

Ad Hoc Joint Committee on Sustainability

Tuesday, October 19, 2004

9:00am-10:30am

216 Anderson Hall

Attendees:

Eva Czarnecka-Verner
Linda Dixon
Mark Hostetler
Charles Kibert
PK Nair
Rich Segal
Kim Tanzer
Les Thiele – *Chair*

Absent:

Matt Armstrong, Student
Mark Brown
Charles Frazier
Paula Fussell
Lisa Hall
Donna Isaacs, Student
Charles Kibert
Chris Machen
Colette, Taylor

- The meeting was called to order at 9:03am.

Discussion

Les Thiele suggested beginning the meeting with a discussion of the budget drafted by Rich Segal and PK Nair. A draft budget was presented outlining the tentative budget for the Office of Sustainability over a three year period. The draft identified specific budgetary figures and the identified offices responsible for payment for: The Director, Office Coordinator or Assistant, Graduate Assistant(s), Seed Grants, and Office Expenses. This proposal set forth a proposal suggesting 100% funding year one, 70:30 (core: grant) year two, and 50:50 the third year. The offices deemed responsible include the Office of the Provost and the Office of Finance & Administration. Kim Tanzer stated that after speaking with VP Poppell and VP Frazier, it should be noted that one large sum be presented to their offices and they will determine who takes what percentage. Kim Tanzer did make note of the issue that Provost Colburn will be stepping down at the end of this year and the individual coming into the position may have a different outlook. It was noted that Chris Machen does agree that there should be a faculty member as well as student coordinator.

The question was raised regarding how an academic home department would be chosen. This department would be responsible for some expenses. Charles Kibert noted that this could lead to problems by creating a tug-of-war, responsibility and confusion. He suggested that rather, there should be a small group of individuals from multiple academic departments working together. One Director and a group of faculty.

A question of the Director's responsibilities was addressed including whether the individual would be responsible for bringing in funding. It was suggested by several members that the individual in the Director position not be tied to grant funding. Les Thiele questioned whether tying the grant money into the position so quickly would be harmful. Kim Tanzer suggested using a five year scale down rather than three years. Kim Tanzer stated that it cannot be the responsibility of one individual rather have a group of professionals to do grant focus and linkages to the community. The Director could be involved with marketing around community.

Another way to further reinforce funding office would be the savings and cost reductions around campus. The saving could pay for the Director position. "Position pays for self"

The location of the office is another matter to be addressed. The location selected could be one of the recommendations presented to the Faculty-Senate.

Suggestions of what the position of the Director would involve include: the development and maintenance of a website, fundraising, major projects, reports, Zero Waste, etc. The individual would be responsible for coordination of tasks. Whatever the responsibilities they should be identified at the onset of hiring, especially if monetary values or figures are a goal. It was agreed that the individual should have a five year appointment with a review after the third year, (or every year (??) as faculty are.) Charles Kibert questioned who would review the individual. The members agreed that a permanent Committee be approved and that the Committee would have a substantial role in the review. Cannot be sunset. Cannot have office and positions temporary. Charles Kibert stated that all grant writing should be done by faculty and the Director should be responsible for cutting costs. Hard costs static with growth showing endowment and funding. Must show saving money, bringing in grants. Annual reviews will hold them responsible.

Charles Kibert did note that there was already a website designed on sustainability at <http://www.sustainable.ufl.edu>.

Mark Hostetler emphasized that it should all be hard money.

It was determined that the specifics should be presented to the Faculty-Senate so that what is approved is generally what is going to be implemented. It was also agreed that the specifics would go to VP Poppell's office, VP's Frazier office, and Provost Colburn's office before presented in front of Faculty-Senate.

Eva Czarnecka-Verner and Kim Tanzer are currently working to gather information on what programs are already in place at UF. This will include any programs, projects, academics, etc. There are various places on campus where sustainability is present. There are courses that have assigned numbers that focus on sustainability. Important to determine the percentage of individuals that are engaging in these methods, behaviors, and ideologies as compared to the overall UF population. This information would serve beneficial to present to the Faculty-Senate to further corroborate that these methods and ideas are already in place, among Faculty, Administrators and Students. Kim Tanzer, Eva Czarneck-Verner, and Colette Taylor have put out a call for information. Will take this information and "construct a web of relationships". Important to continually educate leaders 24/7. Social equity. Kim Tanzer stated that have all the parts and must bring into systematic process. Needs sustainability office to do so. In five years these processes could help UF become a leader.

It was noted that the office should include more than one graduate student as outlined in the draft budget. The Director and Associate Director should each have their own (if not two) graduate students working for them. Will need someone to do budgeting and someone to do website design as well. Mark Hostetler stated that website maintenance and design should be hard money and that it will encompass a large part of someone's responsibility. Will require a great deal of upkeep in order to include the information and projects occurring on campus and in community (worldwide). The funded section would include the Graduate students and outreach

of program.

Les Thiele summarized that the main goal of the office would be to coordinate and serve as a clearinghouse. Office is not really to systematize any Faculty or Departments as people don't want to be told what to do, rather focus on encouragement and education.

The Duties of the Office and the Individual should be about Teaching and Service. Important to include in the preamble that the Committee is part of the package. Committee should be a major player in review process. Both Faculty and Staff will be involved. Community is an interested part of this Office and should be included in projects and such.

At the next meeting the following will be presented:

- 1) Revised budget from Rich Segal and PK Nair amending the items discussed.
- 2) Kim Tanzer, Eva Czarnecka-Verner and Colette Taylor will continue to email and gather information from the faculty and staff. Kim Tanzer will draft a narrative for the Preamble. Everyone will gather ideas on the responsibilities of the office and Director position.
- 3) Linda Dixon will present and discuss the Draft Resolution for the Faculty Senate.

Kim Tanzer informed members present that there would be a webcast 10/20 at 1:00pm in Rinker Hall. Will send email out as well.

Meeting Adjourned at 10:37a.m.