

## Agenda

- Welcome and introductions
- Quick summary of the Provost's request
- Discussion and Feedback
- Next Steps

## Transcript

- Jeff: Welcome everyone, to this special PUSC session to wrap up the list of qualities for the future OfS Director/leader. We've been keeping in touch through email, we built a special section of our site for the leadership transition, including a transcript of the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. We boiled those comments down to the short list which has been printed and put on your tables. We added two more bullets in the last few days, and today we want to finalize that list. (Schedule restrictions, some have to leave early, let's respect time and try to wrap shortly after 4). Provost is running late, meeting with President.
- Introductions: Paul Pancella, Jorge Rodriguez, Carolyn Webber, Pooja Mandagere, Fanny Hernandez, Laura Donders, Tamara Toutant, Jody Brylinsky, Steve Bertman, Cybelle Shattuck, Lu DeBoef, Josh Schultz, Emily Hazel, Isaac Green, Brittney Blokker, Dan Bair. Sue Stapleton arrived shortly after.
- PP: This meeting was called, as many of you know, because the office for the director of this office, is vacant. And the provost has asked us for input on a job description, other details on how to fill this position, she expressed her desire to complete this task on a fairly aggressive schedule. I would like to have a product today that expresses our thoughts as a committee of the characteristics of the new director, the next director, and any other details on filling the new position. Lots of the March 15<sup>th</sup> discussion was good content, thank you for summarizing that. Other things discussed that we can give input on are; faculty status of the candidate, minimum qualifications, (aside from personal characteristics), terminal degree or not, so we can characterize these requirements as required or just desired. And also whether this should be an internal or external search, or both. We had heard from Prov. Gilchrist last meeting and he expressed that he felt we had great candidates, and saw no reason we couldn't fill this position in-house.
- SB: Well, can we clarify if the mission/goals of the OfS are going to be discussed or changed in any way?
- PP: In general, no, the OfS will continue for now, the commitment to sustainability is as strong as ever. When this committee formed, it was Harold's belief that it should report to the president, but in a more practical sense we report to Academic Affairs. The Provost has indicated that this should be the direction moving forward. We need to mesh the strategic plans of this unit with that of the broader University.
- SB: So is it the plan for the new director to be involved with that strategic plan or...
- PP: In reality I believe we would likely proceed before they were here, but I imagine once they are in place things could change again.
- JB: last time there was a discussion, well I was the discussant, about this point, the need for the office, the committee ---
- PP: let's keep the committee separate from the office
- JB: --so that the committee itself needs to be recharged by the president. Maybe the focus has changed, and if we are truly the presidents committee, it is related to the role of this office. In time there will be a maybe a greater focus, because the focus of the office and committee seem diluted, and

now that we have additional institutes and centers, a new director may have conversations as we have a new provost and as our president becomes more familiar. I don't think anything will happen immediately, nor do I think that your strategic planning should happen until a new director comes in and we have these broad discussions. This doesn't mean all the great initiatives that really aren't strategic, but are in the works and are moving forward.

- SB: Part of my question is, is this committee separate from the office –
- PP: YES
- SB – serving the provost as a search committee—
- PP: NO
- SB: --or is there going to be opportunity for broader input outside of this committee.
- JB: This is clearly not the search committee, I can speak for the provost on that. There may be many people from this group that get placed on the search committee, but this is not that committee.
- PP: I can speculate that the provost will seek input from other places besides this committee.
- JB: My only thought regarding the internal/external debate; I don't know if we can decide that until we have a good working list of minimum qualifications. Let's talk about that first. That's how we can figure if we have enough of that type of talent inside, or if we need to search.
- PP: Fair enough. Minimum Qualifications? (silence) Any ideas?
- JB: For fear of dominating, I brought two examples, one is from my favorite place Wayne State, which has been a model for us for some other strategic planning initiatives. The President says we are better than them, but Education and Experience are the two minimum qualifications that are typically listed. Wayne State requires a master's degree in the physical sciences for higher education, the other one I have is from Missouri State, which requires a bachelor's degree in environmentally related disciplines, such as physical, biological, or earth sciences. They prefer a Master's degree.
- PP: A Master's in anything?
- JB: well, related to sustainability. We can relate it and define it as we need.
- PP: Which can be everything, the way we conceptualize it.
- JB: One job description requires 3 years of experience, the other 7 in sustainability.
- LD: those are both director positions?  
(yes)
- CW: A demonstrated excellence or experience in sustainability, working with students, the social sciences, philosophy.
- PP: When specifying minimum qualifications, we want to be very clear because that's an initial screening that HR will do before forwarding applicants. Things that are recommended can be more stringent.
- JR: Chicken or egg, is this person faculty? Will they become faculty?
- JB: Whether they are faculty or not is another issue, we have faculty that are Master's. We should build this description so we get the person we need.
  
