

**University Council**  
**January 29, 2018 at 8:30 a.m.**  
**East Tennessee Room, Culp Center**

**1. Call to order**

Dr. Wilsie Bishop called the meeting to order. She noted that President Brian Noland had been unavoidably detained but would try to get to the meeting as soon as possible. The meeting, however, would proceed as the council awaited the President's arrival.

**2. Roll Call**

Ms. Kristen Swing called the roll. Those in attendance were: Dr. Bert Bach, Dr. Wilsie Bishop, Mr. Scott Carter, Dr. Cheri Clavier, Dr. William Duncan, Dr. Susan Epps, Dr. Bill Flora, Dr. Michael Hoff, Dr. Keith Johnson, Dr. Jane Jones, Mr. Ed Kelly, Dr. B.J. King, Dr. Karen King, Dr. Claudia Kozinetz, Dr. David Linville, Mr. Michael Luchtan, Dr. Robert Means, Ms. Keyana Miller, Ms. Stefanie Murphy, Ms. Pam Ritter, Dr. David Roane, Mr. Jeremy Ross, Dr. Jana Scarborough, Dr. Joe Sherlin, Mr. Joe Smith, Dr. Ramona Williams, Dr. Randy Wykoff.

Those absent were Ms. Bridget Baird, Ms. Kristin France, Dr. Angela Lewis, Dr. Celia McIntosh, and Dr. Rick Osborn.

*Note: Dr. Brian Noland arrived at approximately 10:30 a.m.*

Others in attendance: Ms. Stephanie Good, Ms. Mary Cradic, and Ms. Kristen Swing (taking minutes).

During this time, Dr. Bishop asked Mr. Jeremy Ross to introduce Ms. Stephanie Good to the group. Mr. Ross explained that there has been many assessments taking place in a number of areas, including marketing outreach, finance, athletics, and financial aid. He said he is now looking at Human Resources and Equity, noting that with the new budget model, HR will serve a very large role. He cited the fact that no one across the campus has the word "recruitment" in his or her title and yet it is a significant role/duty. He said he is looking at HR being very customer service based. Currently, an assessment is underway with HR consultant Stephanie Good from Boston conducting the assessment. Ms. Good will be with ETSU through May 15 and is on campus three days a week. Her recommendations and report are forthcoming, with the report expected in two weeks.

Ms. Good explained that the report will give an overview of the initial phase of the assessment, which included a series of interviews of employees across campus. The findings will address the current state of Human Resources, benchmarks compared to peer institutions, and findings around particular things others have experienced around Human Resources functions. Ms. Good said she is really trying to get a better sense of how HR works at ETSU as well as how data and processes are managed. Mr. Ross said that over 1,200 people have participated so far.

**3. President's Report**

*NOTE: Dr. Bishop asked to hold this item until the end and take agenda item 4 first, so the President's Report took place at the end of the meeting.*

Prior to Dr. Noland's arrival, Dr. Bishop shared some updates on his behalf, including one on university budget hearings, which began the previous week and were continuing this week and next.

Dr. B.J. King reported that everything was going extremely well and everyone had submitted pertinent documents. She said the (former) Budget Advisory Committee expanded and started meeting in September. She noted that we are on an extremely short timeline. The THEC meeting in November will inform the budget call, and Gov. Haslam was due to release his budget later today, so it would be possible to then determine what he took from THEC recommendations, which, in turn, will be used to inform any changes. The Board of Trustees meets Feb. 23, and Dr. King said the budget materials have to be together two weeks in advance of that meeting (re: salary increases, tuition and fee increases). The budget will be presented to University Council in March and the full budget has to be approved by the Board of Trustees in April. The budget will be contingent on everything in the governor's budget actually making it through. Dr. King noted that they have moved up their scheduling so that by the time the semester is over, students, faculty, and staff will know the next year's budget, salary increases, and increases in tuition and fees.

Dr. Roane noted that part of the budget is predicated on state appropriations and would we know those by then? Dr. King said we will be informed by the THEC recommendations and will step out in faith based on the governor's talk later tonight. By the Board of Trustees meeting on April 27, she said, we will have to say the budget is based on Nashville landscape at that moment in time. She noted that we are the only former Tennessee Board of Regents school doing its budget this early but also said UT wants to be in the same place we are going to be by next year. She said there is some risk involved because sometimes the state legislature doesn't like for entities to get out in front of them, but she reminded the group that the state funds only 30 percent of the institution's budget.

