Meeting called to order at 1:02pm by President Pat Sims. Dr. Sims welcomed the expanded group.

1. Executive Committee Report
   No Executive Committee report as we have not met with the Provost since our last meeting.

2. Discussion Items
   The purpose of the called meeting is to discuss Reorganization Proposal #8 and the Gulf Coast Reorganization Proposal. The Provost prefers that concerns be followed up with recommended solutions.

   A. Reorganization Proposal #8: Four groups broke out to discuss proposal #8. Themes, issues, and solutions were then shared with the full group.

   1. Issues with nomenclature. “Faculty lead” and “program leads” and distinctions between the two are not clear. An attempt at consistency seems to be creating other problems.
   2. Associate Directors should be brought back and replace Faculty Leads. Ex-chairs can now become Associate Directors.
   3. Program Coordinators should be brought back and replace Program Lead.
   4. It seems confusing for students as to who they would go to.
   5. How can School organizational structures be supportive of unique needs, including geographic distances and multiple buildings. Can you organize schools around work flows?
   6. Compensation is not mentioned in this document at all, except for that it is to be negotiated with Deans and Directors. Compensation in the equivalence of summer course pay could work. Would this extend beyond orientations? Make people 12 month if they work in the summer. Do not tie summer compensation to summer enrollment. Directors have less discretion in making decisions about summer compensation.
   7. Research active faculty can be excluded in serving as faculty or program leads. Why? It will negatively impact their research and if grant active, they might be bought out in the summer. (We know that some faculty who are research active are also competent administrators).
   8. Flexibility. Size and complexity of school still needs to be addressed. This does not seem to be addressed in the document. Cannot schools define efficient models?
   9. At the same time, how much flexibility is actual possible? We are being denied requests for actual needs.
   10. Equity and parity. This is why counting majors does not work. Different majors have different needs and require different resources.
   11. It seems like we are being asked to “find out way” this year.
   12. We are all inheriting what we were left with on June 30.
   13. The economic realities of the University and how they drive this are not clear.
   14. How much is enough for a program to make? Are we looking at productivity across the school level? Or are we looking at programs microscopically?
   15. Do we really need to go with the three models in the document? What if none of these models fit?
B. Gulf Coast Reorganization proposal:
1. There are accreditation issues if programs are split.
2. If the reorganization is meant to be premised on disciplines, then why is this one based on geography?
3. How does this mesh with reorganization goals of greater efficiency, synergy, etc.? It seems to be going back to an old idea about two separate universities. It seems like no one is making a decision to move forward in terms of resolving this.
4. It seems unlikely that students would be willing to do all four years on the coast.
5. Is this about creating academic clusters that are unique to the coast?
6. How complete is this document? Is it a done deal?
7. There are serious issues about faculty evaluation.
8. How does this reinforce our goals of operational efficiency? It seems like this creates some operational duplication and/or redundancy. We do acknowledge that efficiencies can be addressed and increased.
9. This document is about separation. We have heard that it is not; but that seems to not be true.
10. What are the concerns of the coast faculty?
11. The bottom line: this contradicts the charge to the Directors to do what they need to do.
12. We do have Associate Deans from each college on the coast and it is working well in some instances. In other schools/colleges, Directors have a strong presence on campus and that model is working well. What is wrong with these models?
14. The budget: Directors never see them and have no input. Directors are held responsible, so they should have the authority to manage these things.
15. 2014: the non-academic side of the university was reorganized. This seems to be in the face of this.
16. How do we assure that curriculum drift doesn’t happen from campus to campus?

3. Announcements:
A. Bylaws and constitutions revision is underway. Please review. The executive committee will start working on the revision.
B. Undergraduate Bulletin. Please review for accuracy.
C. Website revisions and redirects.