- SS arrives, welcomed by PP, sits down.
  
- PP: So education and experience are prime areas to discuss. Any reflections, opinions? Instead of saying Master's or PhD, sometimes we say 'a terminal degree in that field' – is this what we want to say?
- LD: there was discussion amongst students and staff about the desire to have the future director able to lead students and have publishable reports. It's correct to say that someone with a Master's can still publish in journals?
- PP: as a general statement, yes.

- JS: To answer Jody's thought... most of our students are paid in paid-positions, every year there have been at least a couple students that received credit for their work as opposed to pay. Dave Bere is one example of that this semester, he will be receiving credit from HG-
- JB:-- based on that faculty position, not this office—
- JS:-- that is correct. Each semester, in the current design, we have 20-30 undergraduate students that work part time. Thinking about grants, and director's ability to lead or co-lead grants. I've learned that we can be fairly flexible about who can be the PI on grants-
- PP: In physical sciences, having a PhD helps. It helps. Improves chances of success.
- CW: another way of thinking, are we looking for this person to be a leader in terms of academics, or they should be good at coordinating and reaching out? They may not have the terminal degree in the field, but may have exceptional talents in organizing and motivating.
- PP: Another way to phrase that, what's the priority we give to grantsmanship? That doesn't appear on this list (printed on table).
- PP: I had assumed that was a big thing, but maybe I'm wrong.
- JB: it's a big thing for centers and institutes, I don't know how big it is for this office. When the charge has been to facilitate environmental issues relating to facilities management, and to specifically direct student-based projects.
- SS: Other than we are all being asked to find more diverse ways to increase our portfolio.
- PP: How is the funding, how is all this great activity funded.
- SB: Are you going to answer that question?
- PP: the answer is obvious! It isn't funded at adequate levels, it could always be better. If someone were excellent at getting grants, that would be a very positive thing.
- SB: What kinds of grants though? In the current configuration what would be appropriate for a director of 30+ students? Are there GA lines that are awarded to the office?
- JS: I can say that for the last 3 years we have asked for, competed for, and been awarded one GA for the last 3 or 4 years.
- PP: they can be research grants, or application grants. Lots of potential areas.
- SB: Writing to NSF, having a PhD is almost essential. The types of grants this offer could write for might be very different.
- PP: director will be collaborating, they might not need to be the grant lead. Let's say under education we have Master's degree or equivalent.
- JB: my example said "in an environmentally related discipline" the other said "physical sciences or higher education"
- CW: I don't like the vagueness of the second.
- JR: Should be environmental or sustainability. I say yes to sustainability related discipline.
- PP: Later people can decide if this is relevant or not. We are proposing be that the educational attainment of this person be at least masters level, in a sustainability related discipline.
- (crosstalk)
- PP: if I were anyone else on campus, I might read this and say that's a terrible description, but we are here, among friends. Flexibility can be a blessing. Leave it open to masters, international applicants. Relevant experience: some years... we heard between 3 and 7, how are those characterized?
- LD: someone who both knows the realm of sustainability, and has a leadership component.
- JB: some language, a place to start: 3 years' experience working with sustainability programs and higher education. The next is longer: experience in leadership positions and higher ed and or sust fields, 10 years' experience in enacting, coordinating development, and planning and leading environmental initiatives and interaction with facilities.
- PP: again, balancing what we need with not throwing out people we might want to look at seriously.

