in support of nominees and that summarized the nominees’ name, position, affiliation, and how and when they were nominated.

The committee began with a wide-ranging discussion of the meaning of balanced representation, especially given that only three representatives could be selected to represent over 2,000 faculty members in our system. The committee also discussed desirable attributes of a Presidential Search Committee faculty representative.

It was recognized that there are too many aspects of faculty diversity to be able to adequately represent them all with three individuals. These aspects include the range of schools and colleges – including health sciences vs main campus vs divisional campuses; the range of areas of major emphasis – teaching vs scholarship vs service; the type of discipline – STEM vs humanities vs arts vs engineering (and so on); type and level of position; and gender, among others.

The committee reached a consensus about the attributes of a good representative. The representative should have a broad understanding of the university as a whole, its programs and operations. Preferably, this would be demonstrated by committee membership or having held a role that required interaction with faculty from across the system. The representative should also have a firm understanding of the challenges associated with our recent history, and be able to represent far more than simply a narrow area or single college’s interest. In that light, service in the Senate or activity in key cross-university Senate committees would be a plus because the individual would have demonstrated a personal commitment to faculty shared governance, have a global sense of the university, and thus have a more informed understanding of the role of the President with respect to our constituency. Further, the representative should understand the pressures and nuances associated with being a faculty member in an institution that continually asks faculty to perform with top-level expertise in the classroom with larger and larger class

sizes, using new technologies that require ongoing updating, produce higher quality research often with less resources, and conduct service at a higher level yet with decreasing resources and support. The representative should understand current legislative issues such as SB330 as well as the PEIA considerations for faculty. They should be well connected with the university and local communities so that they might iterate with faculty during the search process. The representative should be insightful, independent-minded and able to avoid “groupthink.” They should be a good communicator who is not afraid to ask hard questions and can do so in a constructive manner that does not cause offense.

The committee examined the list of nominations to determine whether they all conformed to the requirements included in the call for nominations that had been distributed by Senate Chair Lisa DiBartolomeo. A few nominations were removed from consideration because they either were made after the deadline or did not include the required statement.

The committee addressed whether to consider the nominations of Associate Deans. Despite many strong faculty names being submitted who serve in this role, the committee voted not to consider these individuals. It was felt that their day-to-day view of the university would be more representative of that of the administrator role than that of a faculty member.

The committee discussed each nominee and the statement about them that had been provided. After comparison of individual nominees to the attributes discussed above, the nominees were sorted into three groups – outstanding, good, and those who did not have enough of the attributes to be considered further.

After a long discussion, the committee decided that only one of the current faculty representatives to the BOG should be selected for the Presidential Search Committee. This decision would permit four different faculty members rather than three to be involved in the search. It was felt that selecting only one BOG member would increase faculty involvement with the process, while still having a good Presidential Search- BOG relationship. The second faculty BOG representative will still be involved at the BOG decision-making stages. The fourth faculty involved would help provide more balanced representation.

Finally, the committee voted to select three representatives. The faculty BOG representative was selected first. The committee chose the other two representatives sequentially to permit committee members to consider the affiliations and disciplines of those already selected in making subsequent choices. Alternates were also selected in case the chosen representatives would be unable to serve for any reason.

The committee charged Dr. Kleist with the tasks of contacting each chosen representative to reconfirm their availability and willingness to serve and of communicating the results to Chairs Jim Dailey and Lisa DiBartolomeo.

The meeting adjourned at 2:44 PM.

Note about events after the meeting: Dr. Kleist contacted the faculty selected over the next 24 hours, and then conveyed the names to Chair DiBartolomeo. Dr. Kleist also sent a note about the

process to BOG Chairman Dailey. Once their willingness to serve was reconfirmed, Senate Chair DiBartolomeo sent the names to BOG Chair Dailey in an email on December 11. A congratulatory reply was received on December 12, 2013.

Minutes prepared by Faculty Secretary Alan Stolzenberg