

FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes of October 9, 1996 (approved)

E-MAIL: ZBFACSEN@ACSU.BUFFALO.EDU

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM in Room 567 Capen Hall to consider the following agenda:

1. [Report of the Chair](#)
2. [Approval of the Minutes from September 4 and 11, 1996](#)
3. [Report of the Public Service Committee](#)
4. [Approval of the Draft Agenda for the Faculty Senate](#)
5. [Proposed Academic Calendar 1997/98](#)
6. [Recycling](#)
7. [Consensual Relations between Students and Faculty](#)

Item 1: Report of the Chair

The Chair had asked a student assistant to begin a search through the Senate resolutions prior to 1986, with the purpose of making them available to the campus community via WINGS. Professor Malone asked whether these were still available, given that the former secretary was not the most organized. Professor Welch responded that Senate minutes are in the University archives, and that he will provide a full new set of resolutions when the compilation is finished.

The Chair had received a letter from the Chair of the Parking Advisory Committee, copies of which he distributed to the FSEC. The issues listed for Committee consideration include paperless registration, third-party collections, enforcement guidelines, clinic parking, and special parking for visitors and guests. He had contacted the Chair of the Committee and pointed out to her that, in certain key respects, parking is a contractual matter; she agreed,

noting however that on some issues, Union approval was not necessary. Professor Miller reported that two people had attended the last Committee meeting, the Chair and himself. He had raised some concern as to how the Committee functions, and remarked that, although the Committee will meet more regularly, progress will be rather slow. He noted further that the tradition of the Committee is not to discuss parking "in any rational sort of way", but rather everything has been done by fiat.

Professor Welch then reported two items dealing with undergraduate admissions. The first was a letter from Kevin Durkin about the possibility of including a student member on the Individualized Admissions Committee. In Durkin's judgment, the Committee deals with sensitive personal information that fall under the Family Education Rights to Privacy Act (FERPA); this would exclude any undergraduate student member. Secondly, Durkin requested from the Senate a nomination of someone to serve on the search committee for the Director of Student Recruitment, who would serve in place of Durkin, who recently announced his retirement. Professor Welch had nominated on his own Professor Harwitz, Chair of the Admissions and Retention Committee.

The Chair had received a final report from the previous chair of the Athletics and Recreation Committee, Professor Chatov, and distributed copies of it at the meeting. He then solicited in writing nominations for members to fill vacancies on other Senate committees.

The Elections Committee is nearing completion of the new nomination ballot to elect the new chair of the Senate. Professor Welch reminded the FSEC of a Senate resolution to elect the new chair during the Fall semester prior to taking office, in order to provide some lead time for that person to become accustomed to the office. The delay in circulating the nominations is due to uncertainty about the number of GFTs entitled to cast ballots.

Copies of a letter from the President of the UUP to the President of the University Faculty Senate were made available to the FSEC. Professor Schuel asked what was meant by the "terms and conditions of employment" mentioned in the letter. Professor Welch replied that what he knew most closely was a change in teaching responsibilities at Brockport, but could give no further information. Professor Nickerson mentioned that part of it was related to an

attempt at changing certain terms and conditions of employment in the School of Optometry. Professor Meacham added that on many campuses there are issues of increasing the number of courses taught per year, as well as asking faculty to take on new roles; also under consideration is the possibility of changing the mix of faculty workload (teaching, advising, research). One major question was whether or not these are contractual matters.

The Chair informed the FSEC of recent activities of three Senate committees:

1. The Affirmative Action Committee established three subcommittees on (1) increasing representation of women and minorities in higher administrative posts, (2) correcting employment disparities by gender and race, and (3) hiring members of protected groups proportional to the available pool of hiring opportunities.
2. The Computing Services Committee, after checking into recent problems on the UNIX system, reported that a protocol had been set up such that every username entered was checked against a roster of about 30,000 names, thus accounting for some of the log. Professor Welch had also asked the Committee to examine the use of the new Technology Fee.
3. The Committee on Faculty Tenure and Privileges is nearing completion of its draft report on teaching and its role in faculty promotion.

The Chair reported that the Provost had consulted with the dean of the Medical School and the chair of the Statistics department about the "forced marriage" of Statistics and Social and Preventive Medicine. The Medical School Faculty Council will be examining the matter shortly.

