

Faculty Consultative Committee (FCC)
November 9, 2017
Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[**In these minutes:** Campus Events Coordination Committee Update; Big Ten Academic Alliance Governance Leadership Conference Update; Conversation with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon; Faculty Representation to the Board of Regents; Structure of FCC; Priorities and Issues for Student Senate Consultative Committee; Approval of Resolution on Proposed Tax Changes for Graduate Students]

PRESENT: Joseph Konstan (chair), Greta Friedemann-Sanchez (vice chair), Catherine French, Les Drewes, Dan Feeney, Jennifer Goodnough, Robert Kudrle, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Wendy St. Peter, Abimbola Asojo, Robert Blair, Sheri Breen, Tabitha Grier-Reed, Peggy Nelson, Ned Patterson, Amy Pittenger

REGRETS: Bill Arnold, Peter Tiffin

ABSENT: Michael Oakes

GUESTS: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon; Shantal Pai, chair, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee

1. **Campus Events Coordination Committee update:** Professor Konstan called the meeting to order and welcomed those present. He then asked Professor Amy Pittenger, who sits on the Campus Events Coordination Committee, to provide a brief update on what this committee is doing. Professor Pittenger began by noting that the committee's membership is broad and includes people from across the institution. She also noted that the purpose of this committee is to develop a comprehensive approach for coordinating all Twin Cities campus events regardless of sponsor, with a focus on gathering event plans and conducting risk reviews for various events. Professor Pittenger emphasized that event content is out of the scope of this committee given the University needs to remain a place where people can explore ideas, engage in debate, and learn from one another's perspectives. While the committee just recently started meeting, it has an aggressive meeting schedule because it needs to have its report and recommendations to President Kaler by December 22, 2017 for implementation in February 2018. Professor Konstan thanked Professor Pittenger for serving on this committee and said it is particularly important because faculty have unique perspectives on the types of speakers that come to campus.

2. **Big Ten Academic Alliance Governance Leadership Conference update:** Professor Konstan began by saying that the Big Ten Academic Alliance Governance Leadership Conference meets annually and is comprised of faculty governance leaders from the various Big Ten schools. The agendas for these meetings vary from year to year. For example, last year, a lot

of time was spent on athletics' issues, and this year a significant amount of time was spent on governance structures, including the structure of the different Senates, their committees, different models for faculty leadership, relationships with trustee boards, and issues related to representation of and policies related to fixed-term faculty.

Professor Friedemann-Sanchez added that she came away from this meeting feeling very good about the University's relations between faculty and administration relative to what she heard is going on at other universities. She also said she found it interesting to hear what shared governance topics were being discussed at other institutions. Lastly, she mentioned a session on predatory journals that she found informative, and announced that there is an initiative underway, among the Big Ten universities, to work together collectively to combat this predatory practice. As an example, Professor Konstan mentioned that the universities in Germany worked together and collectively unsubscribed from Elsevier.

Professor Konstan added that the institutions that attended this conference were asked to think about drafting a statement supporting the faculty and governance system at Purdue University and condemning the process Purdue University used in the [Kaplan University acquisition](#). Before doing this, however, said Professor Konstan, he and Professor Friedemann-Sanchez have to get more information so the issue can be discussed intelligently.

3. Conversation with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon:

Professor Konstan welcomed Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education Scott Lanyon and asked him to share what is going on in the Graduate School as well as to share his perspective on the proposed tax plan changes that are being discussed in the House and Senate.

The [Association of American Universities](#) (AAU), and [Council of Graduate Schools](#) (CGS), said Vice Provost Lanyon, have both issued statements on the proposed tax reforms and the negative impact these changes would have on graduate students, graduate education, and research in general. In response to a question from Professor Konstan about what the FCC could do to be supportive, Vice Provost Lanyon suggested asking Channing Riggs in Government and Community Relations how the FCC could be helpful. He added that this is a difficult situation given how fast it is moving; therefore, if the FCC wants to do something, it will likely have to act fast. Vice Provost Lanyon noted that he is sending out an email message later today to all graduate students to make sure they are also aware of this issue and to encourage them to contact their legislators.

