

General Faculty Meeting
Tuesday, March 3, 2015

Talley Student Union, Piedmont Mountains Ballroom 3:00
p.m.

1. Call to Order

Chair Zonderman called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

2. Remarks, David Zonderman, Chair of the NCSU Faculty

Chair Zonderman commented on the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors is the body that oversees the entire (17 systems) campus. He stressed that they are not NC State's administration and they are not the campus Board of Trustees. He explained that the Board of Trustees is pro NC State and they are pro faculty. They are a body that cares deeply about this university and wants to recruit and retain the best faculty.

Chair Zonderman highlighted a few issues from the Board of Governors that he feels have troubled many on this campus.

Chair Zonderman stated that the BOG have given President Tom Ross a one year terminal contract, though they have not provided a reason for why they are changing leadership. The Faculty Assembly which is the body that contains representatives from all campuses passed a resolution basically praising Tom Ross and respectfully asking the Board of Governors why they made this decision. The Faculty Senate endorsed that resolution and took a stand with the Faculty Assembly.

Last Friday, the Board of Governors voted to close three centers at various UNC system campuses. The Faculty Assembly again, last week sent a very detailed resolution; basically pointing out that what they were doing was contrary to their own policy. They, in turn, countered with a memo from their General Counsel basically saying "the Board of Governors can do whatever it wants to do, "policy be damned" and that is what they did. In today's N&O there was a letter from the Faculty Assembly which all members endorsed, respectfully asking the State Legislature as they go through the process of naming new Board of Governors, to think clearly about who they put on and try to find folks that know something about what a great university we have and how great universities require great governance.

Chair Zonderman stated that the Board of Governors is currently looking to revise its presidential search procedures when hiring their next President, which is going to make the search more insular to the Board itself. They would also like to put a Board of Governors representative on every campus' Chancellor Search Committee, which is something that has never been done before. They have been told that this is likely to have a chilling effect. It hasn't been put into policy yet, but this is where they seem to be going.

Chair Zonderman asked that the information be shared with colleagues and noted that the Faculty Senate is well aware of what is happening. His personal philosophy is many issues that involve the Board of Governors taking the lead, the Faculty Assembly is the first line of response. He explained that there is no formal shared governance role, that it is an advisory body to the President and to the Board of Governors and the State Legislature.

Chair Zonderman stated that some have asked, “What else can we do?” He said the Faculty Senate can do what it can, but there is a limit to the resolutions it can pass. We have a Board of Governors now that seems not to be paying attention to any resolution put before it as well. There are ways to mobilize beyond the Faculty Senate and sometimes that is very appropriate. Several people have pointed out that various things have been happening, both at Chapel Hill and Greensboro as well. Faculty on both campuses are mobilized, partly because they have had their own campus issues. They have taken that mobilization and directed it toward the Board of Governors as well. He stated that he is happy to work with anyone beyond the Senate.

Chair Zonderman stated that two specific things that faculty can do are to join the AAUP, which is the last major national organization standing up for the principles of academic freedom, tenure, and good academic governance. He urged the faculty that are interested to attend a statewide AAUP conference at Greensboro on March 28th. He informed the faculty that if there if any ad hoc groups form and want to organize partitions or meetings that the Faculty Senate can get the word out.

Chair Zonderman ended his comments by quoting one of the great labor organizers in the twentieth century, Joe Hill before he was executed by the state of Utah. He wrote to his friends the famous line “don’t mourn but organize”, which is what we should do on this campus. We should speak out as faculty, not only as a part of this campus but part of the UNC System.

Senator David Baumer commented: I’m somewhat concerned about you making noise about what the faculty and Faculty Senate say, and to my knowledge we haven’t had a resolution condemning the closing of the centers and we haven’t even had a discussion about that, yet if you will listen to what you said today as well as look at the minutes it seems to me that we are leading, but you haven’t received consent of the people you are supposedly representing. I would like for you in the future to clarify when you are making statements about we need to get rid of Board of Governors interference and all of these other things. That is my statement as oppose to the Faculty Senate, because again to my knowledge we haven’t had any notes on that topic. I think it is healthy for the Board of Governors to review centers, etc., and I don’t think it’s healthy to assume that this is censorship or that they are trying to underline the entire university.