Dr. Bishop questioned whether the budget call had been sent to everyone on University Council, which it had not. She said the whole council should have that and Ms. Mary Cradic pointed out that the timelines are posted on the University Council website but actual figures are not. Dr. Bishop said the memo in its entirety will be sent out to all members of the UC.

In subsequent discussion, Dr. Bach mentioned an issue that had come up in Academic Council recently regarding a concern of the university being spammed. He noted that, while spamming is a problem, he has the impression that what we have now (in terms of the weekly emails sent out to students and faculty/staff on Mondays) is not

working. He cited an example of a communication from Dr. Celia McIntosh regarding enrollment opportunities. Dr. Bishop asked Mr. Joe Smith to talk a little more about the weekly emails put out thorough his office and feedback he has received. Mr. Smith said University Relations had received positive feedback, especially from students. He acknowledged there would come a point where we would need to assess its success further. Dr. Randy Wykoff said the concern is that there were action items hidden in the document that were not visible to the reader and wondered if color coding action items would be possible. Mr. Smith pointed out that almost everything included in the weekly email is considered some kind of action item and noted that color coding would be very difficult. Dr. Bach said the specific concern raised at Academic Council was related to GRE courses. During the conversation, Ms. Kristen Swing (from University Relations, who helps lead the weekly email effort) pointed out that some of the challenge to emphasizing the importance of the weekly email so that people will open it and read it comes from the number of separate, individual emails still going out to campus. As that gets paired down, she said, it might help folks realize that the weekly email is the go-to place for important information. Dr. Joe Sherlin said that there may need to be some discussion at the VP level regarding one-off emails. Mr. Jeremy Ross said he didn't think there would be a perfect medium, citing the United Way campaign. He said that the campaign saw higher levels of response when it was sent as a separate email. Similarly, he said the Weight Watchers program saw more people signing up when an individual mass email was sent out to all faculty, students, and staff. Mr. Smith asked Ms. Keyana Miller to speak in terms of the students' feedback on receiving the weekly email. Ms. Miller said the students like it more than receiving individual emails.

Following that conversation, Dr. Joe Sherlin provided information and an update pertaining to the upcoming Culp Center renovations. Dr. Sherlin said the Culp will be "as is" until graduation. After graduation, the Post Office will remain in the building and, for the fall and spring semesters, food service will be available. The bookstore will be moved to the ballroom. Everything else is moving out. Finding space for all of those services has been a challenge, Dr. Sherlin said. Most units are moving to either the library or the CPA. Student engagement functions will go to the CPA. The Multicultural Center and TRIO are moving to the ground floor of Lucille Clement. There are a few units yet to be placed, namely Student Affairs and Counseling Services. Dr. Sherlin said a group is working on looking at meeting spaces available for all of the activities that occur at the Culp. He said the biggest challenge is not having a large meet-and-greet space. Dr. Noland and Mr. Ross are pursuing a possible lease of the Millennium Centre to serve campus groups. He cited an example of renting the Millennium Centre on an event-by-event basis, noting that sorority rush alone would cost \$18,000. The lease, he said, would be a huge cost savings for the university. Dr. Sherlin said there is a need to communicate with campus all that is going to be happening in the coming months, noting that a fence will be going up in March around the amphitheater. Within a month, there should be more specifics, he added. Dr. Wykoff asked about food trucks on campus. Dr. Sherlin said the Marketplace will remain open during this process, but the retail food options in the Culp will not. Food

trucks, including a Steak 'n Shake truck, will be on campus to help provide additional options. Dr. Bishop noted that Building 60 will be online this summer and will offer another food service option as well. She said Building 60 could also have some meeting options for groups such as Faculty Senate and Staff Senate. Dr. B.J. King also offered her new conference room on the second floor of Burgin Dossett as an option for meeting space. Mr. Ross took a moment to thank Mr. Scott Carter for all of his assistance as many events move to the Mini-Dome and football stadium during this time as well.

Dr. Bishop announced that Dr. Noland was on his way to the meeting and suggested a short break while awaiting his arrival. Following the break, Dr. Noland apologized and thanked the group for understanding the need for his delayed arrival.