The Chair had received a copy of a letter signed by 19 professors in the Department of Surgery at ECMC which indicates that the chair of that department was informed by letter from the hospital administration on August 29 that his position as chair was to be eliminated within two weeks. No copy of the letter was sent to the Medical School. In addition, the

letter from the 19 professors stated that the other four department chairs at ECMC were similarly dismissed. Professor Welch quoted part of the letter expressing the sentiment of those who signed: "We believe that the summary dismissal of five university chairman, in its timing, manner of execution, and choice of individuals to be dismissed, represents a cynical repudiation of the teaching mission of one of the great medical institutions in our community."

Senior Vice-Provost Levy said that the letter to the chair of Surgery was not sent by a University officer, but rather by an administrator of ECMC (Professor Welch concurred, noting that it was the Chief Executive Officer of ECMC who sent the letter); Senior Vice-Provost Levy further made clear that he [the CEO] had not terminated the chair of a University department, but rather the chair of a department of a hospital. Professor Welch considered the issue as one which raises not only financial/contractual issues, but also broad academic policy issues in which the Senate would have deep interest. Professor Miller doubted that the Union would not be involved in a dispute with ECMC. Professor Albin asked what other medical departments were affected, to which the Chair replied that he was not sure. Professor Schuel wondered whether any contact had been made with the dean's office about this matter; Professor Welch replied that there had not been any.

Professor Malone wondered why this should be considered Senate business, other than as an interest in our colleagues, since the appointment of chairs is a management prerogative. In the interest of collegiality, the Senate could express interest, but should not be involved in the matter. Professor Welch considered it an issue of academic planning, and believed that if support were reduced in this area, it would have vital impact on the institution as a whole. Senior Vice-Provost Levy explained that the chair of the Department of Surgery at UB is not the one referred to in the letter; rather, the letter referred to a different organization, with its own chairs, and one not governed by the policies of the Board of Trustees. He considered it a financial issue which must be resolved between the University and the hospital.

Professor Meacham agreed with Professor Malone that the issue was not Senate business. Professor Albini observed that the letter does not address a personnel question, but rather the issue of whether or not there should be any chair position at all; he considered it a serious matter because of recent changes in the health care profession, chiefly in Medicare and Medicaid. Professor Schuel added that the chairs of the clinical departments of the Medical School play a role in the appointment of chairs at the hospitals which offer similar services; consequently, the summary dismissal of a number of these posts is indeed of great concern to the relations between affiliated hospitals and the University Medical School.

Professor Frisch noted that President Greiner had been asked at the meeting of the Voting Faculty about the situation of Community Blue, and that "important politics" are going on about the relationship between the university and the hospitals in the city; he said it will be interesting to look at the issue in this broader context. Professor Miller understood it as a contractual set of issues between the hospitals and the university.

Professor Jameson asked for a point of clarification, namely, whether the replacement for Kevin Durkin would have a different title. Professor Welch replied that, according to the letter from Vice-President Palmer, the title would be "Director of Student Recruitment and Admissions". She then asked who was chairing the search committee, and the Chair replied that he did not recall.

Item 2: Approval of the Minutes from September 4 and September 11.

The Minutes of the FSEC meetings of September 4 and September 11, 1996, were approved, pending minor corrections submitted prior to the meeting.

Item 3: Report of the Public Service Committee.

The Interim Vice-President for Public Service and Urban Affairs, John Sheffer, first drew attention to the Request for Proposals (RFP) recently distributed, and announced his willingness to discuss any issues concerning Public Service. He said that copies of the RFP had been sent to the deans and chairs, and had also been posted on the Web. He reported well over 100 inquiries, which evinced a good deal of interest, despite the limited amount of funding. The general goal of the RFP is to encourage faculty in service opportunities and to help them explore ways in which public service can enrich teaching and scholarship. Awards offer up to \$10,000 for approved proposals on a competitive basis. Although the RFP lists suggested areas of research, any service-related initiative is welcome. The proposals are due in November, at which time they will be evaluated, and the awards will be announced in December.

He pointed out that this was a new initiative, and that it is funded with external money, not with University money. He reported a concern expressed by one dean as to whether this would conflict with a policy of public service that his particular unit had promulgated. Vice-President Sheffer did not view this as the Committee's role to mandate any particular type of process or policy -- this was up to the individual unit.

