# MEETING - ATTENDANCE & MINUTES
January 18, 2022- 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
VIA ZOOM
Presiding: Dr. Ann Marie Cavazos, Faculty Senate President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Officers (Present)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Senators (Present Cont.)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Deans (Present)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ann Marie Cavazos, President</td>
<td>Dr. Roscoe Hightower</td>
<td>Dr. Allyson Watson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tiffany Ardley – Vice President</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Gragg</td>
<td>Dr. Deidre A. Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jamal Brown – Secretary</td>
<td>Dr. Hsuan Huang</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Alo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. James Muchovje – Parliamentarian</td>
<td>Dr. Jeffrey Wilkinson</td>
<td>Dr. Valencia Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Robin Butler</td>
<td>Dr. Johnnie L. Early II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Senators (Present)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Senators (Absent)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Deans (Absent)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jenelle Robinson</td>
<td>Dr. Islam El-Sharkawy</td>
<td>Dr. Bettye A. Grable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Odhimbo</td>
<td>Dr. Keerthisinge Senevirathne</td>
<td>Dr. Shelley A. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Muhammad Haseeb</td>
<td>Dr. Clement Allen</td>
<td>Dr. Jeneen Surrency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lavetta Henderson</td>
<td>Mr. Anthony Thompson</td>
<td>Mr. Artiste Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ezzeldin Aly</td>
<td>Dr. Shonda Bernadin</td>
<td>Dr. Novell Tani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Patricia Broussard</td>
<td>Dr. Peter Kalu</td>
<td>Dr. Victor Ibeanusi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Cynthia Ramkellawan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bridgette Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ebenezer Oriaku</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Arlesia Mathis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edith Onyeozili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Osborne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Micheal Thornton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kyle Eidahl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kyle Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Terrell Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jeneen Surrency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Novell Tani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Courtney Micots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kenisha Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuchun Liang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Karen Southwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Phyllis Reaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kurt Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Craig Huffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Leon Prosper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EX-OFFICIO (Non-Voting)</strong></th>
<th><strong>SGA (Voting) (Present)</strong></th>
<th><strong>SGA (Voting) (Absent)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Taylor</td>
<td>Mr. Christopher Allen</td>
<td>Mr. Artiste Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Administrators (Present)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Administrators (Absent)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President Larry Robinson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Maurice Edington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. **Request to amend agenda** - Dr. Cavazos motioned to amend the Meeting Agenda to include Dr. Genyne Boston’s report on University Policy under new business
   a. Moved by Dr. Osborne, 2nd by Dr. Oriaku. **Motion passes with no objections.**

II. **Meeting called to Order** - Dr. Ann Marie Cavazos, Faculty Senate President at 3:01pm

III. **Approval of the Meeting Agenda** – January 18, 2022, meeting
    a. Moved by Dr. Osborne 2nd Dr. Oriaku – **motion passes with no objections**

IV. **Approval of Meeting Minutes** – November 16, 2021, minutes
    a. Moved Dr. Ardley, 2nd Dr. Arlethia Mathis - **motion passes with no objections**

V. **Opening Remarks by Dr. Cavazos**

   Good afternoon, Senators, Faculty, President Robinson, Provost Edington, Deans, administrators, Staff, and honored guests

   Happy New Year, and welcome back to Spring semester 2022. I hope you had a wonderful holiday season with family and friends and got some much-needed rest.
We had a great first Fall semester, and things seemed as though they were moving along, and we were finally out of the woods, but then Omicron happened. Once again, we find ourselves with a new variant to fight, and since then, there have been several variants identified. More than ever, we need to keep vigilant until we receive an all-clear from our medical and government officials.

Faculty, I encourage you to continue to keep yourselves safe as possible. Right now, it feels as though we'll never be done with the Pandemic, but I assure you we will be. So, let us continue to do our part to observe all proper protocols to keep ourselves, our families and friends, and our students safe. Again, I commend you on a job well done!

As we have just celebrated Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s day, let us not forget the essence of Dr. King's message. Dr. King once wrote that non-violent resistance "is a courageous confrontation of evil by the power of love."

Having read Henry David Thoreau's Essay on Civil Disobedience as a freshman at Morehouse College, Dr. King became fascinated with the idea of "refusing to cooperate with an evil system."

Then, how imperative it is that we at FAMU, an HBCU institution, continue to hold up the torch and run with the dream first laid out by Dr. King! We must stand firm until our children's children's children see that day when they are genuinely judged, not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character!

Faculty, thank you for your hard work and dedication to educating some of our nation's brightest and best students!

Thank you!

VI. Announcements

President Cavazos announcement #1 - I wanted to shout out to one of our senators Dr. Patricia Broussard. For the last 14 years, in conjunction with the City of Orlando and many other stakeholders (including our students, staff, and faculty at the College of Law faculty), she has stayed ahead of the day of giving back and cleaning
the Paramore Community. This event bridges and helps repair the breach in the Community of Paramore. The event in and of itself does not just talk about love, but its love shown by demonstration with community leaders making a difference and making our community safe. Unfortunately, the event was canceled for the safety of all. Still, Director Harrington and Dr. Broussard hosted a zoom meeting on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day for our students, faculty, and anyone else who wanted to join. The theme was, "what should the FAMU law school do to keep Dr. King's legacy alive"? It was wonderful and filled with great comments, and I just wanted to do a shout-out and applaud Dr. Broussard for the 14 years she has been hosting this event.

President Cavazos announcement #2 – Tallahassee Democrat names FAMU COVID – 19 Testing Center “person of the year” - I wanted to shout out the COVID-19 testing site which was named the “2021 person of the year by the Tallahassee Democrat" and recognized for their dedication and efforts in the face of the ongoing pandemic. Also, to Tanya Tatum and her team, thank you for keeping us all safe and protected and keeping us abreast of all that's happening in our community.

Student Body Vice President Marcus Thomas - Greetings everyone. I just wanted to say on behalf of the student body and student government association, that we thank you all for your diligent work and everything that do to keep us safe. It does not go unnoticed, and we appreciate all of your efforts.

