

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Minutes of the Faculty Senate
February 7, 2017
3:00 p.m.

Regular Meeting No. 9 of the 63rd Session: Faculty Senate Chambers February 7, 2017

Present: Chair Moore, Chair-Elect Bird, Associate Chair Orcutt, Parliamentarian Lubischer, Senators Ange-van Heugten, Argyropoulos, Ash, Barrie, Bernhard, Berry-James, Bullock, Bykova, Carver, Fath, Feducia, Havner, Hawkins, Hergeth, Huffman, Kotek, Kuzma, Parker, Pearce, Sannes, Sederoff, Young

Excused: Senators Eseryel, Kathariou, Rever

Absent: Senators Auerbach, Banks, Gunter, Laffitte, Lee, Nam, Peretti, Perros Silverberg, Thakur

Guests: Roy Baroff, Faculty Ombuds, Katharine Stewart, VP for Faculty Affairs, Monica Banks, Assistant to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

1. Call to Order - *Jeannette Moore, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Moore called the ninth meeting of the sixty-third session of the NC State Faculty Senate to order at 3:01 p.m.

2. Introductory remarks - *Jeannette Moore, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Moore stated that our guests were present each week and introductions were not necessary.

3. Announcements - *Jeannette Moore, Chair of the Faculty*

Chair Moore referred the Senators to the committee activities and announcements on page two of the meeting agenda.

1. Data Privacy Month - February is Data Privacy Month. Please heed the warnings and learn about individual phone security and other topics that will provide information on protecting your data. Please refer to their website at: <https://oit.ncsu.edu/2017/01/18/data-privacy-month-2107-protect-the-pack-protect-your-data/>
2. Alumni Association Executive Director Bennie Suggs, who is an NC State graduate and a native North Carolinian, was presented with the Order of the Long Leaf Pine, which is the most prestigious award given to a citizen of the State of North Carolina. Benny will be at the final meeting of the Faculty Senate in April and we will congratulate him at that time.

3. The Dancing Around the World event is for faculty, staff and students and the organizers are seeking faculty to participate in the event on Thursday, February 16th from 5:00 – 7:00 p.m. in the Witherspoon Student Center, Washington Sankofa Room. More information can be obtained here: <https://staffsenate.ncsu.edu/>
4. Please see the APPENDIX A – Summary of University Standing Committee activities. This information was provided by the Faculty Senator on each committee. APPENDIX A can be viewed on the January 24, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda on the Faculty Senate website.

4. Approval of the Minutes, Regular Meeting No. 8 of the 63rd Session, January 24, 2017

Darby Orcutt, Associate Chair of the Faculty

With suggested minor changes to the draft minutes, a motion to approve the minutes was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

5. Provost's Office Remarks and Q/A

Dr. Duane Larick, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy & Resource Management

Dr. Larick brought greetings from the Provost and explained that he is involved in a meeting during this time that precluded him from attending this Faculty Senate meeting. He brought information that the Provost's office is actively engaged around campus and shared that he has been going to each college to discuss enrollment planning and the enrollment budget and where they are in each of those areas. He stated that they are working with each of the colleges and at the graduate level, to help ensure that we are hitting our enrollment targets for Fall 2017 and 2018.

Dr. Larick stated that we were significantly short of our enrollment targets for Fall 2016, and as a result of that, the best way to think about it is that we are over-funded by the state for the student contact hours that we don't have to deliver because those students are not here. In turn, that will result in a budget reversion on July 1st of this year. He explained that the scope of that reversion in both July of 2017 and July of 2018 will depend on our ability to hit enrollment targets. So, he stated, more than ever, the enrollment planning and the implementation of the enrollment plan is critical to our ability to continue to make progress in our strategic plan and its implementation.

Senator Pearce asked if other schools, like Chapel Hill, have similar problems with their graduate enrollment? Do you know that answer?

Dr. Larick responded that for Fall 2015, Chapel Hill also had enrollment planning challenges where they did not hit their enrollment targets and it was not as substantial as ours, but about \$5 million. He further explained that Chapel Hill made a decision this year to dramatically increase their first time full time freshman class and tried to work themselves out of that hole in a one-year period of time. He continued

that this was not the direction that NC State has chosen, and he referenced the 2025 year plan that says the University will try to do modest growth in undergraduate enrollment and we will focus on graduate, master's and doctoral enrollment and we are continuing that effort.