Professor Welch asked him to elaborate on the various policies and definitions of "public service". Vice-President Sheffer reported that he had received from various (but not all) units some policy statement developed on public service, some of which are identical, though most differed on procedural matters. He had also received a letter from the Provost's office that expressed the attitude that the pursuit of these kinds of issues, and different models of public service, are unnecessary in that it is well understood what constituted public service. Vice-President Sheffer disagreed strongly with the statement, arguing that UB, like most other institutions, is not even close to a consensus on a definition of public service, not to mention its proper role within the process of promotion and tenure. Thus he believed that this effort -- one of many -- is critically important in pursuing such a policy. He did not want to impose any matrix on individual faculty to follow; rather, he finds it proper and most productive for there to be different emphases, all of which should add up to a balanced policy on public service.

Professor Frisch added that although the Public Service Committee is working closely with Vice-President Sheffer's office, as a faculty committee its job is to represent and explore the concerns of the faculty. In continuing to work on the policy statement being developed, Professor Frisch offered on behalf of the Committee two observations. First, he detected a substantial gap between the attitudes of several faculty (and deans) and the initiatives the Senate and administration have taken concerning the role of public service. Secondly, this gap is similar to other differing views between the faculty and the administration. The Committee is interested in looking for the connections between the problems that it might see coming up in public service and their parallels in the work of other dimensions of the university, and in finding constructive ways of engaging and resolving those problems.

Professor Malone explained the manner in which public service was handled in Engineering: If an individual presents a case of performing a significant act of public service, this would naturally count in matters such as promotion; however, the lack of any public service is not counted against that individual.

Vice-President Sheffer agreed with a comment by Professor Albini, one very similar to what the Provost had said, about making more money available not simply for research-oriented projects, but for "actual projects, for actual service to the community". Accordingly, the focus was broadened significantly for the present RFP. Over the last several months, the Office of Public Service and Urban Affairs has raised about eight times the amount of money for such projects.

Professor Frisch said the Committee was most interested in developing incentives, in broadening activities instead of imposing new requirements and models; in fact, the most interesting proposals were those in which traditional boundaries disappear. He regarded as problematic one policy statement which specified that only that public service which (a) officially represents the University and (b) has been approved by the chair and dean in advance shall be considered for promotion and tenure. In his opinion, the statement seems to violate basic notions of freedom of research and freedom of activity; although the intent is understandable, the junior faculty (in particular) must be given some sense of what

constitutes appropriate research so that it will count toward their promotion. The terms of the policy are vague -- for instance, what is meant by "officially representing" the university? -- and need to be investigated.

Professor Miller echoed the sentiment strongly, and pointed out that not only might one perform a type of public service totally different from one's field of research and teaching, but also that one might not be allowed to perform public service in one's professional field. He encouraged a more open interpretation of public service, as well as a readier acceptance of it during the process of promotion. Professor Schuel expressed the opinion that UB had failed up to now to establish tentacles that reach out into the community, and believed UB must do more of this in order to survive. Vice-President Sheffer agreed, noting that this was especially true for a public university.

Professor Frisch said that one goal of the Committee was less in getting the faculty to do more as in finding ways of recognizing what the faculty were already doing in terms of public service. Senior Vice-Provost Levy observed that the policy statement in question did not prohibit one from performing any activity, but that in terms of research, there are clearer expectations. In the realm of public service, we have less experience, and the guidelines are not clearly defined. Nevertheless, it is his understanding that since the chair and dean of a department/unit play an integral role in the promotion process, the implicit assumption is that a junior faculty member will occasionally consult with one or both of them to make sure the direction of the research is appropriate.

Professor Acara remarked that the "culture of research" at present seems immovable, that research forms the main criterion for promotion. Furthermore, we need a leadership statement on public service, because otherwise the faculty will not respond to any public service initiative if it will not help further their careers. Professor Meacham had heard second-hand that the intention of the public service statement in the Faculty of Social Sciences was, in a word, not to bother about public service, but rather "keep your nose to the grindstone". If the statement is interpreted in this way, then it is indeed "a poor statement".

Professor Malone argued that often, neither the chair nor the dean is knowledgeable about the research a particular faculty member pursues. He cited an example in which a faculty member was advised not to pursue a certain project, since it would not amount to anything; as it turned out, that project led to the development of the pacemaker.

