

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

East Campus Union, Prairie Suite

April 1, 2008

Presidents Steve Bradford, Kathy Prochaska Cue, and Ali Moeller, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Bradford called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Outgoing Senators

President Bradford announced that this is technically the last meeting of the year for the current Senate membership and it is a time when we recognize some of the senators whose terms are ending. He thanked and recognized the following senators for their service to the Faculty Senate: Mark Hinchman, Architecture; Arthur Allen, School of Accountancy; Hossein Nouredini, Chemical Engineering; David Admiraal, Civil Engineering; Brenda Wristen, School of Music; Wendy Weiss, Textiles, Clothing, & Design; Steven Jones, Animal Science; Deanna Peterson, West Central Research & Extension Center; Karen Lee, Communication Studies; and Jennifer McKitrick, Philosophy.

2.2 Recognition of Faculty Senate Coordinator

President Bradford stated that if the senators think back ten years ago we had a different Governor, a different University President, a different Chancellor, and probably a completely different set of Vice Chancellors. Throughout this ten year period there has been one person who has been steadfast and that is Karen Griffin, Coordinator of the Faculty Senate. President Bradford then presented Karen with a plaque in recognition of a decade as Faculty Senate Coordinator.

3.0 Chancellor Perlman

Chancellor Perlman wanted to thank the outgoing senators as well as the rest of the senate for all of their work. He noted that it has been a remarkable year and he has enjoyed the working relationship that he has had with the faculty and he appreciates the support they have given to the many initiatives that have occurred on campus.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Research Fair taking place on campus celebrates graduate and undergraduate research work. He noted that the research that is conducted at UNL is what distinguishes us. He stated that being around the Research Fair today reinforces that while teaching is extraordinarily important, research may have the biggest impact on us doing what we need to do.

Chancellor Perlman stated that even with the controversy that has surrounded the moving of the state fair, there has been extraordinary support for the university's research efforts and the impacts that it has for the State of Nebraska. He pointed out that the faculty has really stepped up to the plate and advanced the research agenda of the institution which enhances our reputation. He noted that at a luncheon today he was approached by 17 or 18 state senators who all indicated the importance of research. He stated that he does not know whether the university will get the state fair property but if we do it will be because of the success of the research conducted here.

Chancellor Perlman reported that there is more to come in April. The Research Fair is to celebrate success and federal officers are coming to Lincoln to have a look at the university. He noted that he has seen a remarkable change in the attitudes of these officers since they first started coming here. They spontaneously say what a great university we have and they are excited about the research proposals here.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the Honors Convocation will be held on Sunday, April 6th. He noted that students, faculty, and administrators will be honored at the event which is one of the great events of the university. He noted that judging by his email, there are many functions honoring students and faculty members taking place on campus and he regrets that he cannot attend them all but he believes that they are a reflection of a university that cares about success.

Professor McCollough, Anthropology and Geography, stated that some of her neighbors are upset about the state fair possibly moving to Grand Island. She noted that they are asking what they will get out of the proposed innovation park. Chancellor Perlman pointed out that the university has no opinion on where the fair

is located. He reminded the Senate that the decision to relocate the state fair rests solely on the state fair board and the legislature.

Chancellor Perlman stated that with the current buildings and current finances he believes that there is very little prospect for the state fair to earn additional revenue. He noted that either a lot of tax dollars would need to be invested into the fair to make it work at its current location or it should be moved to a place that already has existing buildings. He noted that there is a long history of the state fair being in Lincoln and there will be some people upset if it is relocated to Grand Island but if you talk to people in the business community here the majority of them feel that the fair had no real economic benefits to the city. He stated that hotel owners did not really see any income since 86% of the people attending the fair were from Lincoln or Omaha. He pointed out that there is still the Lancaster Country Fair which is held at the Lancaster Events Center and this might serve as a substitute for the fair and it may grow if the state fair is relocated.

Chancellor Perlman stated that he will be the first to admit that the innovation park is an activity with some risk. He stated that he can't guarantee success but if you look at other innovation campuses around the country they have been very successful. He pointed out that one of the criteria for making it successful is that it be located close to a university campus involved in research. He stated that the innovation campus would provide private sector companies, who have a relationship with the university, access to work more closely with faculty members in research, access to students for internships, and access for their employees to further their education, just to name a few benefits. He noted that we may not have the scale of research as MIT but the quality of the research is just as good and so is our commercial potential. He pointed out that over the next 10 – 20 years the innovation campus will create economic growth in Lincoln.