Dr. Larick stated that in Fall 2016 we missed our enrollment targets at the undergraduate, master's and doctoral level and it was really by our own doing. He went on to say that there was not any major event that occurred – not a one-time major event; maybe setting a too aggressive enrollment target all came together at one time to influence that. For Fall 2017 and 2018, part of the message to the colleges is a little different, especially to those colleges that are relying on international students. He explained that as of a few weeks ago, there has been a lot of rhetoric and the current Executive Order that is being ruled on by the courts. He stated that whatever the outcome, the University will be challenged to convince international students that the State of NC and the United States is a welcome place. Additionally, he stated that it will also be challenging for them to get a Visa in order for them to come.

Dr. Larick spoke about the Executive Order currently being argued and said that at this time, there are approximately 280 applicants at the graduate level and about 10 at the undergraduate level who are from the seven countries identified in the Executive Order and will be affected. So out of 26,000 undergraduate applications and out of about 14,000 or 15,000 graduate applications, that is not really a huge issue; however, the second part of the Executive Order, the requirement of a face-to-face interview, could pose additional issues. He explained that it would be physically impossible for all of the applicants to get face-to-face interviews between now and census day of Fall 2017. Therefore, he concluded, there is a lot to this Executive Order that has the potential to really be impactful.

He stated that a student cannot schedule that interview until they have a recommendation for admission from NC State, so he encouraged everyone to get that recommendation into that student's hand so the student can go to the embassy and be the first one in line to schedule an interview. He said let's not wait until May to do something we can do today. There are thousands of graduate students still awaiting decisions so he stated that admissions needs to look at those applications and say there are some real no-brainers in here; these are exceptional students and we need to get them their letter today.

Senator Young asked if the face-to-face interviews have to be done at the embassies, and does Skype count as a face-to-face?

Dr. Larick responded no. He explained that the reason the waiver was implemented was because of the realization that the backlogs were just too big. "At that time, there was a sense that the international students completing STEM degrees were critically important to the workforce of the US and so there was a waiver policy put in place eight years ago. So it now requires a sit-down face-to-face and those meetings take anywhere from 15 minutes to longer, depending on circumstances."

Senator Argyropoulos: For all nationalities?

Dr. Larick stated that a student from Canada has the same requirement as a student from Iran.

Dr. Larick continued by stating that the message that we are delivering to the campus is that we can't just behave the same as we have every other year; we have to be more aggressive than we have ever been before. Additionally, he said, that looking at the percentage of decrease in graduate applications of domestic students versus the percentage of international students, the percentage for domestic students is actually down more with 15%, while international applications are down 8%. The number is smaller, but the percentage of the population is greater. Additionally, North Carolina is down about 4%. He stated that any time you see an improved economy, expect to see fewer graduate applications. More broadly, recruiting students from across the country or internationally to come to North Carolina at this current time is indeed challenging.

Senator Kuzma commented that maybe FY16 wasn't by our own doing – because there is a thing called HB2 and people are boycotting conferences in the state. Why would you want to come to North Carolina?

Dr. Larick responded that most of the backlash from HB2 was a little bit after the crucial admissions window.

Senator Kuzma responded that last year, HB2 did contribute to the reduced numbers.

Dr. Larick confirmed yes, they were applying for Fall 2016.

Senator Kuzma suggested that they were making their decisions in March and April, which was around the time that this controversy was taking place.

Dr. Larick agreed that yes, it was starting to get into the conversation.

Senator Kuzma asked if anyone looked at that or do any comparisons about HB2 and its effect?

Dr. Larick responded that no, but anecdotally he receives messages from the Dean of the Graduate School or some of the Associate Deans that an applicant has specifically said I'm not coming to North Carolina because it's not a place that I feel comfortable moving or moving my family. However, it is mostly anecdotally.

Senator Parker asked what would the data be worth to know why people are not coming here? What would you do with that?

Dr. Larick responded that he is more focused on what we need to do to get students to NC State. Right now, to him, this emergency is what do we need to do to get students to come to NC State.

Senator Parker then asked that the students who are being admitted but are choosing not to come,

what would that data be worth to you to know?