Chair Zonderman agreed and stated that we have endorsed the Faculty Assembly resolution on President Ross. We have not voted on the resolution on the centers. “If I am called upon to make a statement as “Chair of the Faculty” I always reference it. That might be my formal title but I know I don’t represent all 2400 faculty. I did sign the statement that is in the N&O today, both as a member of the Faculty Assembly and as Chair of the Faculty here, and as an individual

and that should be in the statement. If it wasn't, then that was cut by the N&O staff. We all signed as individuals and not on behalf of the Senate, because no Senate met and endorsed that.”

3. Approval of the Minutes, Dennis Daley, Secretary of the Faculty

The minutes of the October 21, 2014 General Faculty meeting were approved as submitted.

4. Remarks by Chancellor Woodson

Chancellor Woodson began his comments by thanking the faculty for their response during the difficult situation a few weeks ago when two graduates of NC State and one current student were lost through a senseless act of violence. The campus responded very well and thoughtfully and with great dignity. He noted that a few members of the campus community went above and beyond, in particular Justine Hollingstead with everything that she did to get us through.

In response to the shooting a scholarship has been set up in honor of the three students, called “our three winners” and it was initiated with some discretionary resources to establish the endowment. Chancellor Woodson stated that he is very pleased that in a short period of time, contributions have doubled and we are well on our way to establishing a very healthy endowment to support future students in the three colleges that the students were graduates of, which are the College of Management, College of Science, and a scholarship recognizing creativity in the College of Design.

Chancellor Woodson reported that the UNC System recently joined the Community College System and the private college and university system to do an economic impact study. This was done in a comprehensive way using an outside firm, and for the UNC system alone the economic impact on the state on an annual basis is calculated to be around \$27 billion. If you look at the economic impact of NC State alone it is more than \$6.5 billion, which is a large portion of the system overall. When you consider that the largest economic impact is the healthcare system, the hospitals, etc. made up by UNC Healthcare, our campus has a lot to be proud of. The Mayor and the County Commission understands that and it's a great place to be. In fact, Charlie Leffler along with Mike Mullen were able to secure \$650,000 from the county council in support of the Gregg Museum project. That project is up and running and on schedule for a ground breaking in April for the new museum.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the Board of Governors meeting last week was interesting. They went about their business. The things that impacts this campus is obviously we didn't have a centers and institute in the final recommendations and although that doesn't change the way we feel about campus autonomy over the creation and dissolution of centers and institutes, that is an important autonomy that we need to continue to seek and support because it is critical that we have to stand up centers and institutes quickly, because often these are established to keep us competitive for federal grants. In many cases one has to create a center or an institute as part of the requirements for a particular grant. This was pointed out a number of times to the board.

The other item on their agenda that got a lot of discussion but very little coverage in the newspaper was they also approved tuition and fees for the next two years. NC State's overall tuition increase each of the next two years is 3 percent.

Chancellor Woodson stated that they are confident that the governor's first brush of our budget will not be favorable. There is an indication that there will be about a 2% budget cut to state appropriation. Please know that the university is still among the most accessible and affordable in the country. In fact, USA Today listed its top ten institutions for access and affordability for in state students and NC State was number seven on that list. We continue to be a great value, but it doesn't diminish the responsibility for us to try to keep tuition affordable.

Chancellor Woodson stated that there is a challenging year ahead, that in the UNC system we have a President in a term of a year contract, we have a Board that is in transition, but the good news is that we have a wonderful group of Trustees that love this institution. You have a dedicated group of administrators working hard every day to keep NC State strong.

5. Remarks from Provost Arden

Provost Arden gave an update on leadership searches.

There are currently searches underway for the Life Sciences for Research Innovation and Economic Development, Dean of the College of Sciences, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Director of Arts NC State.

Provost Arden stated that in the first two searches, the committees are working hard screening applicants, and moving toward the off campus interviewees.

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs—three exceptional candidates have come to campus. This past week he has met with the search committee and have taken all of the results of the survey. He is in the process of making offers and hopefully bring that search to a conclusion within the next couple of weeks.

The new Director of Arts NC State will be Dr. Rich Holly. He is currently serving as Dean of the Performing Arts at Northern Illinois University. He will be a great addition to the university.

Provost Arden gave an update on the Chancellor's Excellence Hiring Program.