If the bill passes, asked Professor Konstan, will the University restructure how it thinks about graduate education tuition, or will it look at providing some sort of financial assistance to graduate students? Suppose tuition were to stay the same, said Vice Provost Lanyon, increasing graduate student stipends would take a long time before students would see any benefit because the increased stipends would be calculated as additional taxable income for them. That said, the proposed legislation could serve to reduce or control graduate tuition rates, but then this would have an impact on the revenue generation side of the equation for the University. No matter how one looks at it, this legislation has huge implications for higher education.

Professor French asked Vice Provost Lanyon if he will have an opportunity to testify, or make some sort of a formal statement, etc. Vice Provost Lanyon said he is confident AAU will take care of this. The most important thing will be for Minnesota's elected officials to hear from their constituents that passing this bill would have dire consequence for higher education across the country. He added that a misunderstanding that may be fueling the proposed tax reform is the notion that graduate education is simply producing more faculty and sustaining higher education. While the reality is that this is not what graduate education is all about, it is what many people believe.

Professor Drewes suggested the University calculate the financial implications this legislation would have on its graduate students, and to figure out how much their stipends would need to be increased to offset the cost of this additional tax burden. Vice Provost Lanyon said if the new tax burden on a student were "x," the amount stipends would have to be increased would be significantly more than "x" because increasing their stipend increases their tax burden. Vice Provost Lanyon said he has asked the Office of Human Resources (OHR) for data on the number of University students who are getting tuition waivers, but he has not yet received this information.

Next, Vice Provost Lanyon distributed a one-page summary of the Graduate School Strategic Plan and walked members through it pointing out the following:

- The mission statement now explicitly includes postdoctoral students.
- The word "facilitate" was added to the mission statement to convey the fact that the Graduate School works *with* colleges and graduate programs.
- The strategic objectives outline what the Graduate School should be doing.

The Graduate School believes it can be most helpful at advancing excellence by increasing diversity, said Vice Provost Lanyon. He then went on to highlight a few of the Graduate School's new initiatives:

- Work with colleges to build inclusive communities for graduate students and postdocs from under-represented populations in order to improve scholarly depth and excellence in our graduate programs as well as to increase recruitment, retention, and graduation rates. These students need to be provided with an intellectual space that allows them to come together and talk about things they are encountering, and, in turn, mechanisms need to be identified for addressing the issues/concerns that are uncovered.

Professor French commented that the College of Science and Engineering (CSE) has a program for women to increase diversity and took a few minutes to describe the program. She noted that this program provides women with an opportunity to network and talk with role models. Vice Provost Lanyon said that his understanding of the CSE program is that it allows people to come together to surface ideas and problems, and it also has mechanisms in place to effect change without putting the people who raised the issues at risk of being identified. In Professor French's opinion, it helps to seed resources like this in the trenches. Vice Provost Lanyon agreed and added that the goal is for the Graduate School to provide resources to help colleges do this exact kind of thing. The intent, noted Vice Provost Lanyon, is for there to be a true culture change. The plan is for the

University to invest some one-time money that will result in a self-sustaining culture change.

- Partner with colleges to provide training to faculty advisors and directors of graduate studies (DGS) in order to improve faculty effectiveness as advisors.

Professor French mentioned that the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has a forum for Directors of Undergraduate Studies (DUGSes) that is held once a semester that focuses on different educational/training topics, e.g., student mental health.

Historically, said Professor Konstan, an area of responsibility for the Graduate School has been interdisciplinary programs. Where does this fit in the Graduate School's strategic plan? Most of the new initiatives, noted Vice Provost Lanyon, have an interdisciplinary flavor to them. Moving forward, diversity and interdisciplinarity will be written into all Graduate School job descriptions, no matter what role an employee plays.

