

2009 – 2010 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Signal Mountain Room, University Center, 3:10 p.m.
September 03, 2009

The minutes can also be found at: <http://www.utc.edu/FacultySenate/minutes.php>

<u>Division</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
President	Pedro Campa	
Past-President	Gavin Townsend	
At-Large	Jennifer Beach, Mike Bell, Rebecca Bromley, Rebecca Elliot, Clair McCullough, and Jim Tucker	
Lecturer	Andrea Becksvoort	
Adjunct		
Behavioral Sciences	Nick Honerkamp, Barbara Medley	
Business Adm.	Jim Henley, Keith Richards, and Greg Thibadoux	
Eng & Comp Sci		Ron Goulet, Frank Jones
Fine Arts	Ron Ulen, and Kenyon Wilson	Stuart Benkert
CHEPS	D. R. Meece, and Cheryl Robinson	Kay Lindgren, Deborah McAllister, M.A. Mccoy, and Elizabeth O'Brien,
Humanities	Jennifer Beech, Ralph Covino, Lynn Purkey, and Vicki Steinberg	
Library	Beverly Simmons	
Math & Sciences	Irene Loomis	Hill Craddock
Ex-Officio	Roger Brown, Phil Oldham, John Delaney, Theresa Liedtka, Richard Brown, and Jocelyn Sanders	
SGA Liaison		

Among the guests present: James Nathan, Anthony Haynes, Dr. Linda Orth, Dr. Herbert Burhenn

Senate meetings are open meetings to which all interested parties are welcome.

To presenters: If a document camera is needed for a presentation, please make arrangements with Media Resources.

1. Call to Order 15:14
2. Approval of the minutes of April 16, 2009. Dr. Purkey stated that she had to correct the attendance in the minutes. Motion made by Dr. Honerkamp and seconded by Dr. Sweetman. Minutes with these corrections were approved.
3. Report on Board of Trustees (BOT) – Dr. Prevost

Dr. Prevost: I'll keep this very short. Last June before one of the meetings of the BOT, we were having a discussion, and someone turned to Pedro and said, "How are things at UTC?" Pedro [Dr. Campa] said "If you want the optimistic version, ask Verbie [Dr. Prevost]. If you want the pessimistic version, ask me." So I am here today to give you the optimistic version, and I am truly optimistic about the future of the UT system and about our role in that system. The BOT met on Aug. 25 for a full day workshop related

to the future of UT system, and where we want to see it go in a highly productive meeting. We began with a discussion of the historical background of the UT system, reflecting upon changes, especially the burgeoning of the system in the past 11 years, and agreed this was a result of the personalities of the president that we have selected over the past few years, rather than a direction determined either by the BOT or by the campuses that were involved. So, the goal of this BOT is to try, while we have an interim president, to set up the best possible system that we can devise, and then to find someone that will fit that system, and not devise one of his or her own. That we want to chose the kind of system that we want – that’s our goal. So, we had a very candid and very forthright discussion, even with reporters present. It was amazing how people were able to speak out. For example, I had the audacity to suggest that just because Knoxville athletics were orange, it didn’t mean that my English stationary at UTC should have to be orange. You got some different reactions. The trustee who represents Martin of course said, “We love big orange.” We got into a discussion. It was very helpful and revealed the differences of all the campuses that are part of this institution. Martin has a very different relationship to UTK than we do and I think that came out in the discussion. We started with a list of concerns from all of the campuses about the system as it exists and there was very strong overall consistency. The number one concern for every campus was more autonomy. Amazingly, Knoxville feels this as strongly, if not more strongly than we do. The second concern was about making a clear cut distinction or separation between the system and the campuses. I think that did come out in one of the newspaper article, the idea that the two are just so indistinguishable. The third one was of course better communication. There were many other concerns, but these were the main ones. With the direction of Tom Meredith, who was our facilitator for event, has had extensive experience in several different systems. He asked us to think of several different situations, and for us to assume that we were building a system from scratch and what that system would look like. Obviously there was a lot of agreement and a lot of disagreement, and we certainly haven’t resolved all of the issues yet, but we feel like we are making a start, and that we will get there. We had a very civil and very productive discussion, and I think the first thing has been accomplished. As you have read, there will be a movement of the system office off of the main Knoxville campus. It is not yet determined where. It will go somewhere in Knoxville for the time being. There is still disagreement over whether it will ultimately remain in Knoxville, which according to its charter it has to (that would have to be changed by the legislature, but it cold be done), or whether it will be moved to Nashville. People in Memphis feel very strongly that it should be moved to Nashville, but that is yet to be determined. It is definitely moving off of the main Knoxville campus. Also, work has already begun to provide more autonomy for the campuses, and this will be showing up, I think eventually in several ways. I think one of the ways that we can expect to be affected, is when we start building our library here. We will have a little more autonomy in that. They have also begun to work on better communication. We know about that on our own campus, and they will continue to work on that.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend: Did the board have a chance to discuss, did they have the temerity to discuss trimming the UT system administration?

