

Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Minutes of May 5, 1999 - (Approved)
E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:00 PM on May 5, 1999 in Capen 567 to consider the following agenda:

1. Report of the Chair
2. Report of the President/Provost
3. Faculty Senate Student Life Committee - Interim report
4. Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee
5. Student Comment on fees for graduate students
6. Old/New Business

Item 1: Report of the President/Provost

Provost Triggles asked FSEC to stand for a moment of silence in remembrance of Dr. Jacquelyn Mitchell, Dean of the Graduate School of Education, who died last week.

Dean Freschi will be on leave for a year; in his absence Thomas Headrick has agreed to serve as Acting Dean of the School of Architecture and Planning effective August 1, 1999. The arrival of a new Chair of the Department of Architecture makes it particularly important to have an Acting Dean in place who knows the School.

The budget planning process is entering its final stages. The Provost's Office distributed a close to final iteration of the budget numbers this week. The ambition is to have a five-year plan which will help move us away from the reactive mode.

The Provost has opened discussions with the interdisciplinary organized research units on campus about their budgets, their accountability procedures and what they expect to achieve with the resources they have been given. This is in aid of bringing the Provost's Office into policy making for research issues to ensure that UB is making the best possible

research investments. Deans and Chairs nearly always applaud the creation of a new Center or Institute, but they do so with the understanding that they don't have to fund it and will get credit for any funding it brings in.

- is UB doing anything to re-acquire a Center for Advanced Technology? (Professor Malone)
- this is at present primarily a political issue; UB would like a CAT for biotechnology and biomedical engineering, but this is seen as being in conflict with what Stony Brook is doing; there will be no action on the issue until a budget is in place; there is \$5 M in the Governor's budget for a Roswell Park/UB facility for biotechnology enhancement; would seek to link the CAT and the \$5 M into a single unit and then hire someone from the pharmaceutical industry with experience in outsourcing biotechnology development (Provost Triggler)
- will be asking FSEC for suggestions for appointments to PRB; are there policies which preclude department chairs from serving on PRB? (Professor Nickerson)
- PRB's own policies preclude department chairs from serving (Professor Welch)
- three department chairs are currently serving (Professor Schack)

Item 2: Report of the Chair

The Chair reported that:

- although this is the last scheduled meeting of the FSEC for this academic year, if there is need for input, an emergency meeting in the summer could be called; he thanked Ms. Kedzierski, Professor Kramer and Sue Wuetcher for their work this year
- he attended the May 3 Deans' meeting with the Provost and learned: the budget process is in progress with the Deans; over the next 4/5 years, the University will pay off the \$10/12 M deficit it has accumulated; costs and future directions will be discussed with the Deans; for example Computer Sciences is proving very expensive to operate; financial profiles are complete and revenue projections have been made by the Provost's Office; 90 % of revenues will be returned to the Deans; for the past several years faculty/staff turnover has been constant at about 80 positions per year or \$4.5 M; the Provost and Deans expressed considerable interest in and anxiety about the change in the wording of the *Charter of the Faculty*

Senate regarding Faculty Senate oversight of graduate and professional education; one issue was the speed with which the Faculty Senate could react; he assured the Deans and Provost that Faculty Senate has proven it can respond rapidly, and Thomas Headrick concurred in that assessment; Dean Grant talked about creating a University College that would be responsible for undergraduate students who had not yet been accepted into a Department, and he is looking for cooperation and coordination among the Deans to support the University College; the College of Arts and Sciences would, however compete with the Schools for its funding; Dean Grant is particularly interested in establishing visible links between the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools, setting up joint degree programs, for example; how credit is granted in the funding formula is the difficult question

- it is important to encourage the Deans, who are ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate, to participate in Senate activities; Dean Karwan will talk about issues facing the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences at the Sept. 7 meeting of Faculty Senate
- he is asking for potential nominees for the PRB
- he is circulating an update from Janet Penksa on the bill to place the President of the University Faculty Senate on the Board of Trustees
 - what are the prospects of the bill passing? (Professor Malone)
 - the Assembly is supportive; the Senate is more reluctant, but there is hope that the bill will pass (Professor Nickerson)
 - what is the status of budget negotiations? (Professor Schack)
 - rumor is that no budget agreement will be reached till the middle to end of July (Professor Malone)
 - does the President need to approve the change to the *Charter* adopted at the last Faculty Senate meeting? (Professor Swartz)
 - yes (Professor Malone/Professor Welch)
- he received a letter from Arnold Gardner thanking the Faculty Senate for its Resolution honoring him; Mr. Gardner seemed quite touched