Opening his comments, Dr. Noland said he was struck by how much has changed in a year in terms of governance. In his opinion, shared governance has never been stronger than it is today and the opportunity for it to continue to flourish was a critical component to the discussion the group had today.

Dr. Noland said he anticipated Gov. Haslam's final State of the State address to include a strong budget for higher education. He called Haslam the nation's foremost education governor, citing programs such as Tennessee Promise, Reconnect, Drive to 55, and the FOCUS Act. Dr. Noland said he expects there to be a couple of major announcements around higher education, including specific discussion around the opioid epidemic and what universities can do as well as investment in a new "RISE" initiative that would create strategic research pools for the universities to grow research structure. He also anticipates tax revenues remaining above estimates, formula funding above the THEC recommendations, and strong investments in deferred maintenance and salary enhancements of 2 to 3 percent.

What is unknown, he noted, is the positioning of the proposed humanities building. Dr. Noland said he did not expect it to be funded this year but anticipates it will score in the top five projects next year. With that in mind, Dr. Noland said we will begin in earnest fundraising efforts to meet the university's match of \$13 million. Dr. Noland said he anticipates Gov. Haslam to encourage the General Assembly to be mindful, from a policy perspective, and not get into social issues. However, with it being an election year, Dr. Noland said he suspects social issues will be tackled. He added, however, that he does not think they will take action on DACA. Two legislative items he will be keeping a close eye on are: (1) legislation to create a scholarship pool for the Bill Gatton College of Pharmacy and (2) legislation to support Overmountain Recovery.

Dr. Noland noted that the manner in which institutions of higher education interact with state government has changed dramatically. Now, instead of going to the Tennessee Board of Regents, the House and Senate come to us when they have questions about university operations. Already, we have prepared a 25-page document to respond to some of those questions. Dr. Noland will be at the House and Senate chambers to respond to their questions as well. He said he will appear three times in February in front of the

finance and education committees of the House. On the Senate side, Austin Peay and TTU will appear.

Continuing, Dr. Noland said this all aligns with work occurring on our campus to change our focus. He noted that for the first time in modern history, tuition and fees and budgets will be presented to our Board of Trustees at the end of April and students will know the cost to attend next semester before going home for the summer. Additionally, Dr. Noland noted that things have changed in Nashville. Leaders no longer meet in Legislative Plaza now, but instead meet in the newly renovated Cordell Hull. While the renovation is beautiful, Dr. Noland said the move has changed dynamics. Members now have private hallways and chambers, so the days of more casual encounters with them in the hall are no more.

Dr. Noland stopped and asked if there were any questions. Ms. Miller said she was at a TBR meeting last Friday where the Day at the Hill was discussed. Previously, this was scheduled and carried out for the universities by the TBR. Ms. Miller wondered what was being done to potentially plan a similar Day at the Hill for the six universities that are no longer a part of the TBR. Dr. Noland said the presidents had met as a group and discussed a Day on the Hill specifically for the six institutions. He said he expected that to occur in February.

Next, Dr. Noland spoke about things occurring on the federal level, noting that he serves on the board for the American Council on Education. He said he cannot predict what will happen with DACA, but said he has sent letters to Roe, Corker, and Alexander regarding our support for DACA and encouraging them to find a solution. Dr. Noland will be in Washington D.C. next week and in March having conversations around research, DACA, and higher education. He also noted that the federal tax reform is detrimental to higher education. Dr. Noland said we are in the crosshairs of culture wars federally, nationally, and locally. He noted posters that were found at a South Carolina University that were identical to ones found at ETSU last fall, noting that this is happening everywhere, not just here. He said he is working on a communication to campus that will share defined actions we are taking to change the climate here to have engaged conversations, actions and outcomes. He said it is going to take everyone to have thoughtful, deliberative conversations.

Dr. Noland pointed out that today is the census date here for spring semester. He said enrollment is within projected intervals and our fall-to-spring retention rates are at 90 percent (the same as last year), which bodes well for our fall-to-fall retention rates later this year. He said many things have contributed to this success, including our work with Royall, our work to market online programs, and several back office-type things. He encouraged everyone to focus on the move to decentralized budgets, noting that it should not mean competition between colleges, but rather provides an opportunity to work together to create interdisciplinary research, program, and service opportunities.

He said he feels good about where we are currently, noting that budget proposals, so far, have been balanced. He also emphasized that increases in faculty and staff salaries are predicated on internal reallocation of existing resources, namely colleges and units looking at load and internal efficiencies. The only way to move the big needle is to look at big questions around load, he said.