Vice-President Sheffer concluded by saying that, in deciding to establish a separate office for Public Service, UB demonstrated that "public service" has some value, and that it is something separate from the academic and other administrative arenas. He is seeking to integrate it into other dimensions of the university.

Item 4: Approval of the Draft Agenda for the Faculty Senate

The proposed agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting for October 22, 1996 was briefly discussed. Professor Jameson asked whether the resolution of the Budget Priorities Committee was the same one the FSEC had already considered. Professor Welch affirmed that it was. The agenda was then approved, with the exception of one member.

Item 5: Proposed Academic Calendar 1997/98

Professor Welch opened the floor for discussion of the proposed 1997/98 academic calendar. Professor Malone noted that one problem with calendar is the starting date of August 25, because many of the faculty have children, whose classes first begin in September. Vice-President Palmer replied that the Commission had a few things to consider in compiling the calendar: to explore the feasibility of starting after Labor Day, to maintain the compromise of observing one day for Jewish holidays, and to explore the feasibility of having commencement one week earlier. Professor Malone asked why. Palmer replied that there were several reasons. Getting the required number of days and weeks in the Fall semester has been a difficult problem, in part because of the Jewish holidays;

he said that the Commission simply could not find a better way to meet all the requirements of State law if the calendar were to begin after Labor Day.

Professor Hare asked why the Spring semester is scheduled to begin on January 12; Vice-President Palmer replied that we end earlier. Professor Welch asked again for the rationale, since for many faculty, the first two/three weeks in January form a useful block of research time. Vice-President Palmer responded that the block of time is the same, that only the dates are different. Professor Hare asked why it was so early, since this coming Spring semester is scheduled to begin on January 21. Vice-President Palmer replied again that the amount of time for the break is the same as always, and Professor Hare specified that the block of time after New Year's was what mattered, what counted as a usable block of time. Professor Welch further clarified that after the University opened up again following the shut-down period, the proposed calendar would allow only one week for research work before classes began again. Vice-President Palmer said this was not brought up as a major issue in the deliberations; other considerations -- such as getting grades in on time, turn-around time, time needed for activities in Records and Registration, etc. -- were. Professor Malone countered that a later starting date would facilitate these matters. Vice-President Palmer said the primary reason for this was to allow Millard Fillmore College more time to schedule summer programs, as well as to allow more time for other scheduled activities in late May -- all of these factors make scheduling very tight. There are always trade-offs in putting together a calendar. He said if there were other issues that negatively impact the faculty's ability to conduct research, it was not discussed -- at least not vigorously -- in the Calendar Commission.

Professor Frisch observed that for many years, the start-up dates have been in late August and in late January, and that for both faculty and students these have been very useable blocks of time. Consequently, there should be a more compelling reason to change these. One compelling reason for maintaining the present calendar is the University curtailment period which saves on utility costs. Vice-President Palmer agreed that he may be correct on that point, and encouraged the FSEC to make recommendations to the President. He repeated that, despite having faculty representation on the Commission, these arguments

did not surface in the deliberations. He emphasized that he had no preconceptions of how the calendar should be organized; what troubled him is that only now, after several months of discussion, objections are being raised. Professor Welch asked whether, because it was already October, this was the final version, and if so, would the FSEC need to present its case directly to the President if it were to strongly recommend any changes. Vice-President Palmer replied that no, the date was irrelevant; what matters is that the Commission had consulted all concerned constituents and had devoted an enormous amount of time to designing the calendar. He said he will attach to the recommendation the concerns and issues raised by the FSEC.

Professor Wetherhold addressed the issue of being late with comments, and reminded Vice-President Palmer that the FSEC had first received the draft calendar only a few weeks ago. He also suggested that UB might want to align its calendar with other University centers, so as to facilitate certain programs, in particular those involving distance learning. He cited Binghamton as an example, which begins classes in September, celebrates Jewish holidays, and still manages to finish in mid-December. Vice-President Palmer assured him that the Commission had collected thousands of data and considered everything; he cited as one variable the different length of classes at Binghamton. Professor Wetherhold asked whether there was anything we could do about this. Vice-President Palmer replied that this was certainly possible; any number of things could be changed. He again told the FSEC that the faculty on the Commission had evidently misjudged the importance of how concerned the faculty was about these matters.