- the Committees are beginning to wind down for the summer; the Academic Planning, Budget Priorities, Grading and Governance Committees will all meet soon; several chairs have asked to step down, and he is working on finding replacements
- there have been no responses to Resolutions of the Faculty Senate
- the last meeting of the Faculty Senate is May 11
 - will there be a report from the administrative committee that is working on a sexual harassment policy? (Professor Swartz)
 - Loyce Stewart will make a report for that committee (Professor Nickerson)
 - what is the status of the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Affairs that we agreed to establish? (Professor Schack)
 - need to identify a chair; Professor George, who would be a natural choice, will be away for the summer (Professor Nickerson)

Item 3: Faculty Senate Student Life Committee - Interim Report

Professor Ludwig, Chair of the Student Life Committee, explained that the Committee divided into two subcommittees to allow members to work on issues they found most interesting. One subcommittee, chaired by Professor Nickerson, looked at the role of faculty as advisors to student organizations. Professor Ludwig chaired a subcommittee that looked at issues of academic integrity.

Concerns about the academic integrity of students have always been part of college life. Electronics and other media have, however, expanded the methods by which cheating can go on, and the failure to document sources and the submission of papers that are not the work of the student seem to be more prevalent.

Moving beyond horror stories, the subcommittee discussed ways faculty could combat these problems. First and foremost, faculty should include in their syllabi statements of what plagiarism and academic dishonesty consist of. Not all students will understand the

parameters of these terms or know what the penalties are although student rules and regulations are annually included in the *Reporter*. It is also important to explain to students how to document sources; there is confusion about this, especially about how to cite web resources. If a faculty member believes a paper to have improperly come from web materials, commercial search engines can track words and phrases, but there is a fee for the service.

When a faculty member believes a student has been academically dishonest, pursuing the matter puts the faculty member in a difficult position. The faculty member bears a heavy burden of proof. Students have threatened faculty and have instituted retaliatory grievances. It is important for colleagues to give moral support under these circumstances.

Faculty have a value system that doesn't always get transmitted to students. Although a post-modernist could spin out theories of identity and ownership with today's easy replication technologies, most faculty think simply that if you write something, you own it, but if you didn't write it, you can't own it. It is important for faculty to stress that to students.

The Committee also considered tracking instances of egregious academic impropriety. Just failing an assignment or a course may not be a sufficient deterrent. One possibility would be of creating a repository of such incidents.

There were comments from the floor:

- current practice of scheduling exams in rooms too small to spread out the class makes it difficult to monitor cheating (Professor Sridhar)
- even when a class is spread out, students can still read the answers of other students; give multiple versions of the exam to prevent such cheating from being effective (Professor Baumer)
- giving multiple versions of an exam helpful, but spreading students out makes monitoring much easier (Professor Sridhar)
- students do bring grievances against faculty and experience suggests that the student will win any grievance brought against a faculty member; for example, a student caught cheating was told that a

report of the incident would be shared with higher University authorities so she grieved and won because that penalty was not included in the Chemistry Department's document on cheating; the current grievance process is ludicrous (Professor Churchill)

- has not been my experience of the grievance process (Mr. Boyce)
- use of too small rooms for exams is a disgrace; good to create a repository of cheating incidents, but should include more than just incidents that were formally pursued (Professor Churchill)
- important to outline in syllabus what constitutes academic impropriety and the penalties that can be invoked and reference the web site of student rules and regulations; makes providing a written syllabus even more important (Professor Malone)
- important for faculty to adequately monitor tests to protect the interests of those students who aren't cheating (Dr. Coles)
- important for faculty to vary exams; by using the same exam repeatedly the professor is telling students that she considers only the material on the exam important to know; multiple choice exams are easy for faculty to grade, but they are also easy to cheat and guess on; many faculty don't follow through on anti-cheating measures; for example, am in the accounting program and have never had my calculator cleared before a test; may be difficult for faculty to pursue an allegation of cheating, but the student also needs to be protected from unjust allegations; students won't complain about faculty who are lax because they think they will get a better grade from such teachers (Ms. Pitrowski)
- syllabi are required to be provided only to undergraduate students; need prior discussion if the rule is to be expanded; publication in the *Reporter* of the rules on and penalties for academic dishonesty is sufficient to inform students without faculty individually including them in their syllabi (Professor Swartz)
- publication in the *Reporter* is no guarantee that students will read the material; good for students to hear different disciplines' perspectives on what constitutes academic dishonesty; important for faculty not to presuppose their values are known and understood but to actively teach those values (Professor Ludwig)
- failure of a faculty member to explicate standards of academic honesty does not exculpate a student who cheats (Professor Swartz)
- may need to look at grievance procedures to see how fair and effective they are; be warned that if you list penalties for academic dishonesty in your course description, you may be successfully grieved