- JB: something to be said about experience coordinating and managing projects. Someone might be extraordinary, but the staffing structure must support it.
- JS: recent model of staffing has a higher load of post-graduate temporary staffers than we have had in recent years. Couple year's back we had additional full time staffer, which is depending on grants, donations, etc. But always, dozens of UG at least part-time, coming in and out. Just to characterize the crowd.
- PP: X number of years coordinating personnel, some scale? Size?
- Josh: Is collaborating on there, on JB's sheet?
- JB: yes, its there, along with partnership building. Absolutely important.
- PP: add that to experience, collaborating across disciplines.
- LD: they need to be able to manage multiple projects and personnel, give them the scale. A lot going on.
- PP: we can probably not go into that much detail for minimum qualifications.
- JB: manage multiple projects
- JR: can you give a 1 minute org chart?
- JS: the folks in back are generally our post-graduate crew, running a program or projects themselves, often they work with students. Not many months ago we had 5 people on our leadership team, now we have 2. Soon we will begin interviewing for admin assistant, fill that and we have 3. Discussing potential project manager position, that would be 4 + 1 director.
- CW: what is HR going to toss out?
- PP: whatever doesn't meet our minimum qualifications, as we specify. Those candidates won't be forwarded on. Needs to be quantifiable on resume. How many years.
- JR: 5 or 6
- PP: I vote for 5. Any votes?
- LD: 3 seems low, 7 high. Split difference, 5.
- JB: I wouldn't make those different.
- PP: is it 5 years in leadership role, or 5 years coordinating projects?
- CW: better to get too many applicants vs missing someone because they had 4 instead of 5 years, but are otherwise a perfect candidate.
- PP: so don't say leadership role with 5 years' experience.
- SB: if we are expecting fundraising, a demonstrable experience in fundraising.
- PP: doesn't sound like that was absolutely critical as a minimum qualification that you have already established as a successful grant writer.
- SB: not just grants, but gifts, donations, etc.
- JB: I recommend against it –
- PP: why?
- JB: you won't find it in many places. It's not a common skill, and it's not essential to the office. This isn't a self-sustaining office.
- LD: Many candidates might not have had the opportunity to fundraise, given their structural limitations.
- SB: I respectfully disagree, those skills are hard to come by and critical. If we want and expect someone to do that, it's much more likely if they have experience.
- CW: can we separate the desired and minimum?
- PP: when they are formally done, yes.
- JR: I believe it should be part of minimum.
- PP: so you're with Steve. My proposal is that experience fundraising be in desired.
- JR: I believe that is essential to this office.