Chancellor Perlman stated that the innovation campus is not just a university project. We have an interest in it and he thinks we will be better for it but this is more about the state having an extraordinary opportunity. He noted that the university has agreed to pay \$21 ½ million for the development of the campus. Professor Carlson, Veterinary and Biomedical Sciences, asked where the money is coming from. Chancellor Perlman stated that private philanthropy will play a significant role and some money from research may be used and there are some other entrepreneurial opportunities. He pointed out that the university will not be asking the legislature for money nor will students be expected to pay more tuition.

Professor Franti, Biological Systems Engineering, asked the Chancellor what his definition is of a successful state fair. Chancellor Perlman stated that a state fair can be viewed as an event that allows recognition of success in agriculture. He noted that it can be viewed politically as being a means to explain agriculture to an urban society. Increasingly many people in Lincoln and Omaha have not had an association with the state fair. He stated that he believes the state fair can be financially successful and sustained over time. He noted that he believes that either the Lincoln location at 84th Street or the Grand Island location could make the fair sustainable.

Professor Carlson asked what the fate would be of Husker Harvest days if the state fair moves to Grand Island. Chancellor Perlman stated that it is his understanding that there is no intention to merge the two events.

4.0 Approval of 3/4/07 Minutes

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, moved and Professor Flowers, Psychology, seconded approval of the minutes. Motion approved.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 Graduate Council Report (Dean Weissinger)

Dean Weissinger noted that the Council is composed of eight faculty members, elected by the graduate faculty, and two graduate students. She noted that the Council has been a deeply analytical and reasonable group.

Dean Weissinger reported that the Graduate Council approved a couple of new graduate programs but they still need to be approved beyond the campus level. New specializations were also approved to existing graduate programs.

Dean Weissinger stated that the Council approved three graduate certificates. She noted that these are an official credential at the graduate level composed of a small number of courses. She pointed out that the certificates are a good mechanism for incorporating interdisciplinary courses.

Dean Weissinger stated that the old rule of the life span of a course of 10 years or less being applicable to a master's degree has been raised again. She noted that the Council denied the appeal to use coursework that was older than 10 years to get a masters degree.

Dean Weissinger wanted to thank the Senate for its engagement with the Graduate Student Association. She stated that they have increasingly seen the Senate as a model of governance and as having some potential common interests. She stated that she is pleased with the Senate approval of the resolution to form an ad hoc committee to look into campus-wide funding for graduate students for travel. She noted that the GSA is a good voice for graduate students.

Dean Weissinger stated that she watched with great interest the discussion the Senate had on the position of Dean of Graduate Students. She wanted to let the Senate know that she appreciated very much the Senate's interest in graduate education and leadership and the manner in which this position would be appointed in the future.

5.2 Parking Advisory Committee Report (Professor Hanna)

Professor Hanna reported that there has not been a lot of activity on the Committee this past year. He noted that ASUN is having difficulty getting students to serve on the Committee and it is getting increasingly more difficult to have a quorum at the meetings because of people's schedules. He stated that the Committee continues to receive appeals for some relief in parking fees but not a whole lot can be done about this. He noted that most of the appeals come from the staff, particularly part-time staff, who struggle with the cost of parking. He reported that the Committee has spent time analyzing different pricing scenarios but there is not much that can be done to graduate fees.

Professor Hanna stated that the Committee dealt with recommendation of the fees for the next year and the recommendation has gone to the Board of Regents.

5.3 Executive Committee Report (President Bradford)

President Bradford noted that the report speaks for itself. He stated that he would be happy to answer any particular questions on the report.

6.0 Unfinished Business

6.1 Motion to Revise Committee on Committee Syllabus

President Bradford stated that the Executive Committee is offering a substitute motion. He stated that basically what the Committee has done is to amend the structure so it more accurately reflects the membership with only one person coming from the Senate each year and the Senate President appointing another person. The Committee also took Professor Chouinard's suggestion and clarified the language on college limitations. Language stating that the Chancellor and President's designee not be included in the stipulations on college limitations was included. Motion to approve the substitute motion approved.