against if you impose a penalty not listed; the version of rules and regulations published by the *Reporter* needs to be revised to actually be readable; students have a responsibility to report cheating if the faculty member is unaware of it; faculty have a responsibility to test in a manner that discourages cheating; Committee on Student Life should aggressively remind faculty each year of the need to inform students of the parameters of and the penalties for failing to observe academic propriety (Professor Schack)

- students don't read the *Reporter*; better to publish the rules and regulations in *The Spectrum* to ensure reaching students (Mr. Celock)
- if necessary could also publish in *The Spectrum*; rules and regulations are available through the web with key word searching and are sent to students at home (Mr. Boyce)
- allegations of cheating are very serious so it is appropriate for the faculty member to bear the burden of proof (Professor Holstun)
- agree, but if you have samples of a student's writing and the item in question is different, it is appropriate to ask the student to explain (Professor Ludwig)
- student may simply have been working harder or learned from the class; the idea of a central bank of suspected cheating harkens to Bourbon jurisprudence with four quarter proofs being equal to a whole proof (Professor Holstun)
- resolution on syllabi says that faculty "should" supply students with a course outline; the resolution does not extend to graduate or professional schools; consider using this report as a friendly advisory to teaching faculty (Professor Welch)
- publishing the full text of student rules in the *Reporter* is required by state education law; consider publishing a synopsis in *The Spectrum* (Professor Baumer)
- provision about syllabi is needed for the graduate and professional schools (Professor Smith)

The Chair then presented the interim report of the subcommittee that is looking at faculty advisement of student organizations. The subcommittee looked at several issues including the role of faculty advisors for clubs and organizations, the issue of control as seen from the student perspective, and the health of the Greek system at UB.

Student organizations do not always trust faculty advisors, especially in the absence of a well defined role for them. Suzanne Ley, a student member of the subcommittee, is developing a questionnaire to be distributed to Student Association clubs and organizations to see how many faculty are involved and how well faculty advisement is working. John Celock, another student member of the subcommittee, researched policies of other institutions on faculty advisement.

The subcommittee talked to Ms. Davis O'Rourke, the University Greek liaison. She told the subcommittee that there are approximately 300 Greeks on campus with five faculty members acting as advisors. The recognized Greek sororities and fraternities are in competition with the fourteen that have lost University recognition and are, therefore, no longer bound by University rules. The recognized Greek sororities and fraternities view the University as being not helpful, and indeed, adversarial. The subcommittee will be looking for models that the University could adopt at institutions where Greek life is still healthy.

The subcommittee is also looking at issues of liability for faculty and staff who serve as advisors to student organizations and clubs. The Attorney General would defend such advisors if the advisement is seen as part of their job. The UUP provided some information; the subcommittee is seeking to verify it with the administration.

Mr. Celock added that he had researched how advisement of student organizations and clubs are handled at other institutions. The University of Delaware is at one extreme; the University runs all student clubs. UC Berkeley is at the other extreme with a totally hands off approach. He has also researched Greek life at other institutions; UB has a half time position devoted to Greek life; those institutions with strong Greek organizations have substantially more staff overseeing Greek affairs.