Dr. Prevost: Absolutely, and they trying to do that without specifically identifying people, but the one thing that we did have. We did not have any of the system people there with the exception of the president, his assistant Katy High, and Hank Dye was the only other one there. Is that right? The chancellors were all there, but none of the other UT system was there. You did have the press there, but [Dr.] Simek made it clear that he did not want the others there the way they used to be. He wanted this to be an opportunity to discuss it and it was very clear cut that everyone felt that the system was just so bloated.

Dr. Townsend: Were there any other objections or any other important discussions?

Dr. Prevost: Well, you know designing that system and deciding what needs to be at the system level and what needs to be at the campus level. You know, that varies with the system. Meredith worked in the Alabama, the Georgia, and the Mississippi systems. I hope I am not confusing the systems that he gave as examples. I believe he compared the Georgia and Alabama systems and I don't remember which is which. But the idea of IT, should it be at the system level or the campus level. Most everyone agreed that there has to be something at the system level about IT, but how much? He said in one system they had two people in IT at the system, and everything else was on the campuses. In the other system they had 600 people at the system and hardly anyone on campuses. You have to make the decision of what you think works best for your system. So he was not trying to tell us which way to go, he was simply trying to say it is done in different ways that you've got to decide which way to go for your system. These things have not been worked out yet, but I thought that was a start.

Dr. Campa: Thank you. Dr. Prevost is the faculty representative to the BOT, and she's also the Head of the English Department and a professor in the English here at the university.

4. UT System Legislative Liaison Anthony Hanes

Dr. Campa: The next item on the agenda is that we have two very important guests that the Chancellor is going to introduce. One of them you might know, the other, he will introduce now.

Chancellor Brown: Thank you, Mr. President. It is a pleasure to have on campus one of our colleagues, who is the Director of Government Relations for the UT System. His name is Anthony Haynes and he is a proud alumnus of Martin. He has been working in Nashville now for 4.5 years. I will tell you personally that in this last session when we were going through the discussions about whether or not the bond would be extended to the UTC capital projects including our library, Anthony was a critical, critical player in bringing together members of the legislature with campus administrators and faculty members. I want to thank you for that. It was a very, very important issue for us.

Anthony has brought with him today another very important member of our state legislature, Nathan James. Nathan is an analyst for Senator Dolores Gresham, who is the new chair of the Senate Education Committee, the committee that will be very, very important to us as the state studies exactly how higher education will be provided. We are delighted to have both of you gentlemen here. Thank you for visiting us.

5. Report from the Executive Committee

Dr. Campa – TUFSS Document

Dr. Campa asked the new members of the Faculty Senate to introduce themselves to the Senate. These include Dr. Keith Richards (Business), Dr. Rick Thibadoux (Business), Dr. Barbara Medley (Sociology), and Dr. Jennifer Beech (English), Rebecca Bromley (Communication), and Dr. Daryl Meece (TPR), as well as Dr. Ron Ulen (Music).

Dr. Campa: I have one item, which is to confirm my 2nd Vice President, who will be the Head of the Committee on Committees. Chris Stuart was the past 2nd Vice President. His term expired, so Mike Bell decided that he wanted to serve on the Executive Committee. Do I have any nominations from the floor?

There were no nominations.

The motion carried by acclamation.

