

UNL FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

**East Campus Union,
October 6, 2009**

Presidents John Fech, John Lindquist, and Kathy Prochaska-Cue, Presiding

1.0 Call to Order

President Fech called the meeting to order at 2:34p.m.

2.0 Announcements

2.1 Dr. Ayers to Speak at AFCON Meeting

President Fech reported that Dr. Ayers will be speaking on November 14th at the AFCON meeting in Omaha. He noted that people interested in hearing Dr. Ayers will need to register for the meeting.

2.2 Firefly

President Fech reported that there is a mandatory sign up period for use of Firefly.

2.3 Parliamentarian

President Fech reported the Professor Chouinard, Mathematics, has agreed to serve as Parliamentarian for the Senate meetings. President Fech thanked Professor Chouinard for his service.

2.4 Violence Prevention Workshop

UAAD Representative Nancy Myers encouraged everyone to sign up for the Violence Prevention Workshop that will be held on October 20th. She noted that there will be a session specifically for faculty members. She reported that the speaker will be Dr. Steve Albrecht from San Diego who will discuss how to keep the university safe. President Fech noted that faculty sign up has been limited but staff sign up has been going well.

3.0 Faculty Success Stories

President Fech pointed out that one of the goals of the Executive Committee is to extend information to Nebraskans about the work of the faculty and to help people understand the value of the university to the state and its people. He noted that there are several ways to do this and one example will be demonstrated. He stated that success stories start with the faculty and that there are many stories out there that need to be told. He stated that one example is the work done by the Food Science & Technology department that has identified factors that cause food borne illnesses. Through extension efforts this information has been taught to food service providers in Nebraska. This educational effort has resulted in less stress on social services because there have been fewer instances of illnesses created by the mishandling of food. Another example is the research being conducted on pesticides and fertilizers. The information gathered is then taught to people resulting in safer methods for using these products and fewer incidents of pollution.

Dr. Lauerman, Director of University Communications, stated that her office really values getting to know the stories that provide benefits to Nebraskans and sharing these stories with Nebraskans and other stakeholders. She noted that this can be done in many different ways: one is the Nebraska Values interactive map on the web. She stated that on this site a map of Nebraska is displayed and clicking on a district will bring up a list of the kind of work the university is doing in that district. However, her office does not know all of the stories and it would be tremendously valuable for people to learn more about the work that the faculty are doing.

Dr. Lauerman reported that a new tool called Planet Red was launched in August. This website features people around the world and proves that NU is having impacts all over the world, on every continent. She noted that the Deans have been asked to contact alumni about participating on this website. She stated that approximately 500-600 people have identified themselves on Planet Red and the numbers are growing every day. She asked faculty members to log in and put themselves on the map if their work is having impacts on other parts of the world. She noted that occasionally, some of these stories are developed into a television spot that gets aired during athletic games, particularly when the games are on pay per view.

Dr. Lauerman stated that music for these television spots was composed and performed by a doctoral student in Music and University Communications staff shot internal videos, directed and wrote the scripts for the spots, and created some of the animation. There are 30 second spots and 60 second spots and the stories have been from all of the colleges.

Dr. Lauerman stated that the university would love to tell more of the stories of the faculty members. She noted that this project is a multi-year campaign and stories will be periodically changed to show the diverse research occurring on campus. She stated that the goal is to come up with an "I Love UNL" campaign that would provide information about the university for potential students, graduate students, faculty members or potential donors or partners for the Innovation Campus.

Dr. Lauerman stated that flickr on the web is now being used and recently a summer study abroad photo contest was conducted on it. She stated that students were able to provide photos of places they studied from all over the world.

President Fech asked that the Senators introduce the concept to their colleagues in faculty meetings and suggested that departments could pull together some of the success stories. He noted that UCARE projects or other work can be included. Dr. Lauerman stated that she and her staff would be happy to come to meetings to help discuss the idea.

President Fech stated that he created a sheet where information can be provided on possible stories. This sheet can be sent to him or the Senate Office by mail or people can contact him through email (jfech1@unl.edu) or to Karen Griffin, Coordinator of the Senate, at (kgriffin2@unl.edu).