Dr. Larick responded that it would continue to give the Chancellor and President Spellings evidence to say this is another way that the political climate in the State of North Carolina is hurting us.

Senator Parker suggested that maybe for a short amount of time, perhaps waiving the application fee for folks who respond to a survey.

Dr. Larick responded that on the graduate application if a student chooses, it does have questions if they decide not to attend that asks for reasons why. Most students just demonstrate they are not going to come by not registering.

Senator Berry-James asked if we can add to that survey so that we understand fully the economic impact of HB2 so that we can speak from this point of view. That way, all of us will know.

Dr. Larick responded that unless we can come up with some kind of incentive for the student to complete it, he does not think we would be successful.

Senator Berry-James commented that we currently have the survey and even though people do not respond to it, what do you think the response rate is? 10%-20%?

Dr. Larick responded that he feels it is likely less than 10%.

Senator Berry-James stated that since we do still use the survey that we likely use the data in some respect. She added that it might be worth just adding the HB2 question to that. We know that there are students who are choosing not to come to NC State and other colleges in our state because of HB2 and the political climate and issues around safety so it helps us to have a better understanding.

Dr. Larick responded that there is no question that the difference between the decrease in domestic applications from outside of North Carolina versus inside of North Carolina is attributable to the political climate. He stated that the rankings of NC State and your individual programs keep going up and improving, so it is not those issues; there is no question. He continued by saying that individually, it would help us, but I almost feel like being able to say we have seen a 16% reduction in domestic student applications to NC State University is profound just by itself.

Senator Berry-James asked if we would use that kind of knowledge to then offer additional graduate assistantships in the community so that we can attract a certain population. Perhaps OIED would advocate for more GSSP, from support for students in that particular protected class.

Dr. Larick responded that the Provost's office has first year fellows and that number has grown to over 100 now of the first year fellows, which equates to almost \$3 million. In thinking about growing enrollment, the graduate student support plan really is not an issue today as much as it was in the past

because we did not hit targets and will not spend all of the GSSP funds as of 6/30/17.

Senator Huffman commented that it appears that the undergraduate targets were missed but also the graduation rate improved. So are we increasing the incoming class to account for that?

Dr. Larick responded that yes, that is basically what was done. He stated that we increased first time full time freshman by about 200 and we increased external transfers by about 100. With that, he said, we would expect that our total undergraduate population to be stagnant. He went on to say that the other thing that we are doing is we are looking very seriously about a Spring admissions program of deferred admissions. "We will experiment with it now, and for students who are on the waitlist, there will be a select group of those students who will get an offer to defer admissions until Spring, a guaranteed admission for Spring if they are willing to pay the enrollment deposit and wait a semester." He continued by stating that we graduate 3000, 2000 of which are undergraduate students, in the Spring so we think we have a little bit of capacity to maybe help with the issue. We also may be able to do some targeted admissions in certain areas in the Spring.

Senator Parker commented that people go to college or to a University in order to get a job that pays well enough that they don't have to graduate and live in their parents' basement. He stated that in Poole College of Management, in both the undergraduate and graduate areas, they have a very aggressive Career placement staff that is outstanding in assisting students figure out how to get good jobs by anticipating and identifying the skills that are needed in order to do so. Additionally, the MBA graduate program is well-known for its phenomenal highly paid placement rate, which is a result of the amount of work that the career staff puts into working on their behalf. Dr. Parker commented that in many cases, students enroll in PCOM because they know they are going to get a good job when they graduate. At the University level, what is being done to assure this is occurring in other colleges as well?

Dr. Larick responded that, as everyone knows, higher education needs to do a better job of collecting completion data and outcome data. Therefore, we do not have a very well-utilized survey that reaches out to alumni. He stated that we reach out to students when they are being cleared to graduate, at dissertation or thesis submission time, or a master's level student when they are being cleared to graduate and they take an exit survey. He continued that we do not have a good six-month, one-year, two-year and we rely on data that comes from NC Tower, which is data that is done based on students' W-2 earnings statements. He stated that we partner with the Alumni Association, which does a pretty decent job of getting initial contact information, so we do have access to that. However, he said, the majority of the exit survey data that we have is departmentally driven, where departments are collecting that. Dr. Larick cited examples of graduation rates, average salaries and signing bonuses of four-year graduates in departments across campus. He further stated that there are challenges with NC Tower data, saying that it is not robust data at all. He feels our best opportunity is to continue to work with the Alumni Association to build the database.