Dr. Campa: The next item is the TUFSS document, which is the Tennessee University Faculty Senates position paper on the reorganization of higher education in the state of Tennessee. The document which was circulated is a document which has circulated around somewhat, but we do not wish it to be published until all the Faculty Senates in the state actually have approved. The document is the result of a three-day meeting, Aug. 14-16 [2009], in Nashville, where all of the representatives of the universities of the state of Tennessee met. Most of them were represented by the Senate presidents, and some by a representative for the president. So we met for a total of 68 hours. There were grueling meetings that would begin in the morning, then a lunch break, back in, then a dinner break, and then back in, sometimes until about 10:30 at night. And then Sunday morning we met again until about noon, and then some people had to stay. So, Dr. Miles was there with me. She is the secretary of TUFSS for this group. And we represent 10,000 faculty members in the state of Tennessee. So the document that the TUFSS group wants you to approve, or to vote up or down, is the document that you saw on the web. And it is a number of observations, and then a number of recommendations at the end. Some of those recommendations, obviously we did not agree with, but it was a lot of compromise, a lot of give and take, and a lot of finding out about ourselves and about our mission in the state. One thing that emerged from this is that we do want a voice in any decision that is going to be made about the reorganization of higher education. We want to be at the table. We do not want those decisions made in a smoke filled room by the legislature. We do not want those decisions to be totally political decisions. We were thinking of the best thing for the state, for our students, and for scholarship. So this document represents

many ideas of a number of people, who were sometimes very mad about some of these decisions, sometimes very much in agreement with the decisions. But the one thing that emerged from this is that, we want much more independence in the decision making process. And we would also like to have a board that actually represents the interests of our region, our university, our constituency. So that's the document that we have been asked to approve. I wish that we could actually amend this document or have input from you, but again that is not possible. The document either has to be voted up or down. It's going forth with a vote from all of the different campuses. So far Austen Peay has passed it and approved it, the state AUP organization has also endorsed the document. So, saying that, I will ask for any remarks or discussion. Dr. Miles is the secretary for TUFSS, so she took the minutes, and she was at the meeting, so she might be able to answer any questions you have on the recommendations specifically. She has the minutes in front of her.

Dr. Miles: We ended up with 18 pages of minutes. I want to say that it's a remarkable group, of varying interests, some of us in the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) system, some of us in the UT system. But it was an incredibly positive experience, with collaboration and compromise. I feel like we came up with the very best resolution that we could under the circumstances. We also wanted to pledge faculty effort in the state toward reducing costs and being very mindful of the issues that the legislatures have raised with us and to anticipate some of those in the document. Perhaps the wording is not always the same way it would be, if it had been generated in this body, for example, but the heart and soul of a workable suggestion to the governor and the legislature about ways to improve higher education.

Questions:

Dr. Townsend: Assuming that X number of universities approve the document, what would be the next step? Do all universities need to ratify it?

Dr. Miles: No, we said the majority of TUFSS members [must ratify it]. The indications that we have from faculty governance, are that all of the campuses with possibly two exceptions, the Senate presidents felt that it would pass on their campuses, and this week and next it's going through that process. So we anticipate that it will pass.

Dr. Townsend: Are campuses handling it differently? Has it been left to Senates or will it go before the full faculty?

Dr. Miles: Good question. As this is an organization of Senates, it goes only to the senates on each campus. I think there may be one case where they call it a council, but essentially the senate body.

Dr. Townsend: Now assuming that this will be approved, it's going to go the governor. How will it be disseminated and what do we anticipate will be the results of that?

Dr. Miles: It will go to the governor and to the education committee and to key legislators, who have expressed an interest in this. For example, I'm sure that Pedro [Dr. Campa] and I want to make sure that local representatives and senators are aware of this document, and it will also go to the media at that point.

Dr. Townsend: What is the anticipated result?

Dr. Campa: I think the anticipated result is the fact that as a group of concerned faculty in the state of Tennessee, we want to have more than an opinion. We want to have a voice. If you look at the document carefully, it does not propose a template for a new organization of higher education. We thought it would have been too presumptions to tell the governor or the legislature how to put a new configuration together. However, we thought that there were some things that we could all share in common that could be amended, corrected, edited, restructured to reflect not only the economic situation that we find ourselves in, but furthermore what is the best thing for preserving the state of knowledge and university education in the state of Tennessee. So, again, remember this is a compromise document. Again, I must repeat it. This is the subject of many, many discussions, and give and take. Perhaps, I personally see some things in the document that I do not agree with, but there were some sacrifices that were made to get the things done that we all did agree with.