Professor Chouinard asked if any consideration was given to whether there should be a limitation on having six full professors on the Committee. President Bradford stated that he does not know if this was discussed.

The motion on revising the Committee on Committee syllabus was approved.

6.2 Sustainability Commission

President Bradford noted that a motion was made at the end of last month's meeting to ask the Chancellor to appoint a Commission on Environmental Sustainability. He stated that the draft syllabus was created by David Solheim, President of ASUN, the Chancellor's office, and himself and is nearly finished. He pointed out that the Chancellor reserves the right to make minor changes to the syllabus but he wanted to provide it to the Senate to give them some idea of what the Commission will be doing.

Motion to ask the Chancellor to appoint a Commission on Environmental Sustainability was approved. There was one vote against the motion.

7.0 New Business

7.1 Academic Freedom Award

President Bradford reported that he received a letter from the Academic Freedom Award Committee stating that it is not recommending anyone for the award this year. He pointed out that there are no requirements that there be an award given every year.

7.2 Diversity Committee Report (Professor Moshman)

Professor Moshman wanted to talk about the Executive Committee's comments and then the history of the committee. He stated that he agreed with some of the comments made by the Executive Committee. He reported that the charge to the Diversity Committee was much more complicated than indicated. He noted that the report is not a full fledged diversity plan. He stated that he thought that the members of the Committee would have provided more input into a plan.

Professor Moshman stated that the third comment by the Executive Committee, that the report is provocative could be argued. He acknowledged that there needs to be a lot more discussion on the issue and the law is very complicated regarding diversity. He noted that there is a question of what the university can do legally and what it should do.

Professor Moshman stated that he is most concerned with the comment that the report did not make an "attempt to reflect the range of views put forth by all members of the committee." He stated that this is a misrepresentation of what happened in the Committee and that he was directed by the members of the Committee to not speak for others. He noted that some of the Committee members chose not to speak on some of the issues. He does not think that the report is illegitimate and thinks it is relevant to take it into account. He pointed out that it clearly does not represent the original eight Committee members. He stated that the real question is how this report should be taken.

Professor Moshman stated that it is not his view that the report represents the faculty or the Senate or even the majority of the Committee. He stated that the report is a dissenting opinion. He noted that when it was written there were only three people left on the Committee and these three were unanimous on the report. He pointed out that it was his expectation that the other members of the Committee would include their opinions in the report.

Professor Moshman stated that the history behind the Committee is that in the fall of 2006 a draft strategic plan came from the administration but the faculty had a variety of concerns about it. He noted that the faculty and the Senate were not aware that the plan was being drafted. The Chancellor agreed to set the draft plan aside and let the Senate form a committee to deal with it. There was a lot of discussion within the Senate and the Executive Committee about what should happen next.

Professor Moshman reported that in the spring of last year the Committee was appointed. He noted that the Committee originally consisted of eight members but it was very unclear how these people were appointed. He stated that the Committee was not given any charge and it was an ambiguous situation with the Committee forming its own charge. He stated that the Committee decided to ask the Chancellor to officially appoint and give a charge to the Committee but the Chancellor declined to do this because he stated that it was a Senate committee. He noted that at this time it became clear that the Senate appointed the members of the Committee.

Professor Moshman stated that part of the issue for the Committee was for it to come up with a comprehensive diversity plan for the university. He noted that there was a problem with this because no support staff or managerial/professional people were on the Committee. In order for it to be a comprehensive plan members from these classifications should have been on the Committee. He noted that students were involved but they were not appointed by ASUN.

Professor Moshman stated that another factor is that when the Committee looked at other university's plans they found them to be very comprehensive plans that were developed over a significant period of time. He pointed out that the Committee had a short time line in which to work with no resources and the Committee did not think it could form a plan. Instead a formal committee would need to be reconstituted.

Professor Moshman stated that by the end of the spring semester the Committee agreed that it would not do a comprehensive diversity plan. He stated that in the fall of 2007, two of the original members left the Committee due to changes in their faculty status and they were replaced. He noted that anybody else who resigned from the Committee did so because of what was going on in the Committee.

Professor Moshman stated that it was difficult to set up a meeting time when everyone could be there. He noted that he was hesitant to schedule a meeting without everyone in attendance and he communicated by email to define what they should do.

