I. Sven began meeting and said that Elaine S. was going to talk about the new proposed committee structure.

Elaine S. said that the subcommittees weren’t allocated is because they were checking on who was going to be stepping down from senate and because the co-chairs discussed changing back to three subcommittees: FTF Affairs, Learning Environments, Senate Affairs, in addition to the newly added PTF Affairs. But then the co-chairs felt that it wasn’t going to be functional to have only four committees because there would be too many people on a subcommittee. Elaine S. said that they still needed clarification on how the PTF Affairs
committee will interact with the senate. Earl said that there was no conflict with the union about the establishment of the committee on UFS. Elaine S. said that the committee needs to decide its purview. Sven noted that things that cross over with union contract are going to end up being out of bounds. Sven said that the UFS needed to figure out a more functional and direct way to connect with the university outside of these monthly meetings.

Discussion:
Antony said that as a member of a UFS subcommittee that has not met that he was unclear on what the committee was supposed to do. Hel felt that it didn’t really make sense to call meetings if there was no issue on the table. Frank admitted that the UFS was in a hard position since it meets relatively infrequently so was hard to figure stuff out. Sven noted that the UFS had a discussion like this at a previous meeting, and it was suggested that the subcommittees should put together issues that seem relative to bring forth to the co-chairs so that the co-chairs in turn can discuss with the president and the PO. The UFS also had a discussion about being consulted about FTF raises and the FTF Affairs subcommittee will be the conduit for that moving forward. Banu felt that they needed to revisit the conversation about merging committees with the PO so the UFS can be more informed, instead of replicating the structure. It was suggested that the FTF Affairs committee be co-chaired by someone from the PO with someone from the UFS, which could help toward legislative powers and would help give the UFS a little more control over the agenda. Sven noted that the UFS doesn’t have the engagement or willingness from senators to do more. It was suggested that there is disengagement because faculty haven’t had any power and that it is worth asking the PO for things. Sven noted that there is a great willingness for discussion with the PO but that it would be hard to get all the committees filled with just UFS people because of workload issues. The PO has made the effort to get faculty representation. He doesn’t feel that there is push back from administration. The suggestion that the UFS take over PO committees doesn’t seem productive. The UFS should instead figure out how to better populate the committees. Margaret said that administrators are paid be here Monday through Friday but faculty aren’t, and that is something to keep in mind. The co-chairs felt that they needed to staff the committees in the summer. Margaret said she would like to see the list of the provost committees and UFS committees side by side. PO committees: grievance committee, curriculum committee, research committee, facilities committee, budget committee, FTF affairs committee, diversity committee. Faculty are supposed to be represented on all of these committees. Elaine S. suggested that maybe they send an email questionnaire to UFS to get feedback. Sven wanted to define and refine committees during the rest of this year and start next year with committees in place.

II. Minutes

Richard S. said that there was a proposition to meet another time before the end of the semester. Elaine S. mentioned a calendar with all meetings idea to the PO and they are moving toward that. Sven said that the president and PO are visiting in May and they the UFS could schedule another meeting or could extend the final meeting.

Vote Options:
- additional meeting
- extend existing meeting (majority in favor of extending meeting)
Sven suggested adding a meeting between this one and the last one, or setting a date after the final UFS meeting of the semester and if they feel it is necessary at least they have it. A majority are in favor of a tentative meeting on May 19.

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and then approved.

III. Co-Chair Elections

Sven brought up the question of remuneration for UFS co-chairs. The conversation was still in progress, so there is no resolution, but it is not likely. If UFS members are interested in serving as co-chair please let current co-chairs know. There is nothing in the by-laws limiting the term of co-chairs but it would be good if there was turn over. Elaine A. asked if the UFS could nominate people and the answer is yes. Luciana asked to see a list of who was continuing. Sven said he will distribute something within the next 24 hours. He reported that Parsons was still having problems with the PTF elections. He said he would continue to work on remuneration for co-chairs. It was the co-chairs’ informal intent to have co-chairs representative of the divisions. It was noted that newly elected senators would be at the meeting in May, perhaps they could be set up on committees then. David said that it was hard for PTF to want to be a co-chair because they won’t get paid. Sven felt like it might be worth electing a PTF for co-chair and then see what happens after that. It might push the administration forward.

IV. Sven’s Report from Co-Chairs Meeting with PO and President

The co-chairs discussed an agreement to be a part of discussion about FTF salary increases. They felt that the FTF affairs committee was the right place for that discussion. They want to have a procedure in place before the summer, since raises for next year have been budgeted already.

They also discussed senate representatives on PO committees and agreed that they need to clarify service and committees. The president and PO want to be able to say they have effective faculty representations on committees.

The PO has agreed to give the UFS a small and permanent budget, which will ensure they can have refreshments at town halls.

The president’s report on the PTF negotiations was correct, that he was optimistic. The university is close to a deal with the union. The union members still have to vote.

Discussion:
Shane said that she didn’t feel like the breakfast was an opportunity for the faculty to casually talk about anything. She doesn’t want to go to another breakfast like that. Frank said that the co-chairs can influence that. Candy said that the students have been expressing dissent about the branding too, no one knows that the money didn’t come from operational budget, so it might be good to make that clear. The money for the branding effort came from BoT personal funds.

Marcus shared documents on registration and the UFS is encouraged to read them.
Sven said he would also share the committee reports that he has received with the UFS.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and then approved.