Dr. Miles: I should say at the TUFSS meeting the Chattanooga delegation argued as strongly as we could to get some greater freedom on tuition and out-of-state fee reductions. Unfortunately, that did not pass the document. That's one of my personal regrets about this document, but I would say overall, it was an incredible cooperative effort of very diverse interests, and in some cases some distrust among different institutions. So I think that it is a compromise document.

Dr. Townsend: Is there something in the document that the Chattanooga delegation thought was particularly troublesome or objectionable?

Dr. Campa: I think we got rid of those. Also, it must be noted, in this meeting, the ostensible diversity of interests of higher education in Tennessee. In other words, as we talked and ate together, and actually lived together practically for 3 days, we sort of noticed that the perceptions of us and our perception of them is a completely different story, something else. For example, they think of us at UTC as sort of a privileged child of the UT system. How come you got this library, and we got 6 buildings, that we didn't get? So there's a perception of something that we don't see ourselves. Also in urban colleges like Tennessee State, there is a fear of losing some programs, especially when the programs are being offered within a 20 mile radius by three institutions. They can see the ax coming. So a lot of talk was geared toward graduate programs and which were a basic need for the communities in which they were located. And that was a very important part of our talk. The idea of having the only a graduate school in Knoxville, and everything else would be an undergraduate was discussed at large. What is the role of Memphis in all of this? Who will take care of the medical school ultimately? What is the

role of THEC, if any? So, these are things that were talked about for a long time. I would like to hear a motion to approve the document.

Dr. Loomis moved to approve the document, and Dr. Honerkamp seconded the motion.

The motion carried with 22 in favor and 1 against.

Dr. Campa: I also want to congratulate, where's Mike [D. Bell]? You are now the 2nd Vice President.

6. Administrative Reports

Provost Oldham addressed the issue of possible equity adjustments and gave the Senate an overview of the process.

Dr. Campa: Now, what you have all been waiting for, the Provost's remarks. I asked the Provost to come and address the issue of possible, this is not a certain thing, and this is a possible equity adjustment for full professors and lecturers. He will give you an overview of this.

Provost Oldham: I am going to write some numbers on the board first. There will be a test later. Does anyone know what these are besides Fran, Jocelyn? [60.2% - 66.9%] That is our improved freshman retention rate this year. That's roughly 7% points. That's quite remarkable in one year. You've heard a lot and you will even more about graduation rates. There's probably likelihood that performance funding will be much more heavily linked to outcome, like graduation rates, in the future. [39.8 to 42.3%] You can see the graduation rate and how far we've come this year. I hope that we will all celebrate these. We're not anywhere near where we need to be, but we've made substantial improvement, and we need to celebrate that. You know, we'll be peeling this thing back over the next few weeks to learn what we can in condition to why this has transpired. I may have some answers for that, but I will continue to look at the data as it is available and understand it to the fullest extent. I think it's pretty clear that the freshman attendance program is an early indicator and has a significant impact. I think the data also indicates that the freshman seminar program this past year has had an impact on retention rate. So there are some real positive things going on. I think we tend to focus, and understandably so, on the economic issues, and the things we struggle with, but every other measurement, we're looking at; we're tracking here at UTC shows improvement. I think almost everyone recognizes this number too [10, 526]. If you haven't noticed in your classes, I'd be surprised. That is our new record enrollment at UTC. It is the first time we topped 10,000, and we moved right past it. So, I've got a newsletter that is about ready to come out. Hopefully it will be ready to come out tomorrow. In that I give a special thanks to a lot of individuals who have played a big role in helping us reach these milestones. The faculty at large has done a big part. I really want to thank people in the English department for stepping up this last year with the Freshman Retention Project and tracking attendance. Their effort was significant to the overall effort. You know, these are all really good things that are going on, and I

guess the anecdotal information that I keep hearing from faculty is that this freshman class is really a cut above, and they are exhibiting considerably better behaviors in the classroom as well. This freshman class is the largest on record, it's also the best academically on record. The average ACT for this entering freshman class is 22.7. Just to give you a comparison, in 2004, the entering freshman class had an average of 21.7. So it has gone a whole ACT point ahead in 5-6 years. That's a substantial increase. So, not only are we getting more students at UTC, we're getting better students. So, this wheel is turning and it keeps going.