Professor Eccarius, Special Education & Communication Disorders, asked who is responsible for making this kind of information on the website accessible to all. Andy Schadwinkel, Marketing Director for the Office of University Communications, stated that the office makes sure that the websites are compatible to federal guidelines on accessibility. He acknowledged that on flickr and facebook websites can be loaded up but it is not possible to ensure that the sites are accessible.

Professor Starace, Physics & Astronomy, asked what a person needs to do to show the websites at a departmental meeting. Schadwinkel stated that simply going to <http://planetred.unl.edu/> will bring up the Planet Red campaign and <http://nebraskavalues.unl.edu/> will bring up the Nebraska Values website. Dr. Lauerman stated that information on Innovation Campus can be obtained by going to <http://innovate.unl.edu>

President Fech thanked Dr. Lauerman and Andy Schadwinkel for speaking at the meeting and their willingness to help in departmental meetings.

4.0 Associate to the Chancellor Dr. Susan Poser

Dr. Poser noted that the Chancellor was attending the Deans' Retreat in Nebraska City. She reported that the initiatives announced by the Chancellor in his State of the University Address are being worked on. She stated that the Faculty of Life Sciences (FLS) initiative will be a self-selecting group of faculty members in the life sciences. She reported that the Chancellor is working on putting together an Executive Committee for the FLS and she believes that requests for appointments to this committee will be conducted in the next few weeks. She noted that the FLS Executive Committee will be composed of members from both IANR and City Campus. She pointed out that the FLS initiative is an effort to bring scholars and researchers together to collaborate in research and teaching. She stated that the FLS Executive Committee will hopefully advise administrators on hiring to help prevent duplication of hires across departments. She pointed out that the FLS Executive Committee will be strictly an advising committee, not a governing committee, and will not be able to make decisions or will have a budget.

Dr. Poser reported that efforts are ongoing by VC Owens and SVCAA Couture to begin faculty efforts on developing a core curriculum for the FLS. She stated that she thinks the committee being formed by VC Owens and SVCAA Couture to begin work on the core curriculum is close to being formed. She stated that the idea is to model the process on the ACE curriculum program. She pointed out that the committee working on the core curriculum will not have any voting power; the faculty will need to vote on the curriculum for the life sciences.

Dr. Poser reported that a steering committee called the Efficiency Task Force will be formed to look at how the university can be more efficient. She noted that members will be from the campus and outside of the campus and they will articulate the goal of the steering committee. She reported that other universities are doing this as well. She pointed out that this will be a long term project.

Dr. Poser stated that the task force for entrepreneurship is somewhat behind schedule but its work is ongoing.

Dr. Poser reported that three dean searches are going on and all are moving forward and applications are being reviewed. She reported that Dean Cunningham of the Agricultural Research Division has retired. She noted that a search to replace him will more than likely be put off until the new VC of IANR is in place. She stated that the Chancellor is ready to put together the search committee for the VC of IANR, once he has received recommendations of possible members for the search committee from the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Poser stated that airport interviews are being conducted for the chair of the Architecture and Construction Engineering program.

Dr. Poser reported that the H1N1 flu has not impacted a large number of people on campus so far. She stated that the University Health Center is reporting about 20 new cases a week which is not considered extraordinary. She reported that VC Jackson is surveying the residence halls and the Health Center and instructors with large classes to see if they are noticing a higher rate of sick people.

Dr. Poser reported that a new law, LB 403, was recently passed. She stated that this law requires any state agency to verify citizenship status for any personal services performed on campus including scholarships and financial aid. She noted that if work is contracted with anyone outside the university proof must be provided by the contractor that their employees are citizens or that they have proper documentation. She pointed out that this is causing a problem for Admissions because residency status must now be verified for each student applying. She reported that new employees will be checked through the e-verify system and a new clause is being added to the RFP for bids for outside work. She stated that the new law is complex and may go back to the legislature to ask them to tweak the law to make it less difficult to adhere to.

Professor Carlson, Veterinary & Biomedical Sciences, stated that faculty members are concerned with the process that is being used to put the core curriculum together for the FLS. He asked how the curriculum is going to be formulated and identified, who is appointed to the committee that will work on this, and who will be chairing the committee. Dr. Poser reported that SVCAA Couture and VC Owens are in charge and they are going to model the process on the ACE program. She pointed out that no one is saying that the faculty will not be involved in the process. She stated that the efforts are to get people together to discuss and work on this initiative together. Professor Carlson asked if a deadline date has been established and what product will be implemented. Dr. Poser stated that she is not aware if there is a deadline date although she believes the idea is to have a committee in place by January 1st.