There were comments from the floor:

- interesting to read Leslie Fiedler's *Being Busted* which describes his experiences with the Buffalo police while serving as faculty advisor to a student organization working to legalize marijuana; very appropriate for faculty to serve as advisors to academic clubs because there is a natural linkage,

whereas cultural, national or ethnic clubs might look for a different kind of advisor; report does not differentiate between what legal requirements there may be for faculty advisement and the educational opportunities which could accrue; report does not adequately differentiate among types of clubs and organizations (Professor Welch)

- what role does the Office of Student Life play in this area? (Professor Swartz)
- subcommittee is looking at problems with the administration's handling of student organizations, especially Greek organizations (Professor Nickerson)
- am a Greek; my sorority has a faculty advisor, but he hasn't ever advised us; serve on the Pan-Hellenic Council and we all believe that if the University doesn't become more helpful, Greek life may be dead in several more years (Ms. Pitrowski)
- during subcommittee discussions Professor Nickerson told of his positive experiences and Professor Danforth his chilly experiences working with fraternities (Mr. Celock)
- Ms. Pitrowski mentioned that the University can't do anything about excessive hazing in several fraternities; why not? (Professor Malone)
- these are fraternities the University no longer recognizes and over which, therefore, it has no jurisdiction (Professor Nickerson)
- is the University hoping the Greek system will wither away? (Professor Boot)
- the University needs to play a supervisory role, but also a helping role as to sororities and fraternities, and reaching a balance is very difficult (Professor Nickerson)
- the unrecognized sororities and fraternities lost University recognition because they were not following regulations (Mr. Boyce)

Item 4: Faculty Senate Tenure and Privileges Committee

Professor Arcara, Chair of the Tenure and Privileges Committee, said that the Committee had worked on two charges this year. First was the question of the involvement of Interdisciplinary Organized Research Units, Centers and Institutes in the tenure process. Second was a review of the Nyberg document on promotion criteria.

As to the first charge, the Committee found that these entities are an important part of the intellectual life of the University, that they foster interaction, that they contribute to the development of programs and that they counteract the isolation inherent in the two campus structure. However, they are not intended to replace departments. The Committee recommends:

- when faculty wish to explore interdisciplinary activities, they should be encouraged to interact with Organized Research Units, Institutes and Centers
- all faculty appointments will be made in departments, and the letter of appointment should describe any commitments to units other than the hiring department
- when a current faculty member wishes to participate in or to adjust the level of commitment to the activities of another unit, that participation should be discussed with and agreed upon by the department chair and the head of the respective unit; if there is disagreement further discussion should take place with all interested parties, including Deans; final arrangements should be documented
- credit for teaching and research associated with other units should be given consideration in the promotion process, including: consultation with the head of the other unit in preparing the dossier; placing a letter from the head of the other unit in the dossier; getting a list of appropriate persons to write letters of reference from the head of the other unit; inviting the head of the other unit to participate in all discussions of the promotion by the department's voting body of record

There were comments from the floor:

- some schools have no departments, e.g., Law , so appointments will be made by those schools; although this is outside the scope of the Committee, wonder if negotiations for shared faculty time would have budget implications (Professor Welch)
- recommendation says that a letter from the head of the other unit "should be" included in the dossier; perhaps better to say "must be" (Professor Malone)
- "should be" was not meant to be optional (Professor Schack)

- don't know how the intrinsic conflict of interest between the appointing department, which is paying the salary, and the other department, which is getting the benefit on the appointing department's nickel, can be regulated (Professor Boot)
- one method of pay could be that a Center would get a grant that would involve the department; there will be any number of arrangements (Professor Arcara)
- the Committee's recommendations are aimed only at ensuring that the head of the other unit has input into the promotion process; what the department does with that information is not within the scope of the recommendations (Professor Schack)
- getting the appointing department chair to agree to share a faculty member won't be easy; neither will having higher level discussions if there is disagreement (Professor Sridhar)
- interdisciplinary activities are meant to cross fertilize departments and are an important component in current grant getting; chairs who think they get nothing from sharing arrangements are wrong (Professor Arcara)
- chairs do have to cope with consequences of having less of a faculty member's contributions; this needs to be addressed (Professor Sridhar)
- tenure should be tied to the faculty member's scholarly activity as a member of the entire scholarly community and not to economic issues or job security (Professor Baier)
- excellent to document agreements so don't have to rely on varying recollections, but should happen at least annually and whenever there is a change in the level of contribution (Professor Smith)
- faculty in the appointing department should also be familiar with what the faculty member is doing in another unit; helps when it's time for the departmental vote and reduces the feeling that the faculty member isn't pulling her weight (Professor Thompson)
- contributions to other units should be discussed in the chair's annual meeting with the faculty member and should be documented in the faculty member's annual report (Professor Harwitz)
- does recommendation three limit a chair's right to refuse a request of a faculty member who wants to take part in non-departmental activities? (Professor)
- the recommendation speaks only to what records should be kept of the decision, not what the decision should be (Professor Schack)