Professor Moshman reported that on September 7th he sent a memo to the Committee to settle where it was going. He suggested some options: to limit the Committee's focus to developing a charge for a larger committee; focus on diversity of curriculum; or try to address academic issues associated with diversity. He stated that the Committee formulated its own charge and decided to focus on academic issues associated with diversity.

Professor Moshman stated that at about this time the Chancellor suggested to the Senate Executive Committee that he would like to have the Committee address recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty. He noted that the Committee agreed that this was within its scope and that they would address this.

Professor Moshman stated that via an email he received on September 13th he understood the charge would be to have the Committee address academic issues and within this deal with recruitment and retention. He stated that he believes the Committee met this charge.

Professor Moshman reported that once the Committee had this charge it proceeded. Discussions began with diversity of faculty. Through email exchanges the Committee believed that they would not be able to get to the other issues because the members could not come to an agreement on recruitment and retention although it was discussed at every meeting. He stated that after the November meeting he wrote some minutes summarizing where the Committee was and trying to lay out what was and was not agreed on.

Professor Moshman reported that he told the Executive Committee that it would receive something in written form from the Diversity Committee in February or March so there could be discussions on the issue this academic year. He stated that one way to come up with a document was to summarize systematically what the committee agreed or disagreed on. He noted that the first draft that was written turned out to be the only draft. He stated that the intent was to provide multiple viewpoints from the Committee. He stated that he received some reactions to the draft but not as much as he had hoped for.

Professor Moshman stated that at the last meeting only three of the remaining six members of the Committee met. He noted that there was discussion at the meeting of dissolving the committee but they decided not to do this but instead came up with a half dozen topics that could be discussed. It was felt that everyone on the Committee should state their viewpoint and he would simply collate the views. He pointed out that the Committee struggled with deep disagreements but the three remaining members thought there might be some consensus on some issues.

Professor Moshman stated that he urged everyone remaining on the Committee to write what they wanted to say but he did not receive anything. As a result Professor Ball, a member of the Diversity Committee, and he started writing some statements and suggestions on some of the issues. By the end of February, Professor Moshman stated he had not heard anything from anyone else. He stated that the report he and Professor Ball wrote was sent around to everyone else. He noted that shortly after three more people resigned from the Committee.

About the resignations, Professor Moshman stated that there were members of the Committee that had serious concerns on the topics being discussed and how the report was going to be written. He stated that in the end he thinks the other members didn't want to be associated with the report or involved in the discussions. Another factor is that everyone was busy with other things but they initially agreed to serve on the Committee because they have strong commitments to diversity. He thinks that as time went on the people felt that the report was not going to be to their liking. He noted that the remaining three people on the Committee, himself, Professor Ball, and graduate student Jacqueline Thomas, were very enthusiastic and completely happy with the document. He stated that in the beginning he was trying to incorporate other people's ideas but this was changed at the January meeting. He stated that he takes full responsibility for what is in the report.

Professor Moshman noted that the two most controversial issues were the definition of diversity and the issue of hiring practices. He stated that with respect to the definition of diversity the key is how broadly you define it. He noted that many people think that race and gender are two key aspects because this is how it has historically been defined but not everyone on the Committee thought diversity should be defined this way. He stated that some members felt that the university's definition of diversity is correct because it is very broad which includes the diversity of ideas and people.

Professor Moshman stated that the most basic argument on the definition of diversity takes the form of race and sex as fixed biological categories and people have been discriminated because of these biological categories. He pointed out that there are other things such as religion or politics that people are discriminated

against as well but these are not as obvious. He stated that he disagrees with the basic argument because it is not always possible to determine one's race and whether a person's gender is a fixed set of category is questionable. He noted that discriminating against a person because of their beliefs is just as wrong.

Professor Moshman stated that the other issue is the university's hiring practices. He noted that this portion of the report starts out with Section 3.0 from the Board of Regents Bylaws which is a very strict non-discrimination statement and has a very narrow definition of affirmative action. He stated that he has heard people say that the Bylaws are archaic and he finds this troubling and he has heard that there are other policies different from the Bylaws that are being used by the university although he is not convinced that this is true. He stated that it is the view of the Committee that the university should have a consistent set of principles and the Regents Bylaws are correct and should be followed.