Professor Konstan commented that the vice provost for graduate education and dean of the Graduate School are actually two very different roles. The Graduate School has been defined as a school that exists to support and facilitate, and act as a resource and partner for the colleges. However, the role of the vice provost comes with it the power and authority to expect certain results (carry a stick). What role will the Graduate School play in evaluating programs during programmatic reviews, dean reviews, etc.? The Provost's Office, said Vice Provost Lanyon, will be doing academic program reviews on a more regular basis than what has typically been done in the past. As part of this process, 1) he and Vice Provost McMaster will develop questions for the external review committee to ask, and 2) departments will continue to be required to do a self-study as part of the review process, but will not have to complete the data portion. Instead, the Provost's Office will provide data in a standardized format to departments being reviewed. By doing this, the Provost's Office will get to specify the data it wants included, e.g., diversity information. Then, the last step in the process, explained Vice Provost Lanyon, will be for him, Vice Provost McMaster and Provost Hanson, if she is available, to meet with the review committee and get the undergraduate and graduate education findings. Additionally, Vice Provost Lanyon said that he has started meeting with each college this year and providing them with their graduate education data, e.g., admissions, graduate education applications, etc. He said doing this provides him with the opportunity to bring up any concerns he may have. This is an attempt to keep a focus on excellence as it relates to the data. In terms of "carrying a stick," the Graduate School has really not done this, said Vice Provost Lanyon, although he noted that he has made it clear to deans and associate deans that the Graduate School can do this, if needed.

What role does the Graduate School play in the evaluation of centers, asked Professor French? These evaluations are being handled in much the same way as departmental reviews, said Vice Provost Lanyon. As long as the Provost's Office is organizing the review, Vice Provost Lanyon said he will be involved. The one caveat to this are graduate programs that have their administrative home in a dean's office, e.g., dean of CSE, dean of CLA. Currently, graduate programs are reviewed when a department is reviewed. None of these special situation graduate

programs have been scheduled to be reviewed to date, but a mechanism to do so will need to be developed. Based on what he has witnessed, said Vice Provost Lanyon, academic departments or centers with provostial-visibility, will have their reviews conducted by the Provost's Office. However, for centers that are in a college, for example, he said he is not clear what happens in these cases, and suspects it is more of a collegiate level responsibility.

How was the Graduate School Strategic Plan developed and who was involved, asked Professor Patterson? Vice Provost Lanyon said after numerous conversations with various groups of constituents to hear about issues and concerns, the Graduate School staff actually developed its plan taking into consideration what it had the bandwidth to do and what its priorities should be. As things are accomplished, new things will be added to the plan.

How will the Graduate School make sure the interdisciplinarity component of the plan will not get lost, asked Professor Blair? As he mentioned previously, said Vice Provost Lanyon, interdisciplinarity will be explicit in every job description, and he plans to promote the use of memorandums of understanding between interdisciplinary graduate education programs, which will formalize their agreements. As resources become tighter and tighter, in the absence of a formal agreement, problems arise.

Professor French commented that the interdisciplinarity priority needs to be made externally visible for people who review the plan like the diversity priority is made clear otherwise people may not think interdisciplinarity is a priority. She suggested revising the language of the plan to reflect this. Vice Provost Lanyon said this is a draft plan and so changes can still be made, and he will take this under advisement.

What is the role of the Graduate School when it comes orientation, asked Professor Friedemann-Sanchez? Vice Provost Lanyon said because the University is so huge, students often do not hear about or take advantage of the numerous resources the University has to offer besides the resources of the graduate program they are in. While it makes sense that units need to have their own orientations, there really needs to be a University-wide orientation as well, which is coordinated with the units. Additionally, said Vice Provost Lanyon, there is a limit to how much students can retain in a day, especially in the beginning of their career when they do not know the right questions to ask; therefore, revisiting orientation means looking at the structure of it too, e.g., a year-long orientation.

Before moving on to the next topic, Professor Konstan reported that during the discussion with Vice Provost Lanyon, he reached out to Ms. Riggs for her thoughts on the FCC drafting a resolution on the proposed tax reforms. He then read her response aloud, which essentially said she did not see any downside to the FCC crafting a resolution and suggested it be done sooner rather than later. With that said, Professor Konstan read aloud the resolution he drafted and asked for member's input. Members provided some input, and, after a brief discussion, Professor Konstan sent FCC members a draft of the resolution for their comments/amendments. He then said that the committee will vote on this resolution at the end of today's meeting.

Professor Konstan and members of the FCC thanked Vice Provost Lanyon for a good discussion.