- when you edit the recommendation that all appointments be made in departments to take into account schools without departments, avoid creating any loop hole that could weaken departmental structure (Professor Holstun)
- interdisciplinary activities set up a new and helpful communication system between departments; interdisciplinary activities are not meant to be adversaries of departments (Professor Arcara)
- these recommendations are not the place to re-enforce the requirement for an annual meeting between chair and faculty member; a chair who is lax about scheduling annual meetings will not be less lax as to those members of the department who are engaged in interdisciplinary activities (Professor Schack)
- are Centers and Institutes academic units for purposes of various Bylaws or Faculty Senate oversight? (Professor Malone)
- Committee didn't discuss issue, but Centers and Institutes don't seem to fall in the traditional scope of academic unit (Professor Arcara)
- important even for tenure and promotion purposes that the annual review include allocation of contributions between the department and an organized research unit; will protect against misunderstanding (Professor Smith)
- earlier in the meeting there was a question about re-acquiring a UB CAT; we lost our CAT because of a failure to solve this problem of support for interdisciplinary units (Professor Baier)

There was a motion (seconded) to transmit the Committee's report to the Faculty Senate. The motion passed unanimously.

Professor Arcara reported on the Nyberg document about PRB evaluation of scholarship. The document contains no mention of teaching portfolios which were recommended by the Faculty Senate.

- what is the status of the Hay Committee report? (Professor Malone)
- Hay Committee finished its work (Professor Welch)
- will there be a further report on the Nyberg document by the Tenure and Privileges Committee? (Professor D'Elia)
- that is a continuing charge to the Committee (Professor Nickerson)

Item 5: Student Comment on Fees for Graduate Students

The Chair invited Professor Hamlen, Chair of the Budget Priorities Committee, and Ms. Ousley, a graduate student, to join him. The Budget Priorities Committee has been looking at the matter of student fees at UB. Ms. Ousley is involved with an effort to get fees eliminated for teaching assistants and graduate assistants.

Ms. Ousley distributed a history of student fees at UB from 1993/1994 to 1998/1999 during which period fees almost doubled. Most TA's and GA's earn \$8,200 or less per year and for 1998/1999 paid a total of \$710 in fees or almost 10% of their salary. Unfunded graduate students paid \$873 in fees, undergraduates \$1114. For 1999/2000 undergraduate fees reportedly will be raised by \$150, and graduate fees will almost certainly also be raised.

These fees are not used for academics but for activities. Many students work to pay for college, impacting their ability to perform up to their academic potential, and they can't afford these fees. Graduate recruitment is being negatively impacted by these fees which are not covered by tuition waivers. Various graduate and undergraduate student organizations have passed resolutions pointing out the seriousness of the problem with current fees. Ms. Ousley asked that the Faculty Senate consider endorsing the resolution approved by the Graduate English Students Association.

There were comments from the floor:

- fees are being used as a supplement to tuition, but it would be better for students who are being funded to have higher tuition and smaller fees (Professor Sridhar)
- how does UB's fee structure compare with the other University Centers? (Professor Malone)
- fees at UB are significantly higher; fees at Binghamton are \$200 for the year, but are going up; this will be a SUNY wide issue; as to tuition waivers there are differing practices at UB; Architecture and Planning pays TA's/GA's only as half-timers and grants only partial tuition waivers (Ms. Ousley)

