

Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2015

Place: Pamplin 32

Time: 5:15 p.m.

Chair: Bernice Hausman

Minutes: Leonard Grant, for Rebecca Miller

Attending: Monty Abbas, Susan Anderson, Nahum Arav, Richard Ashley, John Barrett, Daniel Breslau, Maria Belen Cassera, Virgil Centeno, Benjamin Corl, Rami Dalloul, William Ducker, Felicia Etzkorn, John Ferris, Joe Gabbard, Leon Geyer, Ralph Hall, Bernice Hausman, Aki Ishida, David Jacobsen, Bradley Klein, Chad Lavin, Jenny Lo, Gerald Luttrell, Michael Moehler, Megan O'Rourke, Jim Parkhurst, Paulo Polanah, Anita Puckett, Wornie Reed, John Richey, Susanna Rinehart, Ahmad Safaai-Jazi, Scott Salom, Christin Kaestle (for Tina Savla), Hannah Scherer, Heinrich Schnoedt, Deborah Smith, Jim Spotila, David Tegarden, Eric Vance, Bruce Vogelaar, Philip Young

Guests: Hans Robinson, Paul Knox (University Distinguished Professor and Senior Fellow in the President's Office)

Meeting purpose: Regular Faculty Senate meeting

Agenda items: Approval of the agenda

Approval of the minutes from the February 10, 2015 meeting

Discussion of the search for a new provost

Announcements

Old business

New business

Faculty Senate President Bernice Hausman called the meeting to order at 5:17 p.m.

Agenda item 1: Approval of the agenda

Motion to approve the agenda was seconded and passed by unanimous decision.

Agenda item 2: Approval of the minutes from the February 10, 2015 meeting

President Bernice Hausman suggested minor amendments to the minutes. Minutes for the February 10, 2015 meeting were approved as amended by unanimous decision.

Agenda item 3: Discussion of the search for a new provost

Prof. Knox stressed the importance of the search to the Faculty Senate. The search committee wants comments and suggestions about the qualities and experiences of potential candidates for the position of Provost. Greenwood/Asher and Associates, a search firm, is assisting in the search. Its website is: <http://www.greenwoodsearch.com>

There will be a website with two ways of communicating with the search committee. [http://www.provost.vt.edu/faculty_affairs/leadership_development/Senior_Searches/Senior_Search.html]. One is through Greenwood/Asher. The other is through provostsearch@vt.edu, which should be live by Wednesday, February 25. The website is a portal for comments and concerns for the search committee. The desiderata are already enumerated on the website. There are two town meetings on Wednesday, February 25 in Squires. This has been advertised to faculty, but not to students. Students are welcomed to attend.

The floor was opened to questions about search, recruitment, and hiring processes. Questions fell into specific categories: demographics of the search committee, the search process, and desirable characteristics of the next provost.

Demographics of the search committee

Faculty Senate President Bernice Hausman described the individuals that comprise the search committee: nine are faculty, two of whom are head of a department or school. Eleven are administrators of various sorts. Two are students, and one is a staff member. Prof. Knox also indicated that two individuals from the National Capital Region are serving on the search committee.

Prof. Knox assured the Faculty Senate that the committee is as inclusive as possible. He added that a committee comprised of every possible group would be unworkable. Faculty Senate President Hausman confirmed the apparent diversity of the committee, in response to a question from a senator.

Prof. Knox spoke on the way the committee was formed, stating that the president had a long list of potential members and asked him to submit his own list. The attempt was to build the search committee from faculty first, as well as members who have multiple campus connections. However, he believes committee members will speak for themselves, not their campus affiliations.

The search process

Prof. Knox stated that the committee would like to have a person in place for Fall semester. The committee is also aware that the summer poses a challenge because candidates and committee members are typically not available during the summer. Greenwood/Asher sees three months as the timeframe to fill a provost position at a Research One university. There are also other R1 schools seeking provosts and presidents at this time, too. The president feels the need to act now. Consultants expect 400-450 nominations or applications for the position.

Prof. Knox stated that the University is conducting a broad search. The question of national and international came up in the committee. The land grant mission tends to rule out international candidates, but someone may satisfy all the aspects of the position from abroad.

Faculty Senate President Hausman, who serves on the search committee, added that there was a discussion as to whether the person should be someone who came up through faculty ranks, or

someone who has other experience. She asked the Faculty Senators whether it was important to the Faculty Senate that the candidate has experience as a faculty member? Informally, all agreed.

Prof. Knox addressed the issue of confidentiality in the search process, asserting that all information pertaining to the search will be "super confidential." He wants to reassure faculty that all suggestions given to the committee will be treated confidentially. Expressing concern about anonymous comments, he asked that faculty include names in all correspondence, given that the search process is confidential.

Prof. Knox said that there will be off campus interviews for the last 12-15 candidates. The hope is to bring 3-4 candidates to campus. Some candidates may want to remain anonymous for their own reasons. President Sands has said he will decide what to do if a candidate wishes to remain anonymous.

Prof. Knox said that President Sands makes the final decision. The search committee is an advisory body. The President is the one who will have to work with this person. He doesn't want a ranked list; he wants three or four candidates.