VII. University Administration Remarks – University President Dr. Larry Robinson

   a. Well, good afternoon, everyone, and Happy New Year. Thank you, President/Trustee Cavazos, for giving me just a few minutes to give this sort of a high-level overview of things at the university. Let me begin first by commending Drs. Ardley and Eidahl for their consistent engagement at leadership team meetings. This year and in the past the body has been well represented by those individuals. Slight correction that the entire COVID-19 testing site (not just Tanya Tatum) was named the person of the Year by the Tallahassee Democrat. Also, an acknowledgement is due to Dr. Cynthia M. Harris who in the early stages worked with me and the Department of Health to get the site up and running.
It really just filled my heart to see them get the recognition that they deserve. By the way, they have administered approximately 575,000 tests at the site, since its inception. In April of 2020, it was the longest standing Community based testing site in this region. We also have a combined site as many of you know. The site offers vaccines for all eligible ages in all vaccination types right here on our campus. Once again, it’s a testament to Ms. Tatum and all of the people that she worked with on a day-to-day basis to make that happen. We are approaching over 24,000 vaccinations administered at the side, since it began in February of last year.

So, overall, we see some very good and positive signals in terms of the future of this institution. As faculty, you serve tirelessly in your roles and as the student representative said, we don't ever want to take what you do for granted. Dr Friday-Stroud might be planning on talking about this later when she speaks, but I do want to tell you that we have broken another record in terms of fundraising. The board of trustees set a goal for me of $13.2 million this year, we had an internal goal of $15 million, and we have exceeded that we are approaching $16 million, which is all time high. So, thank you and I know a lot of you contributed to that!

I am a little bit “disappointed” in terms of our student recruitment. As I’ve been bragging that the average GPA for students entering for the fall of 2022 was an “impressive” 4.0. But it's fallen into the dumps now to 3.98, so we have to work on getting those 2 hundredths of a point back up! (lol) In other words, it looks like we are gearing up to put another crop of outstanding students before you to benefit from your knowledge and skills for the year to come. Another interesting phenomenon that we've noticed, too, is that once again it looks like we're going to have a record number of applications, high quality applications at that, again this year. We almost doubled the number of students who are transferring in the FAMU from other institutions. I'm not talking about a transfer from two-year institutions; I’m talking about other four-year degree granting institutions. This is largely due to the reputation of this institution which I think is really undergirded by the work that you do.

I had the benefit this weekend to attend the ribbon cutting ceremony for one of our former faculty members, Dr. Charles Evans who was an
associate Dean at one time School of Business and Industry and the Tallahassee President of the NAACP chapter for 14 years. We got a chance to dedicate this pond in a once segregated community where he was one of the first African Americans to live in that area. I can't tell you how wonderful that made me feel to participate in that event on Dr. Martin Luther King Jr’s actual birthday. It was quite moving event to see so many people coming out to witness that event. The legislative session started a week or so ago and as always, I already have a huge number of meetings planned and activities, as well as a couple of opportunities where they're coming to campus.

We are hosting “above the rim” where we're inviting the legislators to come and attend a basketball game and at the same time, we will have an opportunity to speak with them about FAMUs priorities for this upcoming session. Just in case you forgot, you know that our number one priority is student success! We are also trying to do things for faculty members, because we know critical role that you play in our student success. We have asked for approximately $14-15 million to support our student success initiatives and another $6 million to support some of the initiatives at the joint engineering school. Also, we have invited Brian Lamb (newly elected chair of the Board of Governor’s) to visit FAMU’s campus, in particular the FAMU DRS where he went as a student. We will be celebrating Brian Lamb Day at FAMU DRS during the board of Governor’s meeting. If you're in town, hopefully, you can come by and attended next week.

The Presidents, Provosts, joint engineering program Dean and leaders from FAMU and FSU had an opportunity to host the vice, Chair of the Board of Governors for fairly extensive detailed visit the College of engineering. Mr. Eric. Silagy happens to be the President of Florida Power and Light, one of the second largest utilities in the nation. And he's on a mission to increase the engagement between the State university institutions in the private sector. He was really thrilled to see the extent of the research that happens at the College. He believes that if we did more to market that research, we could build a strong relationship with the private sector here in the state of Florida with our faculty and staff, and I think that's going to be a priority. They've already had a series of meetings in the past year and a half with leaders in different sectors of the private sector to the Board of Governor’s meetings to talk and so forth.
Mr. Silagy has been very instrumental in shepherding those meetings and making it happen so I'm looking forward to this being very productive. FAMU has had a unique relationship with the private sector, so there's an opportunity for faculty. Also, an opportunity in particular for our students to gain employment.

VIII. University Administration Remarks – University Provost Dr. Maurice Edington

a. **Spring Semester** - First, just wanted to share a few quick thoughts on the Spring semester. Want to thank you all our faculty for your continued hard work and dedication and helping to manage the university through this pandemic and particularly for working with your students and helping to address their needs. We know that we're getting a lot of COVID cases. Students are having to miss class and now I'm starting to see cases where faculty are having to miss class as well. So, we appreciate you all, and your flexibility and there's one thing I wanted to clarify. When you're working with your students to address their needs, particular students who have to miss class due to COVID, faculty have a lot of flexibility on how you work with your students. We want to be as flexible as possible, and I've heard many different practices that have been used across the colleges and schools. Some of those practices include allowing the student to join the class via zoom for very short period of time, providing work to the students or providing recordings of classroom lectures. There is a lot that you can do, and I just wanted to clarify that we encourage you to work with the students during that time and then work with your deans, if you have any questions about strategies that you want to run by them. You know what we want and expect is really for you to be flexible working with the students.

b. **AORs** - Also I see later the agenda; Mr. Bailey is going to talk about AORs because there seems to be some feedback on that topic and changes in the FTE calculations. One of the things I'm going to do is have one on one meetings with each Dean to talk about the particular issues and concerns in the colleges and schools, because every area is different, and I've gotten feedback that the situations are not uniform. The concerns are unique to some very specific programs, particularly those that have clinical and lab components. I want to get to the heart of the matter, to see what particularly areas need to share with the
administration so that we can continue working collectively and collaboratively on those things.