Dr. Noland stopped and asked if there were any questions. Dr. Wykoff said he agreed on getting ahead on hate speech, but wondered if there are any best practices that we could do to get ahead. Dr. Noland said part of this process is about trust. He said we can define what happens within the community. How we dialogue in our difference is what will define us, he said, emphasizing the need for open conversations and a focus on actions and outcomes. Ms. Miller presented the idea of starting a process where students can go to offices and have a connection here if something did occur. She referenced “bias incident reports” that students could fill out addressing incidents of discrimination and/or harassment. It is something we can quantify, she noted. Dr. Noland said some things are happening behind the scene, noting that there will be an enhanced utilization of technology to give a better sense of what is happening in some incidents. Looking ahead to the next few months, Dr. Noland said he wants to anticipate points of disruption to campus.

On that note, Dr. Noland also shared that he will bring in an external consultant group to deal with the Department of Public Safety, spurred by Chief Jack Cotrel’s retirement announcement. The chief of police from Vanderbilt will lead the assessment of ETSU’s public safety. Dr. Noland said faculty senate has asked for years for more community policing, and that is being considered through the assessment.

Dr. Noland asked if there was any other business for discussion. Dr. Epps noted that the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar posted on the web does not match what was approved by the Board of Trustees. Dr. Noland said the Board had approved a calendar and, later, fall break was moved up just slightly to give more time between it and the end of the semester. Dr. Epps pointed out that there still seemed to be some inaccuracies, and Dr. Linville said he would go through and confirm that they match.

In closing, Dr. Noland shared a story about an email that had been forwarded to him recently. It was a blog posting of an alum about his experience at ETSU. The alum told the story of how everything he presumed about ETSU before coming here was counter to what he experienced. He said he had engaging courses and professors. Dr. Noland noted that a change is occurring around us and our students are noticing. There are a lot of really, really good things happening here, he concluded.

#### **4. Discussion of nature/structure/function of University Council**

Dr. Bishop provided initial information, noting that this agenda item is the reason for today’s called meeting. She then provided a history, detailing how it had gotten to this point of discussion.

In Spring 2017, the group had discussions related to the Interim University Council and its future. The group agreed that there was an importance to having the council, which provides a broader university perspective. When we agreed on being the University Council, Bishop noted, a working group was appointed to identify standing rules, roles, and responsibilities. In July 2017, the IUC began meeting as the University Council, with the working group's rules, roles, and responsibilities in place. To ensure continuity, the group remains the President's University Council; however, it was decided that someone else should preside so that meetings can go on even in the President's absence. Dr. Bishop was elected to the role of Vice Chair. In late October, at the President's Retreat to look at the implementation of the university's Strategic Plan (which had worked its way through the University Council and was ready to be implemented), sessions were held that focused on how governance could facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Plan. One of those sessions included group activity around four things: budgets; planning; evaluation and assessment; and government relations. Discussions centered on the creation of University Council sub-councils and formalizing activities. A follow-up conversation occurred on the general effectiveness of the University Council. At the retreat, leaders agreed that more discussion needed to take place at the University Council level about the group's purpose and effectiveness.

Dr. Bishop said Dr. Noland has given a lot of thought to these discussions, to shared governance, to the permanence of committees, to issues of transparency, and to how this group can be critical in the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Dr. Bishop then provided the group with Dr. Noland's recommendations that:

- (1) Budget and planning efforts be combined into one sub-council. Dr. Bishop explained that the (former) Budget Advisory Committee had changed its membership. Members include Dr. Michael Hoff, Dr. B.J. King, Dr. Susan Epps, Mark Proffitt, Dr. Bill Flora (ex officio) and Margaret Pate (ex officio). Dr. Noland's recommendation is to keep the current membership this year and bring the group under University Council.
- (2) Create an evaluation and assessment sub-council. This group would evaluate and assess the success of the Strategic Plan and other activities. Dr. Noland also recommended Dr. Cheri Clavier facilitate the group's charge and structure and then bring it back to the February meeting.

Dr. Bishop noted that the other proposed sub-council, that of government relations, may not be appropriately placed under University Council. In subsequent conversations with Dr. Noland, Bridget Baird said she needed to be nimble and flexible and felt it was not the best approach to have a sub-council, although she said she may at some point need an advisory council of some kind.