Professor McCollough, Anthropology/Geography, stated that although she does not agree with the report she can appreciate the difficulty the members of the Committee must have had because the topic is so difficult. Professor Moshman agreed.

Professor Grange, Theater Arts, asked if Professor Moshman could elaborate on whether he thinks the people who resigned from the Committee were trying to make a statement by their action. Professor Moshman stated that different people may have had different ideas. He noted that some people were very busy and others might have thought the report too controversial and didn't want to be associated with it.

Professor Carlson asked if the resignations were informal or if there were letters of resignations. He stated that he does not understand their reluctance to say why they quit the Committee. Professor Moshman stated that he does think everyone wrote a letter of resignation but they were brief. He stated that he believes that the Committee may not have been dealing with the issues that they thought would be discussed although it is probably more complicated than this.

Professor Weiss, Textiles, Clothing & Design, asked for clarification on the statistics on the opportunity hires. She noted that there were 61 hires but a complete table of who was hired and how they fit into the scheme was not included. She pointed out that this would be crucial information in deciding the direction of diversity on campus. She stated that she would like to see more background information on how the university is doing with hiring.

Professor Moshman stated that the information is out there but it is difficult to get. He stated that the Committee was only able to obtain the data when it was requested by a State Senator. He reported that slightly less than a third of the 61 opportunity hires were spousal hires. He noted that he does not object to this but the university should have a written policy about it. He stated that there are some issues that need to be worked out such as how to deal with partnerships. He noted that there may have been a few outstanding, senior faculty members obtained through the opportunity hires.

Professor Moshman stated that the majority of the 61 hires were exclusionary searches. He stated that departments were told they can't advertise a position but could create a position if they have a specific person in mind. He pointed out that these are underground searches and he has seen many of them. He stated that everyone knows these are exclusionary searches that not everyone can apply for. Professor Grange asked if there was anyone on the Committee that advocated these searches and this was a reason for their resignation. Professor Moshman said probably. He noted that some people felt that the university should use stronger affirmative action measures in hiring. He stated that part of the ambiguity is that the university denies that this is going on. He stated that he believes that the Committee did get to a position where they had the data and acknowledged that this practice is occurring here.

Professor Sarroub, Teaching, Learning, & Teacher Education, stated that she appreciated the report and pointed out that dissenting views are just as important as the majority views for a report. She noted that the report has already generated some public media consequences and asked if Professor Moshman has recommendations for the Senate on what it should do with the report. She asked how we can continue to have discussions with the Chancellor about the issue. Professor Moshman stated that he would suggest that the Senate pick and choose parts of the report and take a stand on some of them. He pointed out that the nature of the issue is such that discussions will not end here but he hopes the report can contribute to the discussion.

Professor Ledder, Mathematics, stated that it is possible that some of the opportunity hires might look like they are exclusionary but they fall into gray areas. He noted that it is a matter of judgment whether a candidate is considered strong enough. Professor Moshman agreed that this could be the case. He noted that the other data

that he has seen shows that most of the opportunity hires are right out of graduate school. It is quite clear that a search could have been conducted for these positions.

Professor Grange asked if the Committee is stating that the university should develop a set of procedures for exclusionary hires. Professor Moshman stated that they should all be put down on paper and data should be available on them. Professor Grange asked if the university is still not providing this data.

Past President Moeller pointed out that Bill Nunez, Director of Institutional Research and Planning, is open about providing any kind of data. She stated that having been the President that appointed the original Committee, the issue seems to be that the charge was not clear enough. She noted that she chaired an ad hoc committee of the Senate in 2004 on gender. The report looked at best practices but she is unsure whatever became of it. She reported that she sent an email message to Professor Haller, the former chair of the Diversity Committee, providing him with at least ten websites of good universities with best practices that the Committee could look at. She stated that she heard that people did not want to rehash the argument on whether we need affirmative action on campus. She stated that the issue is whether we want to accept the report. She noted that there are some good points in it and she wanted to thank Professor Moshman for his efforts.

Professor Moshman stated that many members of the Committee agreed to serve thinking that it was going to be a practical committee that came up with specific recommendations but instead it turned into an intellectual debate. He noted that it is easy to understand why some people were not pleased with the direction that the Committee took.