Let me talk for a few minutes about an effort we are putting forward to do some salary equity adjustments on campus. I would characterize this as a pretty bold move for this administration to do, particularly in this time of budgetary environment. We do that, obviously with the chancellor's support, because we feel that it is incredibly important for this campus and this faculty and staff. Because we are doing things, and hitting these milestones, we need to do everything possible to keep pace in rewarding our faculty and staff accordingly and relative to market. These adjustments are not market based. They are not merit based type of salary adjustment whatsoever. So we are allowed by university policy to look into equity adjustments. So let me talk with you a little bit about this, Richard [Vice Chancellor Brown] is here to chime in. I will try to paint a picture for you as far as academic affairs. Overall we are looking at \$300,000 campus-wide in terms of salary equity adjustments. It is not as large as we would like. In terms of academic affairs, that is about 2/3 of that \$300,000. When we started looking at this, we worked with the deans to put this together. We compiled a lot of data with Dick Gruetzmacher's office, and in consultation with Pedro [Dr. Campa], Dr. Garrett, who is the Chair of the Budget and Economic Committee, and the Faculty Senate. What has transpired, [is that] we sought to develop an appropriate peer group for the goals we're trying to meet. And it seemed that the most appropriate peer group was using the SREB data for something called SREB 2-3 institutions. We're currently in what would be called a SREB 3 institution, and that would generally be considered a comprehensive masters level institution. And it's a pretty good peer group for us. I would say we would be in the upper half at least of the SREB 3 institutions. SREB 2 institutions would generally be aspiration institutions to us. They would be smaller doctoral granting institutions. To make that transition to 2, I think you have to have 5 doctoral programs and graduate on average 20-30 doctoral students per year. We're a little bit removed from SREB 2, but these are institutions like UNC Charlotte. So a combination of those two give us a set of peer institutions of about 60-70 institutions within the southern region. It's a pretty good peer group for us. So we compared salaries by rank, full, associate, assistant, and lecturer. We saw where we stood. What we opted to do in this model, as it is being put forth now, is to set a minimum. What we wanted to do is get, since this is equity adjustment, is get as a minimum everyone at least up to 85% of the average of that peer category. With the exception of the lecturers, in that case, what we want to try to do is increase our baseline. Our current minimum lecturer salary on this campus, I am embarrassed to say, is \$27,000.00. You can get paid more teaching the first year in Hamilton Country Schools. So we want to increase that minimum to \$28,500.00 for all lecturers, and then really focus on where we are seeing the most market based compression relative to this peer set. So, you break all that down, and we ended up being

able to do this, associate and assistant professor were included in that study as well. It turns out no assistant professors were below the 85% threshold to begin with, which is not surprising. We try to maintain market-based entry salaries for incoming assistant professors, and so that's where that fell. 85% of the average, that's not where I want to end up. This is a starting point. I think it's fair to say that if we're able to take this step this fall, as we anticipate that we will, it's just one additional step to try to take another one as soon as possible. It turns out that this will have an impact on about 80 faculty members out of roughly 400-450 faculty members at UTC. And it impacts those that are furthest behind in terms of compression. Where we are with it now, it's sitting in the Chancellor's hands, and he'll be in communication with President Simek to get final approval.

Dr. Richard Brown: On the staff side, we have about 100,000. We have the same approach and methodology, and are trying to get to the market base of 85%. We are dealing with those folks furthest away. All of this is being done as part of a continued process to pay attention to salary compression all across the institution. This is only the first phase. As we build new revenue, we'll come back again, and chip away at this to make sure that we focus on human capital, which is 80% of what we do. At the end of the day we want a quality faculty and quality staff, even in midst of this economic downturn.

Questions:

Dr. Honerkamp: Is the graduation rate for 4, 5 or 6 years?

Dr. Brown: That is the 6-year graduation rate.

Dr. Honerkamp: Is there a state goal?

Provost: We're constantly developing a five year goal. We do not know that at this point in time. Let me see if I can frame it for you. UTK and my former employer Mississippi State, they had a 6-year graduation rate of 60%. Most of our THEC peers would be in the mid 40s to low 50% range. Appy [Appalachian] State probably has the highest in our THEC peer group and I think that they are around 60%. It would take 5 years to turn around the graduation rate. It takes a long gestation period, but the starting point is to improve first year retention rates. And we should be seeing a bump in this as we go along, but I'd like to see it above 50%. I've looked at the historical data for UTC and I don't think UTC has ever had more than a 50% grad rate.