Round 1: Hired about 35 individuals and they are already making extraordinary contributions to the university.

Round 2: They have received 49 applications, and 49 groups of faculty came together to submitted proposals. The top 13 were asked to move from pre-proposal to full proposal phase and by April they hope to announce the finalists.

Provost Arden stated that one of the major things that we have to keep doing is working really hard at bringing new individuals into the institution and retaining the great individuals that we have. The reality is if you look at the objective under our strategic plan we are going to struggle to meet the numbers that we thought. We are working hard to bring in individuals, but there are a number of individuals leaving the university. Last academic year 80 faculty left the university and that included 19 retirements. Department heads and others are working hard to replace those individuals.

Provost Arden reported that tuition and fees were approved as submitted at the Board of Governors meeting, and this included some premium tuitions on a couple of programs. Also approved was a couple of special fees for the university. One was a fee that is already in place which is the professional golf management fee and the other was a significant expansion of the Engineering fee to be a fee specifically to engineering and not fees that are for general use of the university. That will be applied to all engineering students and will result into some significant resources. As the Chancellor mentioned, where we end up the next fiscal year is your guess as good as mind. On the positive side there will be some resources coming in from tuition and fees, specifically the engineering fee will produce resources for the engineering program. If we are funded on enrollment, that will produce a reasonable enrollment increase, somewhere around \$24 million at putting appropriations in tuition. On the negative side we don't know what our budget cuts are going to be. The 2 percent budget cut that the Chancellor mentioned amounts to about \$9 million for the university, which is exactly the same amount as our tuition and fees raised. We really will not have all the pieces of the puzzle until sometime around July or August. There is a very high opportunity that this is going to be a stressful year financially.

Questions and Comments

Have there been any discussion or thought on how the engineering fees will trickle down and be shared with engineering programs that are in the college?

Provost Arden stated that his understanding is that fees will account to the exact proportion of dollars that those programs will benefit as well. At the moment there is a \$90 computer fee that Engineering students pay and that will move to \$500 in the next academic year and \$1000 the following academic year. The total amount of money is projected to be the next academic year, will build approximately \$4.4 million and the following year about \$8.8 million in recurring resources. Those are limited in the way that you can spend it, because they are fees and not tuitions. We are going to spend them specifically on student enhancement programs. We are also going to spend them on things like start up, things to enhance faculty and student research as well. Yes, other engineering programs that are not solely located in the College of Engineering should benefit from those fees as well.

Comments from Roy Baroff, Faculty Ombuds

Roy Baroff commented on the Ombuds Office. He stated that the office fills informal gaps that other formal programs may not. They have a website up and running at facultyombuds.ncsu.edu. The office is located on Cox Avenue just off campus.

Baroff stated that he has already met with a couple of faculty members. The word is getting out and his role is to be supportive to faculty in an impartial way, since he doesn't represent the faculty or the university. He looks forward to meeting and working with everyone throughout the year and into the future.

6. Panel Discussion – University Foundations and the University Mission

Chair Zonderman thanked everyone for being a part of the panel. The purpose of the panel is to educate faculty as to what are university foundations, what are their functions, how do they work on campus and how do they enhance the university for missions.

Chancellor Woodson stated that NC State can be a good university with our normal revenue streams of tuition, fees, and state appropriations, but to really be the university we all aspire to be, private philanthropy and support from private foundations is critical for our success. Foundations largely exist within the university to support the efforts to grow the private philanthropy for NC State and they have been around for a while. Somewhat unique is we have multiple foundations which is a long history going back to the 1920's. Several other institutions have multiple foundations. It creates an environment where we have multiple organizations working hard every day to raise critical resources to benefit the college or the organization that they represent. He stated that when we talk about an overall endowment for the university, which NC State's is approaching \$1 billion; it is a collection of multiple small endowments. Most of which have restrictions associated with them based on the intent of the donors. While private philanthropy is a wonderful thing and something we continue to want to pursue, it does come with restrictions -- and they are based on donor intent.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd, Treasurer, stated that we have a long history of our foundations at NC State. It is not a new development. Many of the organizations have been in existence for seventy years or more. A lot of them go back to 1940 or older. The newest foundation is the Veterinary Medicine Foundation that was established in 1978 and the Natural Resources Foundation was formed from a merger in 2008 from two preexisting foundations which had existed for many years.