4. Faculty representation to the Board of Regents: Professor Konstan explained that the Board of Regents (BOR) recently restructured its committees (see below). In the past, Senate committee chairs whose committee's work aligned with one of the BOR committees, would monitor the topics the BOR committees were discussing. However, with the recent BOR restructuring, there has been some confusion as to which Senate committee chairs are doing this. The BOR committees include:

- Mission Fulfillment
- Finance & Operations
- Governance & Policy
- Audit & Compliance
- Litigation Review (closed meetings)

After some discussion, the following faculty representatives agreed to keep an eye on the BOR committees below by monitoring their agendas and listening to, or attending meetings whenever possible.

- Mission Fulfillment – Professor Joe Konstan (FCC chair), Professor Bill Arnold (Research chair), and Professor Jennifer Goodnough (Educational Policy chair)
- Finance & Operations – Professor Dan Feeney (Finance & Planning chair)
- Governance & Policy – To be determined
- Audit & Compliance – Professor Feeney to see if someone currently serving on Finance & Planning would be interested in monitoring this committee

5. Structure of the FCC: Next, Professor Konstan turned members' attention to a spreadsheet that outlined how the Big Ten school's senates are structured. He then proceeded to share some of the different models these institutions use. With that in mind, he said he would like to have a discussion about whether FCC members think the University's current governance structure is effective. To lay the ground work for this discussion, Professor Konstan threw out a few things for members to consider. First, he asked members to think about the selection process and criteria for FCC membership. For the elected members, the Nominating Subcommittee has used a model that while it has created a committee with broad representation from across the institution, often its members lack deep governance experience. Second, he asked members to think about who is/should be eligible to serve as FCC chair. At any given time, said Professor Konstan, there are only about six members or so who would be eligible to be elected as the incoming FCC chair. As a result, just at the time when many members are ready to serve as FCC chair, they are ineligible. With that said, should the pool of possible FCC chairs be bigger? If so, members may want to consider whether to include the ex-officio members of the FCC in this pool as well as possibly former FCC members. Third, Professor Konstan asked members if they think the FCC should have more of a succession system, e.g., a chair-elect. Finally, the whole notion of the vice chair having a more significant role in the FCC is very recent, said Professor Konstan, happening only in the last two to three years. A possible alternative to this would be to have multiple vice chairs and to divide the work among them so that more people get development. With this as context, Professor Konstan opened the floor for discussion.

What is the eligibility criteria to become FCC chair, asked Professor St. Peter? Professor Konstan said that in order to be a FCC chair a person has to be an elected member of FCC. Additionally, to be chair for the 2018 – 2019 academic year, for example, a person has to be an elected member in 2018 – 2019. Therefore, if a person's term expires on June 30, 2018, he/she would technically not be able to be nominated as chair because the chair election occurs before members are elected and it is uncertain whether the nominated member would be re-elected. Professor Konstan added that in order to be eligible to serve on the FCC in any role, a person needs to be a full-time faculty member (67% appointment time or greater), and not hold a senior administrative appointment. The two previous FCC chairs, Rebecca Ropers-Huilman and Colin Campbell, accepted senior administrative appointments, which has made them ineligible to continue on the FCC as the outgoing chair.

Professor Patterson commented that it is possible for an FCC chair to be chair for more than one year. Professor Konstan agreed, but that assumes the person would be eligible. Professor Patterson added that the AHC FCC decided, whenever possible, it was going to have its chairs serve for two years because it takes almost a full year to get up to speed. That is another possibility, said Professor Konstan, but if it were the case that a chair would need to make a two-year commitment, it is likely there would be fewer people who would be willing to take this on.

Professor Pittenger said she likes the idea of having a chair-elect who will become chair because it helps with succession planning. Several members agreed with this suggestion.

Professor Friedemann-Sanchez said how the FCC elects its chair and vice chair and the need for succession planning is only part of the issue. When she became vice chair, said Professor Friedemann-Sanchez, there was a lot to learn even though she had been a member of FCC for two years prior. She recalled Professor Campbell frequently saying there needs to be more associate professors participating in governance. Going back to Professor Konstan's earlier point, many FCC members get elected without having any governance experience. In her opinion, because how the FCC functions is linked to how it elects its chair and vice chair, she thinks the FCC, as a whole, needs more information about how the Senate actually works. Professor Friedemann-Sanchez said she was given this information after she was elected vice chair, but feels strongly the entire FCC needs to understand how the Senate works from the start of their appointment. Without this information about the structure of the Senate and how it works, the FCC is not as effective as it could be. In Professor Friedemann-Sanchez' opinion, in the short-term, the FCC should move to a chair-elect model, which would serve to prepare the chair-elect for becoming chair the following year, and there should also be a structural change in the chair and vice chair/chair-elect stipends so that they are more equal. In the long-term, the FCC should have a conversation at a Senate meeting about restructuring governance because there are clearly a number of faculty (those who were interested in unionizing, in particular) who are not happy with the current governance structure.