Dr. Susan Epps noted that she, Dr. Marsh Grube, and Dr. David Linville have been working on the policies and are struggling with where, if anywhere, to send some policies. She said they knew that academic policies go through Academic Council but

said there are a lot of policies that do not go through a specific council. She asked whether there is a body that needs to review items of that nature and what the role of the University Council is in the process. She said if there are substantive changes, someone should be looking at them but wondered what process was in place.

Dr. David Linville pointed out that the Board of Trustees has delegated the President to promulgate policies with the exception of those that they are required to do by law or by duty. He said a template has been created in which the Board's policy is at the top of the page while procedures for that policy are featured below. He said it seems as if we have set up a situation where if there is an academic bent to policies, they are going to Academic Council for review, and, by default, administrative policies are coming through University Council. He suggested considering delegating authority to vice presidents for certain policies to bypass the University Council. Dr. Michael Hoff voiced his agreement with delegating some of the responsibility back to vice presidents but suggested, for a checks-and-balances system, that this body still receive some type of report. There are areas that are not business-critical every day that could become an issue if no one is reviewing them, Hoff said.

Dr. Bert Bach said that as we look at policy versus procedure, there are some areas in which it may appear what should be a procedure is something stipulated in the bylaws of the Board of Trustees. He said it was important to look at the bylaws of the Board of Trustees and cited an admissions example (of GPA change for dual enrollment) in which the scope of the bylaws resulted in a move to policy for something that would have otherwise been a procedure.

Dr. Karen King noted a need for clarification on what goes out for 30-day public comment, citing a research policy she brought to the group during the previous meeting. She said the policy originally did not go out for public comment, but after it went into place and she received feedback, she opted to put it out for comment. Ultimately, she said she would have preferred sending it out for public comment in the first place before it ever went into effect. Dr. Linville said the 30-day review period is helpful in some instances and less helpful in others. He said it can cause a bottleneck issue and suggested that the 30-day review become a part of the draft phase before it ever gets to a governing body for review and approval. Dr. King agreed.

Dr. Hoff said the issue of whether certain policies need to be put out for review has come up several times. He also brought up the idea of some being put up for just a seven-day public review. Dr. Hoff agreed to get a group together to discuss this further. Dr. Joe Sherlin said it would be helpful to have some criteria to determine if a policy needs public review. He also voiced his support of the push to vice presidents for some policies that do not require University Council-level review. Dr. Jana Scarborough asked whether there should be something in the process that requires someone to note or talk about how a policy was vetted.



Dr. Bishop said it appeared there needed to be a group established to address policies that should and should not come to University Council and the review process.

Dr. Bill Flora offered a dissenting opinion on the matter of policies being pushed to vice presidents. He said he didn't like giving that authority to one individual and he felt all non-academic policies should come through University Council. He said he felt a piece of governance structure was missing without review from a university-wide committee before a policy gets to the Board of Trustees level. Things are caught at that level that might otherwise be missed, he said.

Dr. B.J. King said her team has been looking at all of its financial policies and said they struggle with authority. She said they came up with one sentence that rules that authority line of their policies. She said she knew her policies were hard and lengthy and people have a lot of reasons to want to make exceptions, but that can't happen if they want financial statements that will pass an audit. She said she did not want a process in place where people can present exceptions. Trying to manage exceptions gets out of control, she added. Dr. Flora said he did not want an opportunity to approve someone's procedure, but a policy statement should flow through University Council. How the policy is handled (the procedure aspect), not so much.

Dr. Bishop proposed getting a group together to work on a "policy on policies." Those to participate in that group were: Dr. Epps, Dr. Flora, Dr. Scarborough, Dr. Linville (to serve as convener), Dr. Kathy Kelly, Ms. Stefanie Murphy, Dr. Jeff Howard, and Mr. Andrea DiFabio. This group will look at the process for University Council related to policies and report back in March.

Mr. Ross pointed out that Human Resources has so many procedures and policies that are broken every day simply because there are so many. He said the policies are copious and extensive and noted that any way to simplify would be helpful. Dr. Epps agreed that there are a lot of needless words in some of the policies and said she is trying to get rid of some of that as she edits each policy.