Brian Sischo, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, stated that we have a relationship between central advancement and the leadership between each of the individual foundations, one where we work hand in hand to ensure that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing.

The upside to having as many foundations as we have is it creates hundreds of opportunities for engagement of more alumni and friends with the university. Greater engagement leads to greater interest to what we are doing at NC State and ultimately that leads to greater investment. The more alumni and friends that we can engage the easier the job is when it comes to fund raising. It is a real benefit associated with having the number of foundations that we have.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd pointed out that for those colleges that do not have a foundation there is generally an advisory board that acts in place of the foundation.

Eileen Goldgeier, University General Counsel, stated that our foundations are private nonprofit corporations organized under nonprofit cooperate law in North Carolina. They are recognized under Internal Revenue code as 501C3 corporations. By their definition under the law and by the nature of their support organizations they are separate and distinct from the university. They have their own articles of incorporation, by laws, and Board of Directors. One of the many benefits of these foundations is to have the leadership of all these foundations on these boards engaged in the university and contributing as well. Because they are private nonprofit corporations they are not subject to the same laws as the university. They act as private nonprofits as any other private nonprofit would.

Chancellor Woodson added that from a conflict of interest standpoint it is important to understand that any gift accepted on behalf of the university through a foundation is subject to the oversight and policies of our Board of Trustees, particularly regarding the naming rights. All gifts received by the university that bring with them restricted endowments are subject to the approval of the trustees.

Goldgeier stated that another component of conflict of interest is all of the directors have a fiduciary duty to the cooperate entity, meaning that they have a duty of care diligence loyal to good faith and honesty and they are not allowed to be involved in self-dealing. The UNC General Administration has a policy framework in which these associate entities must interact with each university and we require that each foundation have a conflict of interest ethics policy and whistle blower process in place so that those things are checked at the door.

Chancellor Woodson stated that there was a time in the state of North Carolina's history and NC State and other universities that creating separate 501C3 foundations was a critical avenue for us to be able to raise private resources. That has changed and we now have the authority under statue to have a university endowment that many of these foundations predate that law that allows the university to establish its own private endowment.

Questions and Comments

Chair Zonderman - One question that faculty has raised is whether you can talk more about how spending priorities and decisions are made by foundations and where. Some faculty feel that "X" foundation is supposed to benefit my college, how come the faculty don't say to the foundation that we want you to spend the money on "X". The foundation seems to decide how to spend it even though faculty object to it being spent that way.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the reality is the assets of the foundation are a collection of individual gifts, all of which have restricted use agreements in place. They are there to benefit whatever their donor gave the money for. The critical thing to remember is the university has a spending policy with regards to foundations, which is 4% on the endowment. The earnings on the endowment provides a spendable account. A lot of the restrictions that exist, exist because a donor gave money specifically to endow a scholarship for a specific county. The critical thing is

to connect the passion of the institution and needs of the institution with the passion of the donor and to be prepared to not accept gifts that are not consistent with our goals or values.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd agreed with the Chancellor and pointed out that as an institution we have a very high percentage, higher than most of our peers, that can't be used for any purpose other than for what the donor intended.

Vice Chancellor Sischo noted that Harvard had their first fund raising campaign in 1643. They have that pipeline of longevity. A lot of universities, NC State included are newer to this game. We find that how unrestricted endowment is built is primarily on the backs of bequests that are realized by universities as a result of generous donors who have passed. The good news in this case is we have seen a real uptick in the flow of realized bequests to the university within recent years. This is a long time proposition. At the same time we do have more than 2400 restricted endowment accounts. Each one of them require a distinct level of stewardship, because those donors want to know, in fact, they are required to know how that money was spent.

Chair Zonderman asked, is there a role for faculty to enter into the conversation about planning and use of endowments? When does faculty enter the conversation?

Chancellor Woodson stated that faculty's voice in terms of what the priorities for the college are, what the priorities are for the units in the college and how do those priorities get translated through department heads to the deans and get incorporated into the efforts of all of the development officers that are around the room. When they are talking to alumni and friends they have on the tip of their tongues, what are the critical investments that they are trying to make as a college. "I have tried to hold people's feet to the fire to say that we have got to make giving to the endowment a priority. Beyond that it is a focus of the colleges. We need to invest in faculty. We have a high priority of trying to endow graduate fellowships. We have a lot of need and it is very obvious to us what those needs are and we just need to keep it on the top of everyone's mind."