Professor Peterson, Agricultural Economics, pointed out that when Professor Edwards was SVCAA a committee was formed called the Wasted Time Committee that looked at efficiencies that could be made at the university. He suggested that there might be some valuable information that the Efficiency Task Force can use.

President Fech asked how the FLS Executive Committee is going to be formed. Will it come from the faculty up or will members be appointed by the Chancellor. Dr. Poser stated that the members will be appointed. She pointed out that the Executive Committee is there to advise the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Deans on issues relating to research collaboration. She stated that the Chancellor is trying to get a balance of members between the two campuses and departments. She noted that the Chancellor has been consulting with the Vice Chancellors on who should be appointed to this committee. She stated that if anyone has suggestions on who should be considered for the committee, to contact her (sposer1@unl.edu). She stated that it would be helpful to have the names of people who would be appropriate for the committee and who can provide the time to work on it.

5.0 Approval of 9/1/09 Minutes

Professor Peterson moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Professor Dewey, School of Natural Resources. The motion was approved.

6.0 Committee Reports

6.1 Academic Standards Committee (Dean Kean)

Dean Kean was not available to attend the meeting. President Fech stated that anyone with questions should contact Dean Kean (rkean1@unl.edu).

6.2 Grading & Examinations Committee (Professor Woodward)

Professor Woodward reported that most of the work is done by a subcommittee in the colleges that review appeals for pass/no pass and for late withdrawals. He stated that the numbers on these kinds of requests are included in the report. He noted that a summary of the activity that has occurred over the last six years with

these kinds of requests was included. He pointed out that the summary indicates that no major changes are occurring.

Professor Woodward stated that a historic track of grades is included in the report and it includes grades when the minus system began. Professor Peterson asked if the grades were strictly for undergraduates. Professor Woodward stated that it is just for undergraduates.

Professor Chouinard asked if there have been any attempts to correlate grades with better students and grade inflation. Professor Woodward stated that he will check on this.

Professor Carlson asked about the critical 3.5 gpa is for undergraduates. Professor Woodward stated that more prestigious colleges use this. He noted that there is quite an effort for freshmen and other students to maintain this gpa.

6.3 Academic Rights & Responsibilities Committee (Professor Shea)

Professor Shea reported that he was lead co-chair last year for the ARRC and Professor Boden is now the current lead co-chair. He stated that last year was a busy year for the ARRC with four special committees being convened to investigate cases. He wanted to thank all of the faculty members who participated in these important investigations, particularly those who chaired the special hearing committees.

Professor Starace noted that the previous draft of the Misconduct in Research policy recommended action by the Senate to change some of the ARRC procedures. He asked what the status is of this. Professor Shea reported that the ad hoc committee working on revising the policy is actively revising the draft and it is hoped that the draft will be shared with the Senate soon, possibly in November. He noted that members of the ARRC did answer questions in regards to the policy and made suggestions to the ad hoc committee in conjunction with the ARRC procedures.

7.0 Unfinished Business

7.1 Ayers' Dis-Invitation Committee Report (Professor Peterson)

Professor Peterson noted that the Senate passed a motion asking Past President Prochaska-Cue to contact AAUP or FIRE to see if they would investigate the cancellation of Dr. Ayers' visit. Both groups declined so an internal committee was set up to conduct the investigation and to make recommendations for procedures to use in the future. He reported that the ad hoc committee was chaired by Professor Bryant and members included Professor Moshman, Professor Rapkin, himself and Emeritus Professor McShane.

Professor Peterson noted that Professor Bryant was unable to attend the meeting today to give the report but sent a note that he wanted read about it. Professor Peterson stated that he is confident that the conclusion and recommendations of the report are sound. He pointed out that the completion of the report does not mean that efforts on academic freedom are finished.

Professor Peterson noted that the first charge from the Senate to the ad hoc committee was to determine if academic freedom was violated and to review procedures and suggest changes on how similar situations can be handled. He reported that committee members interviewed a number of people implicated in the process of cancelling Dr. Ayers' visit. He reported that the committee also read a substantial number of emails, checked internet sites relating to Dr. Ayers, read news stories, and consulted with people who were knowledgeable about what happened during this event.