He added that the Faculty Senate and faculty members should be making nominations to see that the candidates they think will meet their needs are in the pool. Prof. Knox stated that names are sufficient. These names are sent to the search firm, which will then reach out to the nominee. The committee will also have a recruiting function. The position is currently advertised, and the current advertisement is a revision of the previous advertisement; the revision was written by President Sands, Virginia Tech's legal department, and the search committee.

Prof. Knox stated that there is no distinction between internal or external candidates.

Prof. Knox informed the Faculty Senate that the search committee wants to collect sample questions to ask candidates. He invited Faculty Senators and their departments to submit questions.

Desirable characteristics of the next provost

Faculty senators from a variety of departments offered perspectives on desirable characteristics of the next provost. These included:

- Research achievements
- Respect for research in all disciplines
- Support for shared governance
- Reputation for effectively responding to faculty needs
- Ability to help recruit top notch faculty
- Support for Virginia Tech's land grant mission
- Appreciation for the various Virginia Tech campuses and support for faculty in different settings
- Understanding of and appreciation for academia
- Record of significant teaching experience as well as the ability to recognize good teaching
- Ability to recognize and strategize around women's issues, racial issues, and social issues on campus
- Sense of outrage that faculty have no voice on academic matters and that faculty salaries are so low
- Nuanced understanding of women's and ethnic issues and the way they relate to faculty salary

- Leadership abilities

Prof. Knox asked the Faculty Senate what they would like to see on a candidate's CV. What should the committee look for as signs of leadership?

Responses included:

- Look to reference letters, to the people who have seen the signs of leadership.
- The person should have comparable experience in a similar role.
- Leadership is the capacity to bring people along with your visions, rather than imposing changes. Also, a leader must compromise and change directions if faculty do not follow along. Maybe an interview question could be an example of such negotiations.
- Good leadership is about empowering, engaging, and activating the human resources at an institution.
- We need someone who is invested in faculty.
- The search committee should keep a healthy skepticism about CV and resume items. There are administrators who have listed administrative achievements. It is important to look beyond what is on paper.
- The next Provost should have an entrepreneurial spirit and be able to find solutions to real problems, especially in terms of financial constraints.
- The candidate should be successful in research, teaching, and service, however it is defined in that field. An internal candidate may be sympathetic to faculty needs.
- Commitment to tenure track faculty.

A member of the senate spoke up to state that the current provost was open to innovation and can find alternative channels to make things happen. He made time to speak to faculty. These are also traits that the search committee should look for in the next Provost.

At the conclusion of Prof. Knox's Q&A session, Faculty Senate President Hausman invited Prof. Knox to bring the candidates to visit with the Faculty Senate.

Agenda item 4: Announcements

A task force is working on a brief survey of the faculty concerning governance. We will notify everyone when it goes out, so that you can encourage your colleagues to participate. The survey is still being tweaked. We encourage wide participation.

The meeting with Donna Young of the AAUP was very helpful. Faculty must understand how university governance works at other institutions.

Faculty Senate President Hausman confirmed that the survey will have an educational component. Once it is completed, Jack Finney will email it to faculty.

Agenda item 5: Old business

Report of discussion from the University Council meeting on February 23 concerning the Pathways proposal

Discussion focused primarily on the implementation plan and whether or not the curriculum plan and the implementation plan should go forward at the same time. The administration is clearly hesitant to do so, for unknown reasons.

There continues to be no rationale about changes to the Pathways curriculum except that general education hasn't been changed since 1992 and students don't really understand why they have to take general education classes. There was no discussion concerning how the language of the Pathways document will help students make connections or understand the curriculum better than the existing curricular documents for the CLE.

There continues to be no recognition of the significant amount of work that will fall on individual departments and a few colleges compared to other departments and colleges that will be relatively unaffected by these changes.

Faculty Senate President Hausman asked if there are any comments on Pathways. A spirited discussion followed, commenting on the issues raised at University Council and the FS response at the next meeting where Pathways will be voted on.

Faculty Senate President Hausman offered to send a letter to the President explaining the Faculty Senate position, given that he was not present for the discussion in UC and will not be there next Monday. Senators agreed that this was a good course of action.

There was a discussion of possible deferral of the vote on Pathways at UC. A deferral means that no vote can be taken until 6 weeks after the first reading. It can be voted down by 75% of attending participants in a meeting.

A motion was made for one of the faculty senate members to request a deferral at the next university council meeting. The motion passed. It should be noted that there were not enough faculty members present for a quorum.

Although there was a vote on this motion, it was unclear at the end of the meeting if FS representatives at UC will request a deferral of the Pathways vote or not. President Hausman felt that making the decision about deferral is best made at the meeting when the conversation is occurring.

Agenda item 6: New business

Issues from CGSP

Hans Robinson (chair CGSP) briefly presented the CGSP resolution on Continuous Enrollment Policy for graduate students. The resolution is currently before University Council. Information about this policy is on Scholar and was available to senators prior to the Feb. 10 meeting. The purpose of the CEP is to provide an enforcement mechanism for already existing policy, to create new categories (in absentia student), and to clarify the rules for part-time and full-time graduate students. Professor Robinson

fielded a few questions about the policy.

Next meeting: Tuesday, March 17, 2015, 5:15 p.m. in Pamplin 32

The meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.