Vice Chancellor Sischo stated that the reality is donors want to interface with faculty and deans. They tolerate development officers. Having your pitch ready at all times becomes an important part of that interface and interaction.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd stated that the boards do make endowment investment and spending decisions, but because so many received are restricted, their hands are sort of tied.

Roby Sawyers: Just a reminder that faculty's desires may not be the same as a desire from a dean or college with respect to spending from endowments. About two years ago, the Faculty Senate made a presentation essentially asking administration to consider funding of some sort that would provide in lieu of tuition remission for children of faculty and staff, some type of endowment that could be used for those purposes. The point is those things don't come through deans and that is not going to be a priority for a dean or college, but maybe a priority for faculty and staff.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the point is well taken, but there is not a lot of big donor distinguished alumni ready to support an endowment to cover the cost of tuition for our faculty and staff, but that doesn't mean we can't attempt to. In fact, one of the things that we have a real opportunity to do is to do a better job internally of engaging our own constituents into contributing to the university. That is a thing the faculty could get excited about.

If a faculty member brings in funds from industry for a particular project and the faculty member doesn't need to spend all of the money, what happens to the funds that are left? If the grant is to fund an educational initiative and not actually a research grant?

Senator Fred Cabbage: The process of having these closed Boards and foundations have been counterproductive for NC State in general and I'm hoping you will find a way to open these Boards up. NC State's contributions went down 10.7% last year, while most other institutions across the country have seen substantial increases during this period of better stock and investment returns. As you pointed out the faculty for the first point of contact for our alums and for our students we are talking about the representation of loyalty to NC State and I think faculty should be more engaged in these Boards. Do you see a way we can engage the faculty, engage the alums in these Boards to make sure the faculty's voice is heard which I think would really help sell the brand?

Chancellor Woodson stated that contributions have never been higher. We have had three of our best years in the last three years, so that 10.7% decline was year over year which was a record year of \$137 million versus the next year of \$117 million, which is \$30 million more than we have ever raised in a single year. Your point that our contributions are going down is dramatically inaccurate. In fact, the gifts and commitments to the university for the last three years have been on average 100 to 110 percent greater than we have ever received. ⁱ

The role of the faculty in all of this really is to set the priorities to set the agenda for what we are raising funds for and to make sure that those fund raisers that have responsibilities to the foundations and the university are acting in line with the wishes of the college, and that is happening. With regards to the openness of the meetings, our donors are intent on the reasons these exist are 5013C's is because our donors have asked them to exist in that way to protect the identity of those that are giving resources to the university. It is this way in every foundation across the country and will be here going forward.

There are at least two major groups that solicit funds from alumni. Who coordinates those fund raising efforts? How do we leverage those two things together?

Sischo stated that in his experience with working with the folks in Athletics and the Wolf Pack Club there has been nothing but an open and transparent relationship. Part of the challenge is making sure that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing. We are working hard to make sure that we are working together in that regard. Ultimately it comes down to how the donors feel about this. From my experience the donors have enforced that, they appreciate the

distinctiveness of what the Wolf Pack Club is looking to accomplish, but they also recognize that we are working together toward that end. He said as far as taxing the athletics department specifically for academics, he is not aware of other institutions that have done that.

Chancellor Woodson stated that if you look at the annual scholarship cost for student athletes, all of that money goes to the university and it was \$11 million last year. The funds that are raised for athletics are in support of two things and only two things by agreement, which are scholarships and facilities. Facilities are included only if we ask them to support the facility. To a large extent those funds are coming back to support the university.

Chair Elect Moore: Has there been any thought to limiting naming to a certain number of years instead of having something named forever?

Sischo stated that we are seeing more of that in the industry. He thinks that the challenge in discussion with donors is that at some point that name could go away. What starts out as \$10 million today through investing, overtime that endowment will grow hopefully in excess of the inflation rate. Hopefully down the line that \$10 million is now worth \$30 or 40 million dollars to keep consistent with the needs of that program.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd stated that the goal is to maintain purchasing power over time, so that maintenance have that purchasing power. If that all holds should still be able to buy the services and faculty salaries and perpetuity.