Professor Peterson reported that the ad hoc committee's conclusion was that the cancellation of Dr. Ayers' visit did violate academic freedom. Ultimately the cancellation prevented students and faculty members from engaging in academic discussion. He noted that a duly constituted faculty group exercised its responsibility in inviting Dr. Ayers to speak and based its decision to invite him on the basis of his academic accomplishments. He stated that security questions arose when external threats and complaints were made to the university. He pointed out that the heckler's veto was successful in disrupting a legitimate academic event that was to take place at the university.

Professor Peterson stated that the second charge, to make recommendations for procedures, is addressed in the report. He noted that eight recommendations have been made by the ad hoc committee. He stated that some of the recommendations call for faculty involvement in decisions made about future situations that might involve academic freedom concerns. He pointed out that there is language in the general framework of the ARRC procedures on how to deal with an instructor who needs to be removed from a classroom. He stated that the committee is recommending that the same procedure be invoked if there is a need to act immediately

in removing a guest speaker. He stated that if it is not possible for the Chancellor to meet with the Chair of the ARRC, that the Chancellor take the necessary action, but consult with the Chair of the ARRC within 48 hours.

Professor Peterson stated that other recommendations have to do with developing more effective systems to respond to this kind of situation. He pointed out that members of the committee were particularly concerned with the staff members who had to deal overwhelmingly with people calling them up screaming at them about Dr. Ayers. He stated that the committee feels that some violence prevention training and having a centralized switchboard that can deal with these kinds of calls are needed.

Professor Peterson reported that the committee learned about UNL's Threat Assessment Group but found out that not many people are aware of it. He stated that the committee suggested that the Senate could be helpful in increasing knowledge of the Threat Assessment Group to faculty and staff members and how it works.

Professor Peterson stated that another recommendation is to intensify efforts to educate people on the meaning and importance of academic freedom. He stated that the committee suggested organizing a conference on the subject.

Professor Bernholz, Libraries, asked if the committee is aware of any similar questions or threats made with the upcoming visit of Dr. Ayers to Omaha. Professor Peterson pointed out that the event is being organized and sponsored by AFCON, a completely separate organization from the university. He noted that there was some discussion about the Senate being a partner of the event but there was no interest in doing this. Professor Rapkin pointed out that we are no longer embroiled in the heat of the election so there shouldn't be the same level of controversy, and the university is not involved with the event. Professor Shea noted that there was some discussion in the Executive Committee about sponsorship of the event by the Senate. Rapkin pointed out that the key difference recognized with the Executive Committee is that the AFCON visit by Dr. Ayers does nothing to redress the original academic freedom violation.

Professor Harbison, Chemistry, stated that he while he agrees with the recommendations that were made he felt that the report was very incomplete and inaccurate. He pointed out that UNL was not the first university to invite Dr. Ayers to campus. He noted that Dr. Ayers has spent the last five years talking about what a great terrorist he was and in 2001 in the New York Times he stated that he did not regret planting bombs and stated that he should have planted more. In 2006 Dr. Ayers released a set of poems about the Weatherman. He noted that the University of Colorado decided that Dr. Ayers was not the kind of person they wanted to invite to campus and cancelled his visit there.

Professor Harbison wanted to discuss the statement in the report about the Republican politicians capitalizing on Dr. Ayers' visit. He noted that the report talks about comments made by Republicans but does not mention comments made by Democrats. He stated that this goes not make sense at all.

Professor Bryant stated that he was not going to dispute what Professor Harbison stated. He reported that the more the committee delved into the event, the more chaotic it looked. He stated that the committee tried to find a primary source for what happened and in trying to reconstruct the events the committee thought they drafted a good report. However, there were some disagreements with some people who were interviewed and the committee was asked to remove some statements. He pointed out that when Dr. Ayers' visit was announced and then cancelled, it was a very chaotic time for the campus and the visit may have been cancelled in part due to the chaos. He stated that the effort of the committee was not to go back and look at Dr. Ayers' career. He noted that many places have welcomed Dr. Ayers to speak since his cancelled visit here. He pointed out that the committee was more concerned that a person was invited to talk about content that was relevant to faculty but the visit was cancelled for reasons that were not related to academics.