c. **Budget and Planning process** - For the budget and planning process, I just wanted to share that the CFO and budget director presented some information to lose your team this morning and we're actually going to talk about. Dr. Robinson has a retreat this Saturday, with his leadership team. Your deans are going to work with the particular programs following the guidelines that would be disseminated very soon on what the process is going to be this cycle and one of the main strategies is to find some creative and aggressive ways to identify resources that can be directed and reallocated towards some of the pressing strategic initiatives that we have. So, the CFO and others will share more information, very soon on that particular that process.

d. **Strategic planning** - For our strategic planning, we're moving forward with having stakeholder engagement sessions, Dr McMurray, is working with our excellent consultant, and they have scheduled a series of sessions that you see below reaching out to various groups. And we want to get feedback on our goals and strategies. One thing I would offer if the Senate wanted a special session, we could certainly work with Dr. Cavazos to arrange and we’ll schedule targeted focus group with this body, if you all want to do that. We're moving forward with the plan and we're on target to have a final plan later at the end of the Semester for review but are going to be a lot of other activities over the next few months. We want to make sure that we incorporate opportunities to solicit feedback from key stakeholder group so that's what this series of focus group sessions are going to attempt to do.
Leadership Development - Another topic mentioned this before in a previous meeting one of our strategic initiatives is around leadership development. We have a pressing need to cultivate and develop our internal talent. We continue to have departures and key roles across the university and in academic affairs specifically, and I don't want to just rely on looking outside only for these opportunities. The long-term view that I'm speaking about is that I do want to have a concerted internal effort to identify cultivate develop people who have potential and interests. These people possibly assume higher leadership roles at the university, which is very important for us and our livelihood as an institution. I wanted to give an update just to let you know this is under development and is coming soon. Emerging leadership initiative is targeting a subset of our faculty we're going to try to have a six-month program where we engage initial cohort in a series of training and development activities using a variety of strategies and topics. Examples are financial management, leadership development, personal grievance, conflict resolution, etc. We're going to finalize the details, so that we can get the process started in a few weeks. It’s going to be competitive and we have a limited number of slots and we're still finalizing that exact number. We want to be competitive, and so you can expect to hear some details about how that application process is going to work and what the time frame this will occur.
f. **Academic Program Prioritizing Initiative:** The last topic is just update on the academic program prioritization initiative. You've heard me give updates here and we had a workshop with the board in December. We're now moving into the next phase and doing this to ensure FAMU has a suite of academic programs that are meeting demands and needs. Also, we need to allocate resources in the most effective, efficient manner as possible. That includes the process taking a rigorous look at all the academic programming.

### Academic Program Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Why are we doing this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Academic program prioritization is the process used by an academic institution to assess and prioritize programs, departments, and services in order to ensure the strategic allocation of current university funding and resources.</td>
<td>- Shape the existing and academic future of academic programming at FAMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic program prioritization ensures that critical decisions regarding academic programs and resource allocation are aligned with strategic goals and institutional mission.</td>
<td>- Use a data-driven process to prioritize academic programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify opportunities for program enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify potential areas for resource allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline

Phase I (Completed June 30, 2021)
- Develop a model and conduct a comprehensive assessment of academic program offerings against workforce needs, demand, productivity and institutional priorities

Phase II (December 30, 2021)
- Develop a ranked list of programs based on the evaluation methodology
- Incorporate recommendations and enhancements from external partners
- Solicit feedback from academic programs and Trustees

Phase III (June 30, 2022)
- Solicit additional feedback from academic programs and Trustees
- Finalize decisions on enhancement of resource allocations with priorities
- Identify short list of high potential new programs assessed against prioritization framework
- Incorporate analysis tools developed by external partner (HelioCampus)
- Plans for stakeholder syndication

Program Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program pathways</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>% of programs</th>
<th>Potential outcomes</th>
<th>Illustrative program performance levers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Priority for enhancement/ investment | Programs considered strategic priorities that are or can be areas of distinction, targeted for disproportionate investment relative to current levels based on significant future potential | Top 5% | Begin immediate business case development | • Grow degrees produced  
• Invest in research  
• Add new courses |
| Consider for enhancement/ investment | Programs that slightly over-deliver degrees produced; outcome returns relative to their resourcing, may be considered for additional investment relative to current levels based on future potential | Next 5% | Next wave of business case development or as resources allow | • See above |
| Sustain | Programs that deliver degrees produced; outcome returns proportionate to their resourcing, with opportunities for targeted investment | Next 65% | Maintain current resourcing and trajectory | • Optimize financial aid |
| Transform/ Consolidate | Programs that under-deliver degrees produced; outcome returns relative to their resourcing; a formal support plan would help realize significant opportunity for improvement | Next 20-25% | Program leaders to develop an improvement plan | • Focus on instructional efficiency (e.g., course and section optimization, faculty workload)  
• Merge with an existing program |
| Further review/ Potential reduction or elimination | Programs on this path have consistently under/over delivered relative to their resourcing and receive minimal student demand and interest | Lesser of bottom 5% or programs with an overall score < 3.0 | Initiate conversations between Provost and program leaders | • Reallocate investment and reduce program  
• Potential program elimination |

1. Programs excluded from scoring: MS in Systems Engineering (less than 3 years old), PhD in Dentistry (cooperative program), GIS and GIS Cybersecurity (less than 3 years old)

g. Questions for the Provost

i. Question (Dr. Cavazos) – The Emerging Leadership program will focus on internal and external candidates? Will there be a reduced course load for those participants selected?
1. **Answer (Provost Edington)** – this will likely be a combination of both. We have some talented internal personnel that would be great for sessions. Dr. Robinson jokes that he will lead a session on “how to be a great interim” lol. And no, there will not be a reduced course load.

ii. **Question (Dr. Margaret Larose)** – Do people have to apply? Where can the applications be found?

1. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - this hasn’t been finalized yet, but over the next few weeks it will be finalized. No later than early February.

iii. **Question (Dr. Hightower)** – Can we get an update on the instructor promotion process?

1. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - the reviews are underway, but they are moving through the different committee members (same as the professor process)

iv. **Comment (Dr. Hightower)** – The UFF is ready to engage on all AOR matters. Please let us know when you’d like to engage.

v. **Question (Dr. John Odhiambo)** - Is the professional development a one-time deal or periodic offering?

1. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - Hopefully annually after doing it this first cohort we will be able to make the program available each year.

vi. **Question (Dr. Cavazos)** - Dealing with academic prioritization, after the metrics scoring is done, how will the final decisions be made? If subjective, what are the guiding principles?

1. **Answer (Provost Edington)** – A lot of them will be made with the programs. There may be programs placed in ranking categories. Decisions have to be made based on the effectiveness of the program and also the needs of the University. There may be a program that is placed in a certain category with ranking because maybe it’s it has a lot of strengths but has an issue of low degree
production. So then, there are some decisions that have been made, in this case to increase degree production. The worst-case scenario is that program X would be to downsize or other actions, but it’s a much larger decision. The decision isn’t subjective because we are wanting to use data and evidence.

vii. Question (Dr. Cavazos) – How does degree production factor in? Are there Faculty Senate representation on this committee?

1. Answer (Provost Edington) – Degree production is an important metric with all of our academic units. The state of Florida (SUS) and legislature has prioritized degrees in certain disciplines. They’ve done this through the performance-based funding motel and incentives for producing degrees in certain areas. FAMU has to produce more programs with a strategic emphasis. We can’t decide internally not to go by the set priorities, as they are set by the state. We get penalized when we don’t have the required degree mix. The data from targeted programs are impactful in our grading. Those aren’t the only important metrics. The approach was to identify what’s important to FAMU and to the Board of Trustees. At the end of the day, the existing programs have to focus on what FAMU needs and what will make FAMU strong. This also isn’t a committee for Faculty Senate representation, rather it’s an administrative process.

viii. Question (Dr. Cavazos) - Regarding the academic programs, have the schools/colleges provided their input in the process, or is it a leadership decision regarding the academic programs?

1. Answer (Provost Edington) - We have met with a subset of the departments but will be meeting with others over the next few months.

ix. Question (Dr. Cavazos) – What’s the status on the Associate Provost of Graduate studies?

1. Answer (Provost Edington) - We are almost done.
Interviews are done with the finalists. The last few steps are taking place and hopefully an announcement will be made by the end of January.

x. **Question (Dr. Richard Gragg)** – Are you thinking of overall integration across the campus with environmental climate issues in terms of what’s happening globally and how we can integrate them across the curriculum.

1. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - Please include it when I visit your program so that we can discuss. We need to be innovated with how we approach the future of FAMU. We need to challenge ourselves to think about the future of our institution. It’s about 10 to 20 years from now, what is sustainability look like for FAMU? The question is how will this make FAMU viable, dynamic, and competitive when I’m gone? Our peer institution is thinking this way, who we have to compete with.

2. **Answer (President Robinson),** We have to identify new programs that may be initiation. These new programs usually come from within the units. We need to be more deliberate with the problem that we are trying to solve. Programs like environmental sciences is a great example of integration across various disciplines.

**CONTINUING BUSINESS**

IX. **Approval of Final Constitution Revision - Dr. Cavazos.** The last review was completed by the University Administration.

- Motion to approve the final Constitution Revision made by Dr. Daniel Orborne, 2nd By Dr. Ezzeldin Aly.

**Approved with no objections.**

Dr. Cavazos thanks the committee members who started this process almost two years ago. Thanks to Dr. Eidahl, the Chair of the Committee, Provost Edington, President Robinson, and General counsel. I appreciate you, the senators, the faculty for their input and
everything to get this approved. Ms. Milliner will email the document to the general faculty body for approval.

X. Curriculum Committee report - Dr. Kyle Eidahl

Curriculum Committee Report to the Faculty Senate
January 2022

The January 2022 report of the Curriculum Committee to the Faculty Senate contains 3 online requests and 2 new certificate programs. These requests were approved by the Committee at its January 12 meeting. The Committee recommends approval of all the requests by the Faculty Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Program Name</th>
<th>Description of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDA 6199 - International Perspectives in Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Existing Course (Online)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Program Name</th>
<th>Description of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABE 4224 - Non-Point Source Pollution and Environmental Change</td>
<td>Existing Course (Online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE 4232 - Water Management and Climate Change</td>
<td>Existing Course (Online)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/Program Name</th>
<th>Description of Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Certificate In Engineering Data Analytics</td>
<td>New Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Engineering Leadership</td>
<td>New Certificate Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  a. We have three (3) online course requests that are being converted. They have been approved by OIT. The other 2 requests are for certificate programs and have been approved from FSU (for the college of Engineering) but need to be approved by FAMU. These have been approved by the college and university committees.

  b. **Motion to accept curriculum report** by Dr. Tiffany Ardley, and 2nd by Dr. Patricia Brossard.

  c. **Motion approved to accept with no objections**

XI. Executive Council Update - Dr. Kyle Eidahl and Dr. Tiffany Ardley

  a. Dr. Eidahl - We’ve discussed construction moving forward with Bragg Stadium. The stadium should be ready for the fall. University is paving a lot of the gravel lots for ease of use. COVID-19 return kits will be at the Lawson Center today and tomorrow. Congrats to FAMU COVID-19
testing center who tested 4,200 people during the first day back from the winter break. They can do the PCR tests as well and have amazing times for getting results back.

b. **Dr. Tiffany Ardley** – faculty need to remove attendance holds if appropriate. Please make sure that you are clicking them as attending, which holds up their financial aid. President Robinson interjects that there are 3000 students (over 1/3 of the students) will not get their monies if this is not done ASAP.

c. **Question (Dr. Cavazos)** - Instead of increasing housing by 4%, can’t we just get federal funds?

i. **Answer (President Robinson)** - We have not made plans to increase housing or meal plan prices at this time. We have been using federal funds as best as we can at this time. The good news is that housing is over 90% occupation which is great compared to 2020. We are approaching limits in quarantine and isolation for students.