Senator Bykova asked if we distinguish between masters and doctoral students. She stated that it is

well known that PhD programs are shrinking and if we can continue to swim against the stream, we will have a problem. Masters programs are growing because of the industry needs. Will we distinguish between them saying this is our goals for masters and this is our goal for PhD?

Dr. Larick responded that in the short-term enrollment plan for 2017-18 and 2018-19, we have targets for masters and PhD at the college and program level, each program having a target. However, he stated, in the long-term 2025 enrollment plan, we have targets for masters and doctoral students at each college level, but not broken down at each program. He stated that we have masters and PhD targets, some of which have aggressive growth, some that have moderate or very little growth.

Senator Sederoff commented that what is being discussed does not seem to be consistent with our long-term goal to improve our standards. How are we going to reconcile this?

Dr. Larick pointed out that if you look at our 2025 enrollment plan, the number one objective is to grow doctoral education in STEM-related fields. He feels this is very consistent with our goal to grow the research enterprise. He is not sure where the inconsistency is.

Senator Sederoff stated that the projections are that we are going to be more and more deficient.

Dr. Larick stated that we have an enrollment plan for Fall 2017 that shows growth in doctoral enrollment and we have an enrollment plan for Fall 2018 that shows growth, and that plan extends out to 2025. He added that we are going to have to do specific things to hit those targets, and we are going to have to be more proactive and aggressive. He then pointed out that we have created a Provost Fellows Program to have 100 new Fellows; we are adding \$2.5 million to the graduate student support program to make sure it is adequately funded to accommodate growth.

Dr. Larick continued by saying that he thinks the University is taking strategically as many steps as we can, but that we do not have control over the NIH budget or the NSF budget or the USDA budget. He stated that there are risks associated with our objectives, but we are managing the risks on our campus that we can manage as best we can. Dr. Larick said that he will see how we can do for Fall 2017 and Fall 2018 before he is willing to call it a "crisis," but he thinks we are doing everything we can to try to hit those targets. "If we demonstrate that we cannot hit them, then we are going to have to have a serious conversation about the 2025 plan and if, in fact, it is doable." He stated that there are challenges, of which the biggest is funding and funding stipends. Additionally, he responded, if we are going to grow doctoral education, the largest percentage of those students that we are going to rely on require funding to come to NC State to do their PhD.

Senator Argyropoulos commented that a year ago the same question was asked about the same thing and your response was that we were going to have to roll these targets back. We cannot simply set targets and hope for the best; once we see trends, it is our obligation to try to see what the real reasons are. Asking the faculty to bring in millions of dollars more and hope that the targets are going to be met is not the only solution. We need some radical ways of looking at this. He agrees that we are heading

for crisis. We cannot just set targets.

Dr. Larick responded that the enrollment plan that was submitted for 2017 is an \$11 million reduction in funding. We did dial back. He stated that from where we are today, it is an \$11 million reduction and that during the second year, we will recoup about \$9 million. He continued by saying that two years from now we will have \$2 million less because we are overpaid for delivering student credit hours.

Senator Berry-James cited an example from another university regarding ideas for funding doctoral and masters enrollment and was an incentive for researchers. She wondered if anything like this was being discussed in terms of incentives for faculty researchers, ways to increase the number of grants that support doctoral and graduate students, or even an email that's being set up for radical ideas to help us address some of the challenges that we have.

Dr. Larick responded that, as related to F&A, it would be a good time for Scott Douglass and Alan Rebar to come to the Senate to talk about it. He stated that there are conversations going on now about F&A and F&A distribution and changes that need to be done, but that he doesn't know if there is anything concrete that they would be able to deliver today. He continued by outlining another initiative that has been put forward that is related to training grants. The Provost's office now has 62 or 63 matching stipends for training grants, which is a new effort to try to encourage faculty to develop and submit training grants. He stated that we currently have about 250 federally funded training grant fellowships on our campus and our peers would be two to three times that and that this is an area in which we have to be more aggressive.

Dr. Larick stated that emails for innovative ideas can be sent to the Provost.