Professor Grier-Reed agreed with earlier comments about the FCC's need to have a strong succession and transition model if it wants to increase its effectiveness. She then shared an example of such a model from an organization where she had been elected president.

Professor Nelson commented that she has appreciated everyone's input and thinks now is a good time to solicit feedback from those members of the University community who are unhappy with the current governance structure. She added that she is also in favor of modifying the bylaws so someone could serve a fourth year, for example, in order to get the experience needed to become chair. While it is important to continually bring in new blood into the governance structure, it is important to realize that these individuals may lack the governance experience needed to make the FCC as effective as possible, and, therefore, the need for governance training.

Professor Konstan shared his leadership experience with a couple organizations. He noted that in the case of the one organization, no one became chair-elect without first holding at least one or more offices in order to gain an understanding of the organization. In the case of the other organization, it required that in order to be nominated as president/chair, the person had to have first served on the executive committee of the organization. While the FCC has had numerous vice chairs over the years, some of whom would not have made particularly good chairs, and others who would have made great chairs, but there was never the expectation they had to do so.

Professor Goodnough commented that technically the elected Morris representative could become FCC chair, but she does not necessarily think this is a good idea. However, the Morris representative could feasibly be vice chair. With that said, she asked members to think about whether the Morris representative should be given an opportunity to serve as vice chair.

In light of time, Professor Konstan asked members whether this item should be put on a future FCC agenda for a deeper discussion. If so, he proposed inviting some previous past FCC chairs, and FCC vice chairs who did not go on to be FCC chairs as well as members of the University community who have expressed interest/concern in the University's governance structure. Members agreed this topic needed further discussion.

6. Priorities and issues for Student Senate/Student Consultative Committee: Professor Konstan welcomed Shantal Pai, chair, Student Senate and Student Senate Consultative Committee (SSCC), and called for a round of introductions. Following introductions, Ms. Pai provided a brief update on what the Student Senate and SSCC is working on this year and highlighted the following:

- Passed a child care resolution that sets aside grant money (\$150,000 – managed by Office for Student Affairs) for Twin Cities' student parents to get access to whatever child care fits their needs. The resolution also calls for the system campuses to collect data on the number of student parents they have on their respective campuses, and, once this data is collected, the Student Senate/SSCC will advocate for a more permanent source of child care funding for student parents across all five campuses.
- Engage students in legislative affairs in an effort to get more funding for different things, e.g., infrastructure repairs.
- Work on student-worker rights, e.g., paid sick time, minimum wage.

- Participate in system-wide strategic planning efforts in conjunction with Provost Hanson's office as it relates to academic affairs, e.g., credit transfers across the system.
- Work to expand student services that are available on the Twin Cities campus (e.g., legal and health care services) to the system campuses.

Professor Grier-Reed asked Ms. Pai to talk more about the child care resolution the Student Senate just passed. Ms. Pai began with some background information, and concluded by saying that the Office for Student Affairs in conjunction with the Student Services Fees Committee now houses a grant that students are able to apply for to help with their child care costs.

Professor French asked for an update on student issues from previous years, e.g., food quality and variety of food choices in residence halls, student mental health services, sexual assault. Regarding the food issue, said Ms. Pai, the Minnesota Student Association (MSA) is taking on this issue because it is a better fit for them. Another component of the food issue from last year had to deal with business ethics, and the student representatives on the Board of Regents are spearheading this initiative in collaboration with the SSCC/Student Senate. In terms of the sexual assault issue, said Ms. Pai, the SSCC/Student Senate are waiting to hear the recommendations from the MSA task force charged with addressing this topic. Finally, the mental health issue is being addressed through the broader discussions that are taking place around Student Services Fees and making student services available on all the campuses.