**NEW BUSINESS**

XII. **Tenure and Promotion Concerns - Dr. Genyne Boston**

a. Thank you for the invitation previously to attend the steering committee and I think that is what prompted my visit today so. I'm happy to be here to give tenure and promotion updates, as well as brief updates around the academic policies committee. We have at 48 faculty candidates for either tenure only tenure and promotion or instructor promotion and right now the candidates have all of their materials in. They have and they have been set up so that the university wide committee will be able to start their review. They typically begin their review sometime in mid-January when everything has settled down with the classes, because many of the Members of the university wide committee are also teaching faculty. They will meet every Friday for at least two hours reviewing all of this material all of that information has been assembled. I’m waiting to hear back from the committee chair as to when they are going to actually have their first meeting. There was a question that I received as to whether they were meeting, and that committee has not started the review process as of yet.
I also wanted to note or revisit some of the things that came out of a very robust discussion during our Steering Committee that had to do with the instructor promotion process and the candidates, some of the issues they may have countered in just a few select colleges and schools. There were things during that discussion in the steering committee that were brought to my attention around the request for additional information that might not be specific to tenure and or promotion criteria. There was information being requested outside or beyond the timeline for when that information could be requested. There was also mentioned, of a delay of instructor cases being created. All of that information was very good to it was very good to get that feedback from members of the Steering Committee who, in turn, had spoken to individuals who are candidates, whether it be for tenure earning positions or non-tenure earning positions. I’ve had discussions with the provost and some things that have come out as a result of the feedback received in that Steering Committee which I'm going to talk about briefly.

We are going to plan for our next application period, which will likely begin immediately after we have had the tenure recommendations approved by the Board of Trustees and then all of the promotion recommendations finalized in July. We will then begin with our workshops and various orientation sessions for individuals who play very key roles in facilitating the entire review process. One of the things that we are going to have will be orientation training for all of our dean's so that they clearly understand some of the guidelines around tenure and promotion, the do's and don'ts. We also going to have an orientation training for committee chairs that have been identified for the various colleges and schools, so that they understand how to facilitate that process within their respective academic units and then ultimately help to shepherd the cases through the process until they get to the university wide committee and then on to the provost.

We will also look to have additional training for case managers. This is something that we already offer on a regular basis. We typically have two workshops for case managers and one of the things that we determined this semester is that there were some new department chairs or new division directors or potentially some individuals who had been identified to serve on an interim basis, who were not as
familiar with the electronic platform that we use to facilitate the tenure promotion process. We want to make sure that we have the names of anyone who may be serving in an interim basis, anyone who is newly elected or appointed to serve as a department chair or division director, so that they can participate in these trainings as well.

We will also complete our tenure audit, so we are working with our dean’s, associate deans, and assistant deans to conducting audits so that we have a running roster of all of the tenure earning faculty and the dates in which they will apply for tenure. We also will gather any information around credit granted at the time of hire towards tenure. We are hopefully working towards finalizing all of the revisions to tenure or promotion criteria for Academic units. We have a special committee that is working with that effort and we since adding the instructor promotion criteria. That information has now been taken back to each of the units, so that they can provide appropriate updates and it's our hope that we'll be able to stamp all of those as newly revised tenure and promotion criteria for all of our academic units.

b. **Question (Dr. James Muchovej)** – Will you be sending those proposed changes to Dr. Hightower for consideration?

   i. **Answer (Dr. Boston)** - Yes, we will do that as a courtesy notification when we get the final versions.

c. **Question (Dr. Robert Taylor)** – Are we going to look at criteria for research assistant professors too? We don’t have the criteria and it’s very needed. This may be good for other colleges also.

   i. Dr. Boston, we can deifiningly do that. If you’d like to introduce that to Dr. Hicks, it will be good. It’s good to have something that looks uniform across the University, so if Dr. Hicks wants to bring that to our committee, I welcome that opportunity.

XIII. **Policy Updates – Dr. Genyne Boston** *(Updates on a few policies from the academic policy committee under leadership of Dr. Valerie white. Please see document “Academic Policy Summary 2022” for a full description of each policy.)*

   a. **First year great exclusion policy** – First-Time in College (FTIC) students who earn a D or lower in a General Education course during their first year at Florida A&M University (FAMU) may repeat the course within
twelve months and exclude the original grade from their GPA. This particular policy was submitted to the board of trustees on December 3 and the policy must post for 30 days prior to being ratified. We are waiting information from the general counsel as to when the policy was actually posted, but that is in process.

b. **Undergraduate transfer credit policy** - A student who has attended any regionally accredited college or university and has earned 12 or more semester hours of transferable college credit since receiving a standard high school diploma or its equivalent is considered a transfer student upon admission to Florida A&M University (FAMU). This policy is currently based on the current regulation. This policy along with the academic recovery policy is now under review by the general counsel's office and confirmed for next steps.

c. **Name change policy** - Students may change their first name to a preferred name in iRattler Student Center. Preferred name change may affect Class roster, Diploma, FAMU ID card, Self-Service advisee list, Self-Service class roster and Student email account. This policy has been finalized, along with the major declaration policy that has been finalized, and that is in process of leaving the division of academic affairs and headed to the office of the President for signature.

d. **Posthumous degree memorial certificate policy** - A posthumous degree recognizes academic effort of a student (current or active) who made significant progress toward degree completion, having fulfilled a minimum of 75% of program(degree) requirements at the time of their passing or medical condition that led to their passing. Students who have not been enrolled at the institution for one academic year, will not been deemed active. We just finished up with a posthumous degree memorial certificate policy that we just approved in our last meeting last Wednesday. This has finally been approved, and we will be able to go ahead and move that forward for final approval at other levels.

e. **Academic recovery policy** - Academic warning occurs when a student’s cumulative grade point average (GPA) is below 2.0 for the first time during their enrollment. A student on Academic Warning will have a hold placed on the student’s registration until he or she has met with an academic advisor and developed an academic plan of
study to improve their GPA. (BOT Policy 4.012)

f. Question (Dr. Muchovej) --: Is there an update on sabbatical leave applications of day timelines available regarding the process?

i. Answer (Dr. Boston) - Yes, so the sabbatical committee has finalized their recommendations and the announcements will be made at the next Board of Trustees meeting. I believe that meeting is scheduled for February 17. So, the that information has been submitted to the Provost.

g. Question (Dr. Nathan Eriakhumen) - Any plans for academic research tenure positions?

i. Answer - Dr. Edington, this should come from the academic units, and we can begin those conversation then. If they have a need for it, it should start with the college or school. Then, the criteria from your school for tenure and promotion should be created to reflect what you are wanting to do, and we can look at it.