6. Faculty Workload Survey Results

Beth Fath, Co-Chair of the Faculty Senate Governance and Personnel Policy Committee

Senator Fath provided background regarding this presentation. She stated that an issue of concern was presented to the Faculty Senate regarding increased faculty workload, so by working with OIRP, the Governance and Personnel Policy Committee designed and distributed a survey on faculty burdens. She stated that the survey was done to try to quantify anecdotal concerns about increased faculty workload over the past 5 years, so faculty were asked to offer estimates regarding increased number of hours tasks extraneous to our core mission required.

As a result, she stated, more than 700 faculty responded, which is a substantial response rate of almost 50% and every college had a significant response rate. She noted that fewer than 20% of faculty reported "no" increased burden but more than 50% of the respondents reported they were spending "notably more" or a "great deal" more time on tasks. She pointed out that the top two areas of the source of increased workload were uncompensated administrative work and assessment tasks, which

are both broad and encompassed what “other” meant.

Senator Fath displayed the data that was gathered and then explained the different ways to look at the information that was gathered. She stated that the data will be presented in more detail when the full report is released.

From the data, Senator Fath provided a summary of the issues stated in long-form prose answer, which include:

- Centralization of support staff results in local expertise either being absent or residing with faculty whose time is spent on work that local staff used to do
- Hiring has multiple HR roadblocks that don't respect principles of faculty governance
- Administrative fiat introduce burdens without faculty buy-in (which include assessment, but also business and grant transactions).

Senator Fath continued by stating that the sentiment is that faculty time is regarded as free and infinitely expandable – the natural outcome of doing more with less. She then summarized the perceptions and thoughts that were prevalent in the survey. Those include:

- Faculty feel administration “externalizes costs” by imposing them on faculty, leading them to feel their time is devalued.
- These feelings and beliefs may not reflect reality, but they are widespread, and the data are compelling.
- The full report contains more details and appendices with all of the prose responses and additional analysis.

The full report will include greater details on the data.

Questions/Feedback

Senator Huffman asked if the committee had tried to assign a cost?

Senator Fath responded that no, it had not.

Senator Feducia asked what was next because ever since he arrived at NC State, this has been something he has heard about every year, but nothing has changed. Faculty are doing more and it seems that the administration at every level ignores it. This will eventually take away from what we are here to do. This is great but I think we already knew this. What is next?

Senator Fath responded that the goal in doing this was trying to get some large themes or ideas where perhaps we could start to discuss possible solutions or proposals that we can make to address some of these things. Those would likely be the next steps.

Senator Hawkins stated that it was surprising, the universality across the colleges; it seemed that the common themes about administration and centralization and recruitment were things we could get into.

Senator Fath commented that there is a new HR person and so the discussion was that perhaps she might be the place to start discussing how the processes can make more sense.

Senator Sederoff pointed out that centralizing support is not good for us and is easier on administration than it is for faculty.

Senator Berry-James wanted to underscore the nature of a project like this; the first slice being that faculty have responded and told us about the burdens that they experience, the next slice being how many faculty are experiencing burdens and what are those burdens, and then the third slice being accreditation and how much these faculty burdens are distracting from the kind of work we are really here to do. She then asked how many of these burdens are uncompensated burdens for faculty. She feels these are fair and important conversations to have.

Senator Pearce pointed out that one thing that stands out to him is that many of these are considered valueless. He added that we fill out all of these assessments but there never seems to be feedback that shows the value of the process. He stated that he has the sense that it is not only that there's a cost, but that there's not much value.

Senator Bykova stated that, at times, requested assistance boils down to just directions that they are giving us instead of helping us. They end up telling us what to do but not actually helping us because of lack of resources or other reasons. So we have to end up figuring it out on our own, which takes time away from teaching. She stated that she remembers the Chancellor saying that if you are complaining about not getting enough help, we probably don't have enough administration to help you. So if you think for a minute about it, this is their role. There is no one to help, and we are on our own.

Senator Barrie commented that this report is a good start by identifying some factual and measurable information but what can the committee do with this. This is a very good summary but some analysis of some of the metrics could be useful, such as offloading of tasks, centralization of services, budget, cutting of staff that used to serve faculty, etc. He feels that some analysis and parsing this out could be helpful.