Professor Boot mentioned that reasons emanated from the President's office "that made it very, very appealing [...] to have an extra week in May", but would not specify, with the exception of fund-raising, what those reasons were. Vice-President Palmer suggested that there was no secret pressure on the Commission to end the semester early; rather, it was simply put forth as something to explore. He said that if it is the sense of this group that changes are in order, then it is essential to look into the matter again, and soon. Professor Miller mentioned that he had also heard that there is indeed a fund-raising issue, and that this was the major reason for changing the calendar. He added that the earlier January

starting date is particularly inconvenient for the Dental School because it scheduled its boards during this time. Vice-President Palmer replied again that there was no pressure on him; he stressed that his integrity was important to him, and that he "would not try to snow" the FSEC on this matter. Professor Miller stressed that not having enough time between breaks has the effect of suppressing scholarship.

Professor Malone urged the Commission to consider postponing the second semester at least a little bit. He then asked whether the faculty members of the Commission are untainted by administrative appointment. The Chair started citing the names of the faculty members on the Committee (Professors Eberlein and Boot, Vice-Provost Goodman, etc.) as sufficient proof of the integrity of the Calendar Commission.

Professor Jameson wondered why the FSEC had abandoned the possibility of starting classes after Labor Day, pointing out that the discrepancy between University and school calendars is one of extreme hardship for parents. She stated that December 22 is a standard finishing date for Fall semesters, that final grades need not be turned in before Christmas, and that most faculty do not give final exams anyway. Hence there seems little reason to end (and begin) the semester early, and she pleaded that if the Spring semester were to begin later, then the Calendar Commission should make the Fall semester begin later also. Associate Vice- President Donna Rice reported that her office had forwarded a calendar starting after Labor Day to the Commission, but that it was not approved because it failed to allow for three days at the end of the semester for grade review. Professor Jameson responded that the grades were not due until after New Year's. Vice- Provost Goodman noted that we cannot simultaneously have the Fall semester end on December 22 and the Spring begin on January 12, i.e., that if one is shifted, the other must be as well. Consequently, Vice- President Palmer noted, we cannot start after Labor Day and be finished by early May.

Professor Schuel asked what UB's policy was concerning the observance of the second day of Rosh Hashanah. He remarked that UB competed intensely with other University centers and colleges for good students, and did not want UB to suffer any competitive disadvantage

because of any unfavorable policy. Dr. Rice pointed out that every year, a task force calls all the centers and reviews this particular issue. Every campus, she said, does something different for different reasons; what we do depends on our constituency, our calendar and class schedules, and on our priorities. Vice-President Palmer claimed that this topic has come up for discussion repeatedly, and that the Calendar Commission has looked at it very carefully. The one-day observance at UB represents the only compromise acceptable to all parties involved in the deliberation. Professor Schuel said the Commission would be well-advised to reconsider the issue, because many students will reconsider as well their decision to attend UB based on this policy.

Professor Meacham found Professor Schuel's argument convincing; because many students must travel rather far from Buffalo to get home, many of them will leave early anyway. He also noted that in cases where UB declares one day of the week to follow a different schedule, this disrupts many students' work schedules.

The Chair proposed a formal vote requesting the Calendar Commission to reconsider the proposed academic calendar for 1997/98 with particular attention to the starting and finishing dates for both semesters. Professor Jameson also suggested that the resolution include a request to "tighten up" the language at the bottom of the calendar, namely that "lost Wednesday evening class time may be made up at the discretion of the instructor" be altered to read that the class time must be made up. The motion was seconded by Professor Schuel, who also made the motion for the Calendar Commission to reconsider observing the second day of Rosh Hashanah. The motion was seconded and the Chair opened the floor for discussion. Professor Frisch urged a vote against Professor Schuel's proposed amendment on the grounds that it should be considered separately. A vote was taken, and Professor Schuel's proposed amendment was defeated. The original motion, requesting the Calendar Commission to reconsider the starting and ending dates for each semester, was subjected to a vote, and the motion passed. Professor Malone requested a numerical vote; 14 voted in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained.

Professor Schuel's motion was then considered separately and voted on; 8 voted in favor, 5 opposed, and 3 abstained.