- if students don't react to the imposition of fees, the University will continue to raise fees; believe Faculty Senate should support the resolution (Professor Baier)
- what is the definition of a fee? (Professor Fisher)
- tuition is established by the Legislature; fees are imposed locally to supplement tuition; because University support of student activities has decreased, both the GSA and the SA have voted to increase student activity fees; the University has substituted a "comprehensive" fee, with no breakdown of its components, so now don't know what fees are being collected or how the fees are distributed (Ms. Ousley)
- lumping all the fees into a single fee has the effect of making increases seem smaller; it is time to protest the increase in fees (Professor Boot)
- last year Faculty Senate recommended implementing Access '99 which committed the University to spending a lot of money; where did we think the money would come from? the State is decreasing its support for SUNY, and the Legislature prevents tuition increases; there are no good alternatives to raising the revenue we need to provide the services people expect; the SUNY Faculty Senate report on fees in SUNY shows UB's fees as the highest but not by as much as Ms. Ousley stated (Professor Schack)
- is the athletics fee part of the student life fee? (Professor Thompson)
- don't know, but since graduate students can't participate in athletics they shouldn't have to pay an athletics fee (Ms. Ousley)
- athletics fee is mandated specifically by the Board of Trustees and is applied only to undergraduates; athletes have five years of eligibility, so it is possible for a graduate student to participate (Professor Malone)
- before supporting a resolution, should get an accounting from the administration as to how fees are being used and if they are justified (Professor D'Elia)
- agree that we can't act without information and retain credibility (Professor Nickerson)
- in response to Professor Schack's comments, when the administration presented plans for Access '99, there was no mention it would be funded by increased technology fees; there was, however, discussion about providing free computers for students who couldn't afford to buy one; someone does have to pay the piper, but there was no mention of the piper in last year's presentation (Professor Holstun)

- Provost said it would be expensive, but he didn't know how expensive; he later provided an estimate of several million dollars (Professor Nickerson)
- we were only assured that obtaining a computer would not become an obstacle for students who couldn't afford to buy one; fees were not addressed but it was stated that implementation of Access '99 would be expensive (Professor Schack)
- transportation fee remains the same even though transportation has been substantially reduced by teaching math on the North Campus (Professor Boot)
- UB has a multi-year contract with the bus company so the same level of service between campuses continues to be provided (Professor Schack)

The Chair asked how to handle the resolution presented by Ms. Ousley.

- since this is the last meeting until Fall there is no urgency in endorsing; reasonable to refer the resolution for committee consideration (Professor Baier)
- a knee jerk reaction after this brief discussion will impress no one (Professor Schack)

There was a motion (seconded) to refer the resolution to the Budget Priorities Committee. There was discussion on the motion:

- will the Budget Priorities Committee work on this over the summer? (Professor Smith)
- Committee has already talked about student fees in terms of justification, disclosure and accountability; the issue being presented for Committee consideration is who should pay for the services that are being provided; would like to address how the fees impact UB's goals; for example, the University wants to attract graduate students, so if the fees are an obstacle to that goal, we might need to reconsider who pays; Vice President Black will release a report on fees and their use after exams; the timing of action on fees is tied to the State budget process (Professor Hamlen)
- waiting for the budget is a straw man put up to discourage discussion such as we are having (Professor Smith)

The motion to refer to committee passed unanimously.

- last year the administration denied from February to August that fees would be raised, but when bills came in August, fees had been increased (Ms. Ousley)

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn M. Kramer

Secretary of Faculty Senate

Present:

Chair: Peter A. Nickerson

Secretary: Marilyn M. Kramer

Arts & Letters: James Holstun

Dental Medicine: Robert Baier

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Ramalingam Sridhar

Information & Library Studies: George D'Elia

Law: Louis Swartz

Management: John Boot

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Cedric Smith

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: Melvyn Churchill, Samuel Schack

Nursing: Jacqueline Thompson

Pharmacy: Nathan

Social Sciences: William Baumer, Mitchell Harwitz

SUNY Senators: Judith Adams-Volpe, John Fisher, Dennis Malone, Claude Welch

University Officers: David Triggler, Provost

Guests:

H. William Coles, Chair, Professional Staff Senate

Sue Wuetcher, *Reporter*

John Celock, *The Spectrum*

Madison Boyce, Student Life Committee

Margaret Arcara, Chair, Tenure and Privileges Committee

Jeannette Ludwig, Chair, Student Life Committee

Nicole Pitrowski, Student Association

Laurie Ousley

Susan Hamlen, Chair, Budget Priorities Committee

Excused:

Graduate School of Education: Lilliam Malave

Absent:

Architecture & Planning: Shahin Vassigh

Health Related Professions: Luc Gosselin

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Boris Albini

University Libraries: Dorothy Woodson

Ex-Officio: Robert Hoeing