XIV. Assignment of Responsibility (AOR) - Mr. Herbert Bailey. (Mr. Bailey is not present at the meeting because he is in a meeting with a consultant. Dr. Edington has stepped in during this conversation to capture/discuss AOR concerns).

a. Question (Mr. Christopher Allen, Secretary of Academic Affairs in SGA) - I wanted to ask where you wanted SGA to help with the issues amongst the different colleges and schools for students? How can we help you to better understand the problems that students may have? How can we help you guys get a better understanding of like the issues that students may have academically different things like that?

i. Answer (Provost Edington) - I think it may be helpful if we get a set of regular meetings. This way your team and my team can meet regularly and then that would that provide a pathway to talk. We certainly want to hear any feedback that you all have as students. A structured process like that would be very helpful for you and administration. I can connect Dr Boston (the Associate Provost) so that she can work out a schedule and then we can make sure that we use that process to communicate.
b. **Question (Dr. Jamal Brown)** – As a faculty member, I almost feel like it’s a crossfire that we are caught between. I’m hearing the Union speak of how this document isn’t approved for our AOR calculations, however they are being used. When I’m going back to my colleagues as a representative, I’m trying to make sure that we’re giving them the correct information. It's almost a crossfire because, on one hand there's a tone that the information should not be used and that it's not approved. On the other hand, if I’m being handed a document by of my supervisors who says that I need to sign this, it's very confusing. I wanted to see if you could just maybe provide a little bit of clarity on if this draft document even something that we’re supposed to be using at this moment or is this something that after it’s approved that we’re going to be using. Right now, we're being asked to still go from these new numbers and to sign AORs based off of the new numbers that haven’t been approved yet.

    i. **Answer (Provost)** That’s why the Union and administration are going to meet because that's the issue that the Union has requested to sit down at the bargaining table to discuss. The other response is why I want to come around and meet with the units separately because I’ve heard different things from the feedback. I would like to know what the concerns are in your areas so we can have those conversations. I can’t address the issues until we have the conversations.

 c. **Comment (Dr. Jamal Brown)** - If I could I do want to just give an example with pharmacy practice faculty like myself, that was a concern from some of our discussions. Some faculty like myself that may be stationed somewhere like Tampa General Hospital. One of my concerns is that my partnership with the hospital says I’m here let's say 24 hours a week, but if I look at my AOR regardless on the percent of time that I’m being given front of university that has nothing to do with my time I'm just like here at the institution. It’s the same type of problem for nursing. The faculty that at clinical practice sites we're spending 30 to 40 hours a week at a site managing patients and we’re really here real hours with them, but when I look on my AOR is says that I get 16% for this time. When we go up for promotion and tenure, is going to look like we were never anywhere near 80% on our AORs even though I’ve spent most of my work week seeing patients.
i. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - that's the perfect example of why we need had a conversation because that's a very specific set of concerns that are different from other areas. I will say I said is appealing, when we come around to the colleges and schools, we need more feedback. That's a process that I put in place so that I could work with your programs, and then we can also come back I have follow-up meetings and some of the areas I've taken advantage of that. It's all about trying to resolve and address the problems, not to run away from them at all. refine the problems at all, I promise you, and so I just said, you know what clearly there are some concerns across. It's also helpful to see how the other schools are handing these assignments for these clinically faculty and other teaching labs and then try to find the right spot for FAMU. It's going to take us working together and identifying what the issues are so I’m very committed to doing that.

d. **Comment (Dr. Roscoe Hightower):** Hello everyone again from a Union perspective, our place is not us versus them dynamic... we are all team members and teammates. However, there is this thing called the collective bargaining agreement which the hours for calculation have been agreed upon and are in writing. Until those FTE calculations are changed by us through the process (which hasn't happened yet), then what is called “status quo” (meaning the existing rules and regulations) will continue to apply. That's not me saying that...it’s the Florida statute and so that's where we are.

i. **Response (Provost Edington)** Can we not talk about bargaining issues. I did not bring up bargaining.

ii. **Response (Dr. Roscoe Hightower):** Yes, you did. I where we are for the Faculty is that we have an existing collective bargaining agreement that's in place. And that's the only thing that's acceptable for right now. Now what the future holds will be determined, but right now we have a contract, we are ready to bargain whenever we're met at the table. I thank you all for your time and there's nothing really else to say.

e. **Comment (Dr. Robin Butler) -** Good afternoon Happy New Year everybody, I just wanted to agree with Dr. Brown regarding confusion
and concerns about the clinical courses. In our discussion before with Mr. Bailey it was clear that at that point, there really was not a clear calculation comparable to those of the academic for that didactic courses. Just as Dr. Brown was sharing, we're with the students for a number of hours on a weekly basis. However, the didactic courses are being looked at it as the number of hours that the course is being offered. And we were informed that it was looking the clinical is looking at the number of students, but not the time that is involved in training the students. That's where the confusion is, because the allocation of time and effort does not seem to reflect the amount of time and effort that is put forward by faculty when we're in the labs and we're with the students for 12 hour shifts or six hour shifts on several days during the week. It doesn't seem to reflect that, and so we were we have concerns regarding that in looking at the clinical and being responsible for didactic lectures as well, is a lot of time that is not being clarified in our AOR to allow us the time to do additional work like committee, research, etc. My understanding is what is current doesn't really address clinical and really addressed that didactic only.

f. Comment (Dr. Maurice Holder) - I don't know when the Union becomes involved in standing between a faculty and its department. There's an agreement or what that person is going to do in the College and the Union simply as a generalized version that they should be an agreement, but as far as the preparation and the following through on the same spots will be that means the department and the faculty and administration of that college. We've worked out an agreement that has been approved years ago. Unless there's somebody who's trying to change what, the faculty has agreed on, then we shouldn't have a problem. In the College of Pharmacy rules and regulations we already decided. So, I think there's some individuals who are aware of this and trying to reexamine something that has been settled which is in place for the college until the administration and the policies governing change.