- SS: That is something the university is moving towards in terms of leadership roles. I know we have had trouble in the past during dean searches, certain disciplines, they may have grant experience but maybe no fundraising experience. If their role didn't facilitate that, we are hurting ourselves. Desired qualifications indicates to candidate and sends a signal that this is an expectation. It has to be in there somewhere.
- JB: with this office particularly, there have been a great deal of in-kind gifts and partnerships, which are very different.
- (crosstalk)
- SS: the difficulty I have, is that if you add grants, fundraising, etc. to the minimum, and accept masters, we might be setting someone up for failure.
- PP: I don't understand that point, if minimum is masters with experience fundraising, how are we set up for failure?
- SS: well you often won't find those in tandem.
- PP: so it's setting the search up for failure, not the candidate.
- JB: a critical point, if there are going to be greater expectations for outside funding sources, then it does go back to minimum qualifications, relative to education.
- PP: sounds to me like it has to go in 'desired' to keep our pool open.
- JB: this person needs to be able to generate grants, external dollars. I don't think you can stay at the master's level and have that experience.
- PP: I don't think that's true!
- (unknown): look at our development office, how many people there are masters only?
- PP: there are a lot of partnerships, all external, that's all we care about. Doesn't have to be NSF competitive grant program. Doesn't need to be that level. As long as there are dollars and isn't from another WMU dept. that should count.
- JR: if this is going to be faculty position?
- CW: why does it have to be glued to a faculty position?
- PP: should it be faculty? Necessity?  
JR: yes, it should be.
- JB: I don't think it should be.
- CW: someone with excellent skills and collaborating, that's where there time should be going.
- PP: that doesn't require a faculty position. SB is nodding, jody nodding.
- JB: creating a faculty line creates a whole new set of obligations, tenure, etc.
- SS: what do students think?  
Tamara: I don't think it must be faculty.
- PP: does not have to be faculty. Okay. I think it should be an open and external search. Comments? Internal candidates also able to apply.
- CW: will that affect the time it will take to fill position?
- PP: possibly, that's a secondary consideration.
- JB: That's based on the search committee's decision, do they believe there is talent in-house-
- PP: how do they know that better than us?
- SS: Institutional equity will evaluate and make the decision. We can advise.
- PP: It would be great if those posting were listed concurrently. We are asking for a lot. This is high-profile, we have thought in recent years that we can be a leader in the area of sustainability. That's one reason to push this to be external.
- CS: candidates may want to move to MI to avoid climate change in 20 years... (laughs)
- JR: what was it like?

- PP: there was no office for sustainability previously to 2012. I have to leave now but attack this list in detail and keep discussing. We have good info here.
- SS: If this is going to be advertised as a staff position, it would have to go through the HR system for grading to determine salary levels, etc. currently this position doesn't exist in their system in that way. Right now it's sort of a faculty line, what we provided was the top of administrative support.
- PP: do you have idea where it would land?
- SS: We have directors that are in G... that means nothing. I think that starts around 60k\$. It can be comparable to what we might offer a new faculty member at assistant professor level.
- (Pancella leaves)
- JS: I bring your attention to the notes I've taken throughout and tried to group. If we can agree then we have good progress.
- SS: often times because it's hard to put "leads from behind" in a requirements doc, we might put that language in the text describing characteristics of that individual. Hard to quantify those directly in a resume.
- (unintelligible comments due to HVAC)
- JS: storyteller came up a lot last meeting. Lots of people are doing great work around campus, this office can do a better job of amplifying and telling those stories. I would also add, in terms of context. Lu and I are comfortable committing the office to running STARS for 2019. Take the technical info, new data, and celebrate that, or urge WMU to be better.
- (unknown): does skilled communicator convey that?
- JB: Bland language is usually used to convey that. Every job description I've ever seen.
- JS: is there a place for converting technical information into plain?
- JB: that's a skill indeed, I think the technical information is a bit fuzzy.
- CS: a person with community based participatory research experience would be a great indicator that someone had experience collaborating. Citizen science.
- 4:00, JS announces that SS might have to leave soon.
- JB: a large part of this job is working with students, and some managers are not so student friendly. Should that be in the job description? I think they need to work with all, including our facilities connection.
- JS: I would add that our students are particularly passionate, they poke they prod and they want us to do better and more, and more often. So, someone that can work with UG, Graduates, staff, and peers. Someone that can demonstrate they've done that.
- SB: I would make sure that fundraising/grants are in there. Combine language however, but that should be in desired.
- JB: typically, WMU lists education and experience under minimum qualifications, whereas skills are typically under desired. The ability to work independently, collaborate, etc. Build and develop knowledge on diverse skills.
- SS: after a position, description is assembled, it has to go (for staff) to HR system to be graded, that can take some time.
- SB: So what if a faculty member wanted to apply? Would it be graded as staff?
- JB: unless its considered an admin position.
- SS: then you'd be faculty with an administrative role, which is a different can of worms, different than what we are discussing now.