Dr. Bishop reiterated that the group just formed will talk about how University Council relates to policy with a focus on the relationship with public comment – how long and when it should occur. She said it is a matter of how we do our work and what work we should do. She also noted that there is not someone from HR on the committee but said the group can bring ideas to Ms. Good without her being on the committee.

Following that conversation, Dr. Bishop asked if everyone was comfortable with Dr. Noland's recommendation for a Budget and Planning sub-council. She added that the membership will remain the same and that group of individuals will define their charge. With Dr. Noland's recommendation serving as the motion, Dr. Susan Epps made the second, and the creation of the Budget and Planning Sub-Council was unanimously approved.

The group then addressed Dr. Noland's second recommendation, to create an Evaluation and Assessment sub-council. With Dr. Noland's recommendation serving as the motion, Ms. Stefanie Murphy seconded the motion. Prior to a vote, Dr. Epps asked for clarification regarding the role of the group in relation to the Budget and Planning sub-council. Dr. Bishop said they will be looking at KPIs, whether progress is being made toward the Strategic Plan. She said she considered them the bookend to the Budget and Planning group. Budget and Planning determines where we are going; Evaluation and Assessment reviews whether we got there. Dr. Cheri Clavier cited from SACS compliance requirements that call for a "systemic review of university goals and outcomes." Dr. Hoff noted that this governing body approved his office, which staffs these functions but said the creation of the sub-council will provide other eyes to review and give authority. Following discussion, the group unanimously approved the creation of the Evaluation and Assessment Sub-Council.

Dr. David Roane spoke regarding the function of the University Council in relation to the Strategic Plan. He said he sees the Strategic Plan as a transformative document that reflects the fact that we want to change. On that note, he addressed how effective change occurs, noting that a sense of urgency is needed, a powerful guiding coalition and a unifying vision for what we are trying to do (to make ETSU a better place). Change fails, he said, when the vision falls off and people don't see it. He said he would like to see University Council operate at the level that helps increase its mindfulness about what it is we are trying to do. He said he envisions the group as that powerful guiding coalition that Dr. Noland can rely upon to effectively disseminate the urgency and what it is we are trying to do. That culture has to be empowered, supported, and reinforced. He expressed a desire for the group to create and recommend to the President a common statement that could then be communicated to the campus via this body. Dr. Bishop said Dr. Roane's comments get to the heart of the issue – what is the essence of what we do and how do we do it well?

Dr. Epps shared a recent incident in which an individual she knew who had had a bad experience at ETSU now has a daughter here. The person told Dr. Epps that he had talked with Dr. Jeff Howard and others while trying to make accommodations for his daughter, and he said everything was so positive and very different than the experience he had just a year before. Dr. Epps said we changed his mind about this institution through our willingness to help. She said that should be the norm.

Dr. Randy Wykoff said the challenge has been that change requires being outspoken, and we needed to get a positive outlook on change. Dr. Linville said this has to be a group that performs its function in terms of leading. Dr. Hoff noted that we have to decide what we are as an institution and coordinate a more evident vision of what it means for ETSU in this region. If we can help to provide that, we can advance the

Strategic Plan, he said. Dr. Wykoff noted that moving forward is fueled by having a common sense of what you are trying to accomplish.

Dr. Bishop asked how we create a culture of excellence and lead in that direction. She said this was one of the best discussions that group has had at a meeting in a long time. She offered an idea to, at each meeting, have a culture moment where the group spends 15 minutes talking about an issue toward achieving its goals. Dr. Sherlin said he liked periodic discussion around topics and suggested devoted time to it. Dr. Roane offered to provide a 10-minute presentation on culture that he thinks might be helpful. Dr. Bach said it is apparent what is not on the agenda, an invitation for show-and-tell. He said the agenda has a lot of things on it that don't warrant or allow for the type of discussion that took place today. He said show-and-tell is important when you are showing what hasn't always been told. Dr. Bishop said that spontaneity and discussion have been structured out by the agenda format. She said the group needs to do its own assessment periodically of the effectiveness of the body. She asked that group members submit to Ms. Mary Cradic any ideas they may have for future discussion, noting that there is powerful intellect in the room that needs to be tapped. As units start providing their strategic plans to their supervisors, Dr. Hoff asked that the group address next month the process for colleges and other units to submit those plans for review and what happens next.

## **5. Adjournment**

Following Dr. Noland's report, the meeting was adjourned.