Professor Harbison stated that there seems to be Republican bashing in the beginning of the report and attributing speculative motion to political leaders who made comments should have nothing to do with the report. He stated that he believes this to be a basic flaw in the report.

Professor Potuto, Law, asked if we are voting on a motion and if so, what exactly are we voting on. She stated that she had some of the same reactions in reading the report as Professor Harbison. She asked if the Senate will be voting on the recommendations of the report or the entire report.

Professor Peterson stated that his charge was to deliver the report. The Senate would need to decide whether to accept the report or have a motion to take action on the recommendations.

Professor Carlson asked why a credentials check is not done on people who are invited to campus to speak. He stated that there is the implication that the Faculty Senate sponsors the AFCON event on November 14th if the Senate is a member of AFCON. President Fech stated that this is a technical question. He noted the membership to AFCON is through dues but the Senate has not paid any dues for 2009. Griffin acknowledged that no statement of membership for the Senate to AFCON has been received in 2009 therefore, no dues have been paid.

Professor Zorn, Finance, stated that he is in strong support of academic freedom and has been for a long time and the cancellation of any speaker, including Dr. Ayers, is in general a breach of academic freedom. He pointed out that there were other ways the situation could have been handled. He noted that there is a rush to the barricades to protect academic freedom when it comes from the left but silence when it comes from the other direction.

Professor Starace asked for clarification on some parts of the report. He stated that the threat assessment group did not call for a cancellation of the event but a different venue for it. He asked if this was considered. He stated that there is no indication that any action would be taken against those who made the threats. He asked whether this has been purposely omitted from the report. Professor Bryant stated that the threat assessment group was firm in telling the committee that they did not have enough information that led them to think that they could legally prosecute anyone who made threats. He noted that the threats did not indicate bodily harm but instead used anger and foul language and some aggression but nothing that was prosecutable.

Professor Bryant reported that Chief Yardley stated that if there had been enough time the event could have been done in a different venue that could provide better security. He stated that Dean Kostelnik and Chancellor Perlman elected to cancel the event in part, because they felt that to reschedule the event would have been too difficult. Professor Peterson reported that Chief Yardley and Professor Scalora of the Threat Assessment Group stated that they were proceeding under the premises that the event was going to take place and discussing what would need to be done. They both agreed it would not be a nice discussion and a lot would need to be put in place to ensure the security of the event, but all of this became moot after that Thursday night.

Professor Bryant wanted to address the comment made about bashing Republican politicians. He stated that it may have been a good point but the political leaders were lining up and trying to tell the university how it should do things. He noted that earlier drafts of the report were far more critical of the politicians. He stated that the point is that the leaders in Nebraska were trying to control the university. He reported that in supreme state court cases the court basically told politicians to leave their hands off the university. He stated that the report ended up saying it was being attacked by people and it was very discouraging to see some of the comments that were made about the university. He stated that academic freedom allows faculty members the right to determine what gets taught. He noted that President Milliken and the Regents were put into a difficult place because of the political pressure, but they stated that essentially the Chancellor needed to make these kinds of decisions. He stated that he wanted to give credit to President Milliken and the Regents for not interfering with the Chancellor's role to make the decision.

Professor Zorn stated that in his opinion, it is naïve to think that politicians aren't going to express their opinions when public opinion is aroused, but it is a mistake to name and pick a fight with specific politicians. If the legislature were attempting to pass legislation to restrict academic freedom then naming specific politicians would make sense.

Professor Bryant pointed out that the Senate can vote to accept or amend the report but it was written the way it was intentionally.

Past President Prochaska-Cue reported that she appointed the committee and she wanted to extend her gratitude to the members of it in grappling with the information and all of the work that they did. She pointed out that it is unfortunate that the report is so politically charged because it really comes down to a basic issue of academic freedom. She stated that she is not going to offer a motion today, but might do so later.

Past President Prochaska-Cue stated that she is hearing that members of the Senate are glad not to be involved with AFCON. She noted that AFCON is an independent organization that is concerned with academic freedom and protecting it in the state, not just at the university, but at all academic institutions. She stated that she is very sad to hear that faculty members are not supporting this concept and hopes people will think about this. Professor Zorn asked who expressed the view that the Senate is against AFCON. Past President Prochaska-Cue stated that she is a highly intuitive person and she detected negativity towards AFCON both

here in the Senate and in the Executive Committee. She stated that the issue was academic freedom and it was violated with this case. She pointed out that academic freedom is one of our most protected rights.