Professor Konstan asked whether thought has been given to how to go about making student services accessible across the system. Ms. Pai said there will be a focus on electronic communications, particularly as it relates to legal services. While it will likely be necessary to keep the Student Legal Service centralized on the Twin Cities' campus, the goal is to ensure that system campus students have access to these services, which is currently not the case. Regarding mental health services, it is likely the SSCC/Student Senate recommendations will rely heavily on public health recommendations in terms of the standards/criteria for counselors, and how many counselors each campus should have, etc.

Professor Konstan reported hearing concerns raised by students about not being able to access other college's career fairs. Is this an issue SSCC/Student Senate has heard about? Ms. Pai said as the chair of the Student Senate she has not heard of this issue; however, as a CFANS student senator last year, she heard this issue raised in her college board meetings. She added, from a broader perspective, that she has heard concerns raised about access inequities across the entire system.

Professor Pittenger mentioned that work is being done to get law present into some of the interprofessional clinics taking place on the Duluth campus, and she believes there is a legal aid group fairly close to the campus that she and her colleagues may want to look into.

Professor Konstan asked Ms. Pai if there are any things that she has heard of that are going remarkably well. Ms. Pai said students really like the renovated Tate Hall. She said she has also heard positive things about the willingness of the campus community to have discussions about building names as a result of the *A Campus Divided* exhibit at Andersen Library.

Professor Grier-Reed asked whether students are having any free speech discussions. Yes, said Ms. Pai, and there are two sets of discussions happening. First, there are students who want the University to set a higher standard than the State of Minnesota for things like hate speech. Then, there is another group of students who are adamantly opposed to the University setting a higher free speech standard than the Bill of Rights. The issue of free speech has not been a topic of discussion within the Student Senate this year.

Professor Konstan asked Ms. Pai to stay in touch, and added that something he has heard positive things about from students is the [Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program \(UROP\)](#).

Does the Student Senate/SSCC feel that other Senate committees, including the FCC, are approachable, asked Professor Feeney? Yes, said Ms. Pai, but the Student Senate/SSCC struggles a little when it comes to knowing when to approach other groups. In Ms. Pai's opinion, there seems to be a tendency to shy away from issues that may live in a different committee. Professor Feeney said this may be something worth working on and cited the example when SSCC brought their concerns about Aramark to the Senate Committee on Finance & Planning (SCFP). Collaboratively, working together, these two groups resolved these students' concerns. Also, mentioned Professor Konstan, if Ms. Pai thinks it would be helpful, the FCC would be more than happy to hold a joint FCC/SSCC meeting to discuss topics of mutual interest.

7. Resolution on proposed tax changes for graduate students: Before adjourning for the Senate meeting, Professor Konstan redirected members' attention back to the draft resolution he crafted on proposed tax changes for graduate students. He noted that during the meeting he received one edit from Professor Friedemann-Sanchez, which he proceeded to read aloud. Members liked the clarification in verbiage and unanimously voted to approve the amended resolution, which reads:

Resolution from the Faculty Consultative Committee at the University of Minnesota

Graduate education is a critical function of America's universities, powering our nation's research, discovery, and creativity while providing in-depth education to prepare students for leadership positions in industry, research, teaching, and public service. Graduate education also generally involves substantial financial sacrifice for the students -- even those fortunate enough to obtain fellowships or assistantships spend years living on very modest wages as they continue their schooling. One of the most significant ways in which universities can help mitigate this burden is through waivers of tuition.

Accordingly, we are extremely concerned by the current US House tax proposal to make tuition remission as part of assistantships taxable to the student receiving them. Such a step will reduce the accessibility of graduate education, in turn reducing the nation's historic commitment to upward mobility, reducing diversity among graduate students, and diminishing the nation's highly skilled workforce and leadership in industry, research, discovery,

and creativity. Such a tax is counterproductive and undermines our competitiveness.

The University of Minnesota's Faculty Consultative Committee, therefore, strongly opposes this proposed tax change and urges Minnesota's congressional delegation to oppose it.

Adopted unanimously by FCC on 11/9/2017

8. **Adjournment:** Hearing no further business, Professor Konstan adjourned the meeting.

Renee Dempsey
University Senate Office