Professor Rapkin, Political Science, wanted to thank Professor Moshman for posing an illuminating report of how the committee became sidetracked. However, the report is not of a practical purpose. He suggested that the next committee could use the report as a starting point. He moved that the Senate reject the report for the reasons outlined in the comments sheet provided at the meeting.

Professor Fuller, Art & Art History, asked how the Executive Committee can imply that the overall faculty would not accept the report without conducting a poll. President Bradford pointed out that the statement uses the word belief in that statement. Professor Fuller stated this is speculation. President Bradford stated that it is more than speculation. He noted that he has been here for 20 years and is fairly confident in this statement.

Professor Wood, Classics & Religious Studies, noted that the report mentions orthodox Christians. He asked if this included Eastern or others. Professor Moshman stated that it refers to theologically conservative Christians.

President Bradford reiterated that the Committee was an extremely diverse one and did not have an easy task. He stated that there is a motion on the floor and asked if there was a second.

Professor Rapkin stated that he wanted to change the motion to the Senate "not accepting" the report. Motion seconded by Professor Peterson. President Bradford pointed out that the motion will not be voted on until April 22nd.

Professor Grange stated that he did not think it was a good idea to reject the report. He noted that there are some interesting things in it in terms of what we might advise the administration to do in terms of definition and spousal hires. He stated that the university's reluctance to provide data leaves things undercover. He stated that he believes the report should not be rejected.

Professor Peterson had questions about procedures. He asked if the President has a sense where the Chancellor is with creating a university plan and whether the faculty will have input into it. President Bradford noted that the Chancellor hired an Advisory Board to look at best practices at other universities but the report is not in yet. He pointed out that the affirmative action amendment that will probably be on the ballot in November might make much of this work moot. He noted that the Executive Committee is waiting for the report.

Professor Carlson asked what would happen to the report if it is not accepted. President Bradford stated that if it is not accepted it would still be available. He stated that the motion could be amended to not put the report on the Senate website or there could be a motion to do something else with the report.

Professor Schubert, Electrical Engineering, noted that the Senate asked for a report and to reject it would make the Senate not look good. Professor Fuller asked if there is an assumption that a report is automatically

accepted because the Senate received it. She stated that she does not think it was a practice of the Senate to vote on a report. Professor Peterson thought that in 2003-04 that the Senate acted on reports made by ad hoc committees working on gender and minority issues.

Professor Rapkin stated that he has concerns with the legitimacy of the report. Professor Grange pointed out that a person has the right to dissent.

Professor Bernholz, University Libraries, stated that he thinks it is wrong to reject a report. He noted that people worked on this report and rejecting it would be a bad precedent. He noted that if the report has nothing to offer there will be an external report.

Professor Carlson stated that it seems that the fundamental charge to the Committee was not clear. President Bradford stated that he was informed that the Committee would not be meeting over the summer but a charge was given to the Committee in September.

Professor Carlson stated that a report has been delivered and if it did not meet the charge what are we going to do with it?

Professor Jess, School of Natural Resources, suggested a friendly amendment to the motion stating that the Senate received the report. Professor Rapkin rejected the friendly amendment. He stated that believes the language of the report to be provocative, flippant, and inappropriate for this type of document.

Professor Ledder suggested a friendly amendment to state that the Senate not endorse the report because the Senate already accepted the report by looking at it. Professor Rapkin accepted this friendly amendment. Professor Peterson agreed.

Professor Franti, Biological Systems Engineering, noted that the members of the Committee are not even listed in the report. He suggested that the report go back to the Committee. Professor Moshman noted that an earlier draft did list the members of the Committee but some members wanted to be disassociated with it.

Professor Carlson asked if a copy of the document would be kept somewhere. Coordinator Griffin stated that the Senate Office would retain a copy of the document and any email messages or other pertinent information from the President or Executive Committee associated with the Committee and the report.

7.3 Motion to Add Graduate Student Representative(s) to the Libraries, Convocations, Commencement and Honors Convocation, and Grading and Examinations Committees

President Bradford noted that the spreadsheet provided lists the request to include a graduate student representative on the above committees. He stated that the motion will be voted on at the April 22nd meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, April 22, 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Auditorium. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and Richard Alloway, Secretary.