Professor Sarroub, Teaching, Learning, & Teacher Education, asked if there is any further information about the event taking place on November 14th in Omaha and how people can attend. She questioned whether it would be possible to rent vans or buses from UNL that people can take up to the event. Past President Prochaska-Cue stated that AFCON has a registration form. She believes the event costs \$35 to attend and will be held at the Holiday Inn in Omaha.

Professor Starace asked if the Executive Committee will be considering the recommendations made in the report and bring them back to the Senate. President Fech stated that the Executive Committee will be looking at the recommendations and is particularly interested in holding a symposium on academic freedom.

8.0 New Business

8.1 Changes to University Curriculum Committee Membership

Agenda item postponed.

8.2 UNL Resolution on Stem Cell Research

President Fech stated that the resolution asking the Board of Regents to continue following its current policy on embryonic stem cell research comes from the Executive Committee as a resolution. He stated that he wanted to present it as an emergency motion. Professor Chouinard pointed out that the President must declare why the motion should be considered an emergency motion. President Fech stated that there is strong belief that the Board will address this issue at the October 23rd Board meeting.

Professor McCollough, Anthropology, asked if UNMC voted on the resolution. President Fech reported that UNMC voted to approve the resolution.

Professor Chouinard asked if we know what is coming before the Board and to what extent the resolution addresses this. President Fech stated that the intent of the Medical Center is to address the issue once the Board's agenda is distributed.

Professor Leiter, Law, asked if there is a sense that the Board is going to take up this issue in some fashion but it is unknown how the Board will do this. He asked if the current position is to support the existing guidelines. President Fech stated that currently the Board's policy is to comply with federal guidelines.

Professor Leiter asked if anyone knows if the Board is planning to change their current policy. He stated that if it is unknown, then he would vote against it because the resolution seems unnecessary. President Fech stated that it is speculative but indications are that there is a likelihood that the Board will try to change the policy. Professor Peterson pointed out that there are several current Regents who campaigned to change the university's policy on stem cell research. He noted that the resolution is worded to encourage the Regents to stick with the current federal guidelines.

Professor Chouinard stated that the current policy is to observe federal guidelines but with the change in administration the guidelines have changed. He stated that the resolution wouldn't be necessary if there was no possibility of changing it. He asked if the Regents usually vote on a motion when it is made at a meeting. President Fech stated that both things could happen. Dr. Poser stated that she has not heard that the Regents are going to talk about the policy.

Professor Harbison asked for clarification. He stated that the resolution does not say there are no restrictions on embryonic stem cell research, but to maintain the status quo which means that the university could accept funding for stem cell research.

Professor Flowers, Psychology, stated that one of the reasons above and beyond the resolution is the concern about again having more restrictions placed on the university for conducting research and a change in the policy would restrict our ability to get federal funds. He noted that the resolution calls for keeping things status quo, but this is an issue that some Regents want to see changed. He stated the he thinks we need to be proactive on this resolution and he would enthusiastically support it.

Professor Starace pointed out that if the laws were changed to apply only to the university this state would be hindered compared to other universities. He stated that he realizes that this is a moral issue for some people but he sees this as a vote for research and academics and a support for academic freedom. He agreed that we

need to be proactive.

Professor Peterson called the question. Professor Dewey seconded this. The vote to approve the resolution as an emergency motion passed with a vote of 39 in favor with 5 abstentions.

The vote to approve the resolution passed with 38 in favor of it, 7 against it, and 1 abstention.

8.3 Draft Ballot for Academic Rights & Responsibilities Panel

President Fech reported that two positions have opened on the ARRP and an election needs to be held to fill them. He noted that the ballot will go to all faculty members. He declared the motion as an emergency motion so the election can be held quickly and the Panel filled. The motion to approve the ballot as an emergency motion was approved. Professor Peterson moved that the ballot be approved and Professor Leiter seconded the motion. The motion to approve the ballot to fill the ARRP was approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held on Tuesday, November 3, 2:30 p.m. in the City Campus Union, Centennial Room. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator, and David Rapkin, Secretary.