Item 6: Recycling Policy

Walter Simpson and Michael Dupre announced a New York State recycling policy, by executive order, to raise the present level of recycling of solid waste from 25% to a minimum level of 50% by 1997. They displayed new waste cans to replace the older ones. The newer unit consisted of a larger container for recyclable materials, plus an attachable smaller one intended for non-recyclable waste. Mr. Simpson briefly reviewed the policy, copies of which were distributed at the meeting, and suggested in addition that we encourage waste reduction by promoting double-sided copying and using electronic mail. Professor Malone suggested that UB encourage as much as possible the use of e-mail, and to have each department reduce its paper expenditures by 50%. Professor Nickerson suggested that they examine what chemicals are released from the blue plastic containers. Mr. Simpson replied that they pre-air them out before using to reduce these chemical emissions.

Professor Miller recalled that stickers had been distributed for the older metal cans to encourage recycling, but it did not work; he wondered why. Mr. Simpson admitted that the action did not work, and that recycling efforts had evolved since then. Professor Faran wanted instructions as to what could be recycled. Professor Schuel pointed out that he has large cardboard boxes full of paper meant for recycling, but they have seldom been emptied. Professor Kramer suggested that removing a lot of the metal waste cans would further encourage people to recycle properly.

Professor Welch asked the FSEC whether the recycling policy is appropriate for Senate consideration. It was moved and seconded to send it to the Senate for discussion and approval. The motion was approved unanimously.

Item 7: Consensual Relations between Students and Faculty

Professor Nickerson related that Vice-Provost Triggles has recently encountered some issues involving graduate students and faculty and looked to see whether the university had any formal written policy on the issue. Since no official statement exists, he asked the FSEC whether the University needs one. Professor Malone wondered how such a policy would be worded. Professor Welch noted that there were a number of such statements available at other universities. He also suggested that the Academic Freedom and Responsibilities Committee could examine this issue and report to the FSEC.

Professor Miller argued that if there were in fact two consenting adults involved, and if their relationship did not interfere with the academic situation, then there is no place for the university to make any statement at all. Professor Meacham noted that what might appear consensual may not in fact turn out to be that way; for that reason, he considered it absolutely essential that we have such a policy. The point of the policy, he added, was merely to get faculty and students to reflect first before entering into a relationship. Professor Acara agreed with Meacham, for the same reason. Professor Schuel thought it wise to have such a policy, because it would be more difficult to react to an unfortunate situation without such a policy. Professor Meacham added that there is a distinction between providing guidelines for acceptable behavior and inflicting sanctions for improper behavior.

Professor Schuel believed we needed a framework for what constitutes acceptable behavior in general terms, consistent with what other institutions have done. Professor Malone mentioned one case of which he knew which began as a consensual relationship but stopped being one; thus whatever policy is developed must be very careful in its wording. Professor Meacham related a story on the TODAY show which featured a woman who was sexually harassed at an educational institution, and who was successfully suing that institution for not doing something to change the situation. The motion was put forth for the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee to examine this issue and report within the academic year. The motion passed with one abstention.

The meeting was adjourned after a brief executive session at 4:23 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Hoeing,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

THOSE PRESENT:

University Officer(s): Ken Levy, Robert Palmer, Donna Rice

Chair: Claude Welch

Secretary: Robert G. Hoeing

Arts & Letters: Michael Frisch, Nathan Grant

Dental Medicine: William Miller

Engineering & Applied Sciences: Robert Wetherhold

Graduate School of Education: James Hoot

Health-Related Professions: Atif Awad

Law: Errol Meidinger

Management: Ramaswamy Ramesh

Medicine & Biomedical Sciences: Margaret Acara, Boris Albini, Herbert Schuel

Natural Sciences & Mathematics: James Faran

Nursing: Mattie Rhodes

Pharmacy: Nathan

Social Sciences: Peter Hare, Jack Meacham

SUNY Senators: Maureen Jameson, Dennis Malone, Peter Nickerson, Claude Welch

University Libraries: Marilyn Kramer

Guests:

Academic Affairs Director: Sunny Lee

REPORTER: Sue Wuetcher

Other Guest(s):

Walter Simpson, Michael Dupre

Excused:

Architecture & Planning: G. Scott Danford

Absent:

Educational Opportunity Center: Areta Buchner