- CW: do they teach?  
SS: we have deans who teach, it depends. We have folks in admin roles who teach. Part of it do we advertise it, nationally, as an admin position where someone can hold faculty rank, they would have to be evaluated by the faculty in that dept to achieve rank. This position doesn't exist! As faculty, or staff. We are creating, then someone has to fund it. I'm here to tell you that our commitment to this office stands true, we will fund it. I just need to determine our direction.
- SS: We could also do something like ask current faculty if they have interest in this, do that first and if it doesn't pan out, we search.
- SB: that's a process question. We still need desired qualities and experience. This committee could recommend that this process begin that way.
- JB: could extend the process, but the larger issue is that we get it right. It's really hard because when we say 'faculty' we are thinking of people we know. That passion would be great, but there is also the notion of what are the essential qualifications we need to drive the office from an operational standpoint. My bias in this is that I have family members who do this at other universities, its so much more free than what I'm seeing happen here. If we didn't have all our centers and institutes I might not feel as strong.
- CW: so faculty status limits us?
- JB: it could. We all know great people, just talk them into dropping their day job.
- (unknown): sometime faculty doing research with admin duties can get muddled, it can interfere with other parts of their job.
- (unknown): "Whatttttt" (laughs)
- JS: I'm treading cautiously as the secretary, trying to hear a conclusion. I believe I'm still hearing a staff recommendation.
- JB: I don't hear a clear consensus, benefits on both sides.
- JS: we'll share those notes with VC PP as soon as possible and finalize a statement.
- (Summarizing notes on screen) (Lots of pauses)
- I think we can collapse experience to 5 years, managing projects and personnel, and having demonstrated leadership skills.
- JB: the next step I would recommend is create job description for G or H level, consistent. If it's a director level, those are the things compensation system looks at. If we do that, we will be better off.
- SS: Clearly we want representation, this group has something like 40 members. That might be too much for a search committee.
- JB: find similar directors \*in academic affairs\* and compare job descriptions and etc.
- SS: that level and supervision is different, so that's what we need to begin.
- SB: do we want to specifically mention budget management, or is that folded into project management and unit management?
- JB: once we have the description, we can still try out faculty appointments to take this job.
- JS: in the suggested model of a faculty taking this role, would that be full time or part time?
- SS: like we have in faculty development, we have a faculty member who serves as director of operations, who has most of their time bought out to serve that department, but there are side duties on top of that. Faculty specialist is another case.
- JS: I feel good about these directives, we can send out a summary and job description by Tuesday (April 2). I have a lot of questions, but we have a long gap between our next committee meeting, should we stick to the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of September as previously planned? Thoughts?
- JB: any pending projects or strategic planning going on?

- JS: We have been going through, adding, changing, not publishing new goals or objectives. Lots of ideas are percolating, we are trying to gather and honor those as we move forward. Interested in subcommittee, before September.
- Tamara: STARS?
- JS: not directly, but we have a plan to get that work done with GA assistance beginning in Fall.
- I'd like to be done before 2019. We can use that data set for sierra club and Princeton review, and garner praise in the coming months.
- I'll continue to talk with PP about PUSC goals, cautious about rewriting goals or anything without new director, amidst current hustle and bustle.
- SS: two schools of thought, like to see direction, and like to see opportunity to morph/dynamic. If the first thing you are told to do is develop strategic plan, likely to make mistakes with new hire.
- JB: are these current objectives taken from a plan? Aligned with university plan or academic affairs? –
- JS: -not yet- we need to talk.
- JB: let us be intentional, 1 year goals are fine, 3-5 must be aligned.
- JB: I'm just not so sure that this office has a perfect charge right now, let's revise with care.
- JS: I feel strongly about getting STARS back up and running, we can bolster our communications team with stories. They have done a great job over the last year, we have 10 new interns, and we have 5 new Gibbs fellows in the fall, things will happen! Things will bloom. I've got more thoughts on community work and potential grants. I'm going to challenge our staff to plan the fall event, because I think they want that. Closing thoughts? 4:29 p.m.
- JB: Worth having conversation with President about role of office and evolution. Clarification and reaffirmation must happen.
- SS: we heard from Pete S last time about critical nature of collaboration with FM that must continue to happen.
- JS: thank you everyone. If anyone has any comments or concerns, let me know. Thank you!