Senator Hergeth commented that the issue of trying to get something concrete to work on is the problem. In the College of Textiles, we had quite a number of hiring in the administrative level because there were some major changes over the last two years. The College of Textiles has done a survey to gather concrete examples within their own college. He pointed out that the response rate was not as high, in part, because people are really worried about being identified but eventually a meeting was set up with the Dean. The results are the same as is shown here.

Senator Argyropoulos would like to know the number of administrators at different levels and helpers of

administrators and how these compare to tenure and non-tenure faculty.

Dr. Larick commented that Chair Moore has sent out a link to this information, which includes data and varying graphs and representation of every OUC on campus.

Senator Pearce stated that he thought at some point there was a decision made that directors who were administrators before so many years and then became faculty after that. He isn't sure if there is an indication in the data that states what year it was and it makes it a little harder to look at trends.

Senator Fath requested that someone go back and look at the non-tenure track information because it is not correct for her department.

Dr. Larick responded that on November 1st, if you sign a new contract or release a person from that contract, these numbers don't automatically change; this is a census driven. He encouraged the Senators to communicate with Mary Lelik if mistakes were found so that they can be discussed and rectified.

Senator Ash commented that maybe we need to separate things that we now have to do that we never used to have to do from things that we are asked to do through processes that do not work too well. So focus on the specific issues – we have no choice because we have to do these things because money won't suddenly fall from the skies and we have more employees and staff people to help. Instead of trying to count numbers of hours let's re-do systems that may not be as efficient as they need to be.

Roy Baroff has had some conversations with faculty about the time and interaction with staff that you are working with. He encouraged the Senators to think about how do you rather recreate the idea that staff and faculty are a partnership working together, as opposed to we/they. He stated that there is a cultural piece as well as the numbers too.

Senator Sederoff stated that underlying all of these is an "us versus them" philosophy and what it speaks to is a lack of a sense of shared governance because we do not know why these tasks are needed.

Senator Feducia commented that he wondered if it would be of value to follow up with people and ask them if they did not have to do all of this, what would they be doing. Are we doing this at the expense of something else? He commented that this would be important to know.

Senator Huffman commented that all of these administrative takes are proportionately given to the highest performing faculty because they are the ones who bring in the most grants, do the most traveling, have the most students and do the most hiring. Therefore, the more that we continue to push the faculty, the more it punishes the highest performing faculty.

Senator Hawkins asked if there has ever been a cost/benefit analysis done to quantify the cultural

effect of centralizing the support staff. How much has that actually benefitted in cost to do that?

Senator Bykova agrees that it should not be a “they and we” situation. We have good relationships with staff members. However, the problem is that we do not have the staff members any longer – this is the problem. They are taken away from us due to the centralization.

Senator Berry-James stated that if you believe in the principles of shared governance, you have to believe in the principles around fair compensation. If all of these activities that take so much faculty time during the semester are all administrative activities, if the administration does not have the capacity to do all of these things, then the faculty should be compensated for these administrative activities. We would never ask an administrator to teach a class without getting compensation, the same is true for faculty – they should not be asked to use a great deal of our time on administrative tasks that staff should be doing.

Chair Moore stated that she wanted to hold onto this information until the larger report is released.

7. Old and New Business

a. Topics for Spring General Faculty Meeting

Chair Moore stated that we are still taking ideas for the Spring General Faculty Meeting topic, so if you have ideas to suggest, the Executive Committee will discuss that on Thursday. Please send your ideas to any member of the Executive Committee and copy Chair Moore.

b. Faculty Senate Elections – Associate Chair of the Faculty

Chair Moore informed the group that Faculty Senators can each nominate one person from the current Faculty Senate membership to be on the ballot for Associate Chair of the Faculty even if they are due to rotate off. She stated that elections are going to be in about six weeks, but there are not many Faculty Senate meetings between now and then because of Spring Break and the General Faculty Meeting. She reminded the Senators that you can self-nominate or talk to a colleague in the Senate to nominate you, but please send those names to Chair-Elect Bird as soon as possible for nominees for Associate Chair of the Faculty.

c. Feedback from senators who are representing the Faculty Senate on University Standing Committees was provided in short written comments

Comments regarding committee activity were received from Faculty Senators who serve on University Committees. Those comments are attached to the meeting agenda as an appendix and are on the Faculty Senate website.

8. Issues of Concern

None.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.