Chancellor Woodson stated that endowments are designed and the payout of endowments are designed to grow over time into not only continue the current purchasing power but hopefully with good performance and good investment to exceed it.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd noted that it is not only just endowment that is coming in through the foundations, but also a lot of gifts, which also support the institution. Last year the university through its foundations brought in \$68 million worth of revenue from various foundations and that was 5% of the university's overall revenue budget.

With multiple foundations it seems that we are shooting ourselves in the foot.

Sischo stated that it certainly makes it more complicated, but that is why it impresses upon us internally to ensure that we are working in close collaboration. That is why we spend a lot of time working together and a lot of the work that we do is to ensure that we are on the same page. The reality is with larger donors, and increasingly with all donors there is multiple interest and we have to make sure that those multiple interests are fairly and equally represented as we talk to those donors and that is why it really stresses the importance of internal collaboration so that we optimize the relationship with those donors.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd stated that we have two foundations that also work across the university, which does a lot of multi-school work and then we also have the endowment fund of North

Carolina State University, which is where we embed our distinguish professorships and a lot of scholarships. A lot of major donors are bringing funds to the endowment fund.

Is the endowment ever tapped for extraordinary spending? Can you dip into principle?

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd stated that in so many of our historical gifts, it is very difficult to spend corpus. Most prevent the spending of corpus. A survey was done not long ago and there were 81 out of 2500 for which we could spend the corpus.

Chancellor Woodson stated that as we grow unrestricted imbalance, we will have more flexibility that those are just now starting to be realized as a result of bequest. Frankly most universities are reluctant to that because if you have a temporary issue with the state, for example, if you invade the corpus temporary issues are never temporary issues recurring and you have limited opportunities to address it with endowed gifts.

Chancellor Woodson stated that when he came here NC State had roughly two thirds of its endowments under water. That means that the value of the endowment was below the original value of the gift, which our rules prohibit us from spending until it gets above the original value of the gift. That tells you two things, which is we had a lot of problems and it also tells you how young our endowments are, because endowments that we would have received in the 1950's 60's or 70's would have benefitted so much from the growth in the market that even the fall in 2008 and 09 would not have put them under water, but it did and I'm proud to tell you today we have zero underwater. We don't have a single endowment at the university that is not able to spend based on losing value below its original corpus.

Have you noticed a trend of giving in general to the university? Are we getting more donors giving money just to the university and not targeting it to departments or colleges?

Sischo stated that in his view the colleges are the university and the university is the colleges. He sees this as one big happy family when we take the high road. The underline trend in philanthropy in the United States today is at all gift levels donors being increasingly restrictive where they would like to see those gifts allocated, down to the \$25 and \$50 gifts. Donors increasingly want to know how that money is being spent and that lends itself to their being attached to specific programs and to specific departments and less so as unrestricted purposes. Part of that is the influence of the internet, the influence of society today, wanting accountability perhaps more now than ever before, wanting to know and see their monies going specifically for what they intend.

Faculty Member commented: We do have some donors that will give to broader programs across the colleges, where it may not be totally unrestrictive to the university it does cover all the colleges. We have seen a lot of interest in that area.

Chancellor Woodson said he would like to see similar types endowing university wide graduate fellowships that could be used competitively to support.

Chancellor Woodson stated that the annual fund is where the telephone calls and letter solicitations go out. There is a large contribution there called “University’s Greatest Needs” which is unrestricted. He said the last couple of years he has applied those dollars back into undergraduate research and study abroad for struggling students to be able to finance study abroad, because it is consistent with the university’s strategic goals to get students more engaged in high impact learning experiences.

7. Announcements

Chair Zonderman reminded faculty to fill out their COACHE survey and noted that the survey is used frequently at this university.

Mary Pelloquin-Dodd stated that she attends numerous board meetings throughout the year and finds that board members really appreciate presentations by faculty; new technology, new emerging areas of research, those are well received. She suggested that interested faculty talk with the deans of their colleges to see if there is a way to bring more of that into the board meetings.

Chair Zonderman thanked everyone for attending.

8. Adjourn

A motion passed to adjourn the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

ⁱ [Gifts and Commitments](#)