i. (Response) Dr. Richard Gragg - Whatever happens in the college and whatever the college agrees to, they still have to be in compliance with the collective bargaining agreement.

g. Question (Dr. John Odhiambo) - Some of us came in as teaching
faculty. The system only recognizes the research faculty vs. the teaching faculty. When they do our AORs, we are stuck in between because the system only recognizes teaching faculty. The AORs don’t account for the fact that faculty are doing other responsibilities also. Also, we aren’t even getting yearly evaluations as we should receive.

i. **Answer (Provost Edington)** – Provost asks if this issue has been sent to the dean. He recommends sending this issue to the Dean first before this forum. Provost Edington recommends that Dean Taylor and concerned faculty meet and discuss.

ii. **(Statement Dr. Cavazos):** The senators raised the questions about the AOR’s at the Steering Committee meeting. Hopefully, this forum will clarify and address the concerns that have plagued the faculty about AORs. As of January 7th, there was no negotiation and bargaining on the table concerning AORs. Administrators are instructing faculty to sign their AORs. But no one understands the calculations. We were hoping that Mr. Bailey would share information to clarify the confusion. I support the statements made by Drs. Butler and Brown. The SOAH clinical educators are having the same issue with AORs." That issue is across the board; it's affecting the university and the faculty members. The other "statement says, "these are very serious issues that seem to be occurring across campus." So today, we leave this meeting with difficult question of what to do." "if the faculty don’t follow the administrator of their school or college and refuse to sign the AOR, I being insubordinate" or "if I do follow am I violating the negotiations?" "so, we need "clarity. If this is going to become a bargaining issue, so be it, but we still need to know what we have to do in order move forward.

iii. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - I think one of my points is that's why I want to meet with the academic units. Do you see what I'm saying?

h. **(Question Dr. Cavazos)** - What do the faculty do in the meantime while you are meeting with the academic units?

i. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - First we have to talk about the problem because, even in this meeting here they're different.
My point is it's not the same problem. It's not every college and school either you see. I’ve talked to some Deans already about this. Where we see the concerns are clinically, teaching laboratories and so I want to get with those areas to talk about these specific issues as soon as we can. That's what I stress today. While we work with our Union colleague, I'm not going to step on the collective bargaining process because that’s a process we have. We can still have conversations and I can still get a better understanding of what the unique concerns are. That's why I’m saying there's two things that are going to be happening that hopefully will both get us where we get these issues resolved.

i. **Question (Dr. Cavazos)** - We have to resolve this matter. I have another message saying, “are our spring AOR calculations based on the current collective bargaining numbers on the books? Regardless of the issue within the units, what is being used now?

j. **Statement (Dr. Hightower)** - Why, I don't know whether it's for me or not, but our position is clear and we're on the team we're FAMUans. We're not standing in anyone's way, we are ready to move forward, we are ready to address all of these issues, we are ready. We don't have the authority to speak for the President and his team. That's up to them, all I can say to faculty is that we're ready, I hope that university is ready and let's all work on behalf of doing what's right for the institution. We know from prior senate meetings where I’ve said certain things about certain units, some of them are represented here today, others are not. As the young faculty member said earlier, they are in the middle, and we don't want anyone in the middle. This has already been argued this can be done.

i. **Response (President Robinson):** Madam President Cavazos, I just want to reiterate the point that we never walk away from the bargaining table. We are open and willing to sit down with Dr. Hightower and his team to talk about this and any other issue. The other thing that Dr. Holder mentioned is that we can’t randomly an arbitrarily make up rules right. There is a process associated with how we determine time and effort right, because this is a legal issue. We just can’t do it haphazardly, and so my suggestion is the provost comes around, everybody
understands that there is a process. If somebody came up to you as a faculty Member and randomly changes that process, then you have the opportunity to let us know. You can also let the Union know, and we can deal with it accordingly. For example, with tenure promotion, the fact that I can't dictate you know tenure promotion policies. That has to start with the faculty, and it comes up to a process. As you are very well familiar with, we don't have to agree with it, but it does start there.

We've been struggling with this time and effort issue for years and we're hearing something different now on the clinical side that we need to start to address. Until we come to a collective agreement on that I can’t arbitrarily change that as a department chair or dean just because I want to see that change. It may be in our best interest to see the change but there’s a process by which we have to follow before it can change. So, I think what we need to do, though, is determine when the clock starts and what were people doing at the time when they came. There are some rules for example, even tenure promotion criteria. I can't make those up retroactive. If a person is here, in less than three years, the new criteria can apply. After three years, they have the option of selecting the old criteria. We are here to work with you to help you get this settled, and so I’m hopeful that, with those conversations you have with the Provost and Dr Boston we can really have some honest frank discussions. You need to know what your options are when it comes to any effort to impose upon you, as faculty members if that has been happening.

k. **Response (Dr. Cavazos)** - President Robinson, that is exactly what Faculty here today have been expressing. There are changes; each school/has different criteria for calculating AORs. This issue needs to be settled rather than later, so Faculty can focus on being effective on the frontline, educating our students, and doing their work without having this unsettled issue looming over their heads. I appreciate your understanding of this issue. Like you and Provost both said in the past, you are Faculty first. The AOR's issue needs to move forward because we are in limbo. Today, we will leave the meeting without answers. Faculty are concerned and fearful of not signing the new AORs and the
ramifications if one chooses not to sign. A decision has to be made on the AORs so that Faculty can focus on working efficiently and effectively.

I. **Question (Dr. Jamal Brown)** - I'm still very confused. The AOR calculations that I received now are different from what's in collective bargaining and they are different from prior semesters. What I’m being asked to sign has different calculations than what’s published. So, I’m confused because I don’t want to be a rebel. Am I being rude to my supervisor, am I being insubordinate? Are we supposed to sign AORs? Faculty are in a crossfire and a very sticky situation. I appreciate the bargaining from side of the Union representatives and also from the leadership, but I think something I’m not understanding is what’s authorized right now. I understand that there's going to be some future bargaining, but if someone looks at Jamal Brown spring 2022 what's it based on? Is it based on collective bargaining or is it based on the draft document that hasn't gone through the approval process yet?

i. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - I see that the chat that Dr. Hightower said, “they are using us as an excuse to slow this down.” I love working with the Union and we have a good relationship. I would also like to make sure we clarify statements like that, because they know that we wanted to sit down and work it out. My response to the Union was “can we have an informal meeting” because I want to sit down at a table. I started trying to sit out so we could talk about it, but then it got to collective bargaining before we could even have the conversation. We currently have a demand to bargain from the Union, so the administration isn’t holding this up. I'm committed and it's not the administration making excuses and slowing things down. We do respect that process, so we can come to a resolution. That's where we are and I know I'm going to go back and report to our team that Dr. Hightower said in the senate meeting that he's ready. I’m making sure on our side of the table we're not holding up that part of the process, but at this point is something that is going to be addressed through the bargaining. My other point was, though, I want to really come to continue having these conversations at the unit level. There are some different opinions and we do need to resolve them.
quickly. But I hear the Union out and we are ready to sit down and begin the process.

ii. **Response (Dr. James Muchovej)** - Parliamentarian: Yes, Sir, and the title demand the bargain is a legal term for request. Let’s sit down come to the proper resolution of this particular thing. I think we would love to sit down at the table and start this process because it needs to be resolved.

iii. **Response (Provost Edington)** - And Dr. Muchovej, you know from our working our history, working together, the reason why I propose that is because we have a good track record of both parties sitting down at the table informally resolving issues.

iv. **Response (Dr. James Muchovej)** - Yes, yes, Sir, we will start sending you times when we can meet.

v. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - I just didn't want to leave the impressions in the minds of the faculty that the administration is making excuses and doesn't want to address it.

m. **Question (Dr. Tiffany Ardley)** - I have what I hope is a simple question, should our AORs currently be calculated, based on the publish CBA or the draft document? It's an A or B test question. I don't know whose question, it is, but that’s the question.

i. **Answer (Provost Edington)**: Well, the thing is that is an assumption embedded in question. The assumption is that there there's a conflict. If there's an issue in pharmacy, I want to come to the pharmacy. Let's have a meeting with y'all and talk about your issue to answer your questions and the same thing and nursing or another area. I can’t answer without looking at your AORs and seeing like Dr Brown, what is the assignment and then where's the contradiction with the CBA. There was an issue with FAMU’s data files and how we were accounting for time. FAMU wasn’t in alignment with state statute, so this is a big problem.

n. **Question (Dr. Tiffany Ardley)** - So should faculty who have those concerns refrain from signing AOR until it's clarified.

i. **Answer (Provost Edington)** - I'm not going to tell you to refrain
from signing your AOR. If you have a problem with your assignment, can make sure you communicate it to your dean so that when I circle back with your dean, I know that in your area there are some very specific issues that we need to address.

o. **Dr. Cavazos**: I want to be respectful of everyone’s time, as it is 5:07pm. Maybe we could have one more question/comment.

i. **Answer (Provost Edington)**: So that it's clear one of the first areas we need to meet with this pharmacy and nursing.

p. **Comment (Dr. Roscoe Hightower)** - I want to say that we were ready, and we will act on the best interest of faculty at the university immediately.

i. **Response (President Robinson)** - I think we need to be careful in this conversation realizing that the best of what we said, will not be the part that is captured. It will be the headline that gets the most attention. The headline right now could very well be “they’re using this as an excuse to slow this down”. I hope that isn't the case because it's definitely not true. If I was trying to sell newspapers, that would be what I would pick from this whole conversation, out of all the wonderful conversation we've had today about so many great things Dr Hightower. I think that's so wrong, because I think the administration and faculty are on the same side of things and there's sort of a false dichotomy. The headline that I want to see is that we are working together.

q. **Comment (Dr. Genyne Boston)**: Yes, I know that we are wrapping up and so maybe I want to take us out on a positive note, I have shared the information. Regarding the academic policies and provided a summary of that. I also wanted to just bring to the attention of everyone that I placed in the chat the spring 2022 teaching and learning schedule that has a number of workshops that are specific to tenure and promotion being offered this spring, so please join us.

r. **President Cavazos** - I just want to say again, on behalf of the Faculty Thank you President Robinson, Provost Edington for taking your time to hear the concerns and doing the best at this present time to
address it. I look forward to when the day comes that it has been negotiated for all faculty. I just want to say thank you so much for hearing us. On a positive note, the members that participated in the constitution revision are as follows: The Chair was Dr. Kyle Eidahl, Dr Robert Abrams, Dr. Ali, Dr. Ardley, Dr Broussard, Dr. Cooper (who's now associate dean of the College of law), Karen Demean, Dr Guthrie, Dr Holder, Dr Hunter, Dr. Muchovej, Dr. Robin Perry, Dr. Thornton and Dr Perry. Thank you all for your commitment!

s. **Dr. Cavazos:** There’s a question directed to you in the chat, President Robinson. It’s from Arielle Mealy, member of the university athletic committee.

i. **Response (President Robinson)** - Yes, I did see that. I sent her incorrectly the announcement from the summer. To my knowledge, I haven't heard about the January announcement, yet it could have happened, and I missed it. I haven't seen anything. While we were here, I was trying to search Google and so forth, but I haven't heard anything about the recent announcement other than those that were announced this summer and this fall. I'll keep my eye out for it and the way you will actually now is that we will very quickly put it up on the website. We don't waste any time of attaching those very positive outcomes for our students and our faculty.

t. **Dr. Cavazos:** Thank you, President Robinson, and the Dean from the College of law just sent a note saying, “thank you to all the members of the committee. It’s so great to see so many College of Law faculty representing on the constitutional committee”.

i. **Comment from President Larry Robinson:** I also commended you and your team earlier today in the leadership meetings. Thank you, President Cavazos for really getting this on the path to success!

XV. **Adjournment** - President Ann Marie Cavazos

a. With that said, I think this was a wonderful meeting. We got a lot of issues or to be addressed and I want to thank our guests’ speakers today, President Robinson, Provost Edington and Dr. Boston for your presence at our meeting. Thank you
b. Motion to Adjourn by Dr. Osborne, 2\textsuperscript{nd} by Dr. Broussard.

c. Motion Carries and meeting is adjourned at 5:10pm.