Dr. Prevost: Do we have any idea of a time line on salary compression. Some of my lecturers will have heard, and they will ask me.

Provost Oldham: Chancellor, did you want to comment on that at all?

Chancellor Brown: I think that it can be fairly fast now. We've got the methodology. We've got the recommendations from the deans. I do not expect any push back by the

system, because we have checked through the human resource director for the system, and she pointed out that the rationale we're using is well within the guidelines the system has promulgated. So, I'll be seeing the President tonight, and I'll get a formal time from him.

Provost: I think the rubric we're operating under is that the rules are retroactive.

Dr. Campa: Are there any other questions for the Provost?

Provost Oldham: You went easy on me today.

7. Other Business

Dr. Campa: I have a little bit of other business. The one thing is that I got a communication from Dr. Doug Kutz, and the representatives that are missing here in math and science will be elected after the full faculty meeting. Also I have a note from Dr. Petzco and she needs for us to appoint or elect a faculty member to serve as an at-large representative to the Graduate Council. This person should represent a program or a department that does not have a graduate program. Do I get any volunteers for this or are you going to think about it? I'll appoint myself in the meanwhile and serve until we find somebody, but be thinking of it, because I'm going to hit on you again about it.

Dr. Townsend: Just for clarification, I don't think the representative has to be a member of the Senate. The Senate just elects them.

Dr. Campa: No. The Senate does the election, but it could be a suggestion from the floor for someone who does not have a committee, but would like to serve in a committee.

8. Faculty Concerns

Dr. Townsend: I don't have a concern exactly, but do want to take the opportunity before we adjourn to thank Lynn for her serving as Senate secretary.

Dr. McCullough: I have a concern about second-hand smoke. In all these buildings there is no smoking areas, and yet we have ashtrays, we have comfortable seats. We in the EMCS building have to go through a cloud of smoke. What can we do to have some entrances, that are smoke free? I am sure it is not just our building. Whom can I talk to about that? There must be

Dr. Campa: The Chancellor.

Chancellor: I assure you I will take this concern to Facilities Management right away.

Dr. McCullough: And it makes no sense, because you have signs that say no smoking [there], and yet there are comfortable seats, and ashtrays. People are going to smoke

Dr. Campa: The other thing I have. I see Karen [Dr. Adsit] sitting over there. Remember SACS. This is a university concern.

Dr. Adsit: I wanted to update you on where we are on SACS and the QEP. If you do not know what SACS or the QEP are, I want to let you know what those are. Our SACS date has been set for April 5-7, 2011, which seems like a long way away, but we have a lot to do. We have in Jocelyn's [Dr. Sanders] committee is going to see where we are, if we are in compliance, in partial compliance, or not. We do have some areas that we will probably work through. We have started the documentation of institutional effectiveness, and we are using a software application for that called Task Stream, that allows different areas to outline either student learning outcomes or departmental service outcomes, and also results. We'll start in April and we'll continue throughout September, October, and November. The 2 years that are the most important for us at this moment are the 08-09 and 09-10 academic years. Those will be the 2 years that the visiting committee will ask for documentation on. However, the institutional effectiveness software application will be something that is expected from every area on campus, every year all the time. So it is not a thing that we will check off the list and say that we are done, but we will continue to use data, and continue to look at how to improve that. That is part of what SACS does as the peer evaluation review, including ours of ourselves. In the spirit of accountability, government, and no child left behind, we hope that we will do it to ourselves, before they do it to us. There are some on the committee that say why, but if we do not get reaffirmed, we will not have any federal money to pay students financial aid. That will pretty much guarantee that that 10,000 number will go down. As it relates to QEP, the Quality Enhancement Plan, we will see either tomorrow or next week an email come out about where we are on that. We know what the topic is. We do not know how it is we will do it. And that is our task next year, we will hold forums on brainstorming how we want to attack this, how to put together a plan for QEP for the institutional part of the reaffirmation process.

Dr. Campa: Thank you. If you get a call, especially people on the Faculty Senate, if you get a call from Karen [Dr. Adsit], please serve.

Dr. Adsit: If you are willing to do something, please let me know.

Dr. Campa: I have one faculty concern. We are we going to address some of the committee's memberships, with Dr. Steinberg imbalances after this meeting. If you have any suggestions of people who have been left out of these committees or getting these committees balanced in accordance with the guidelines of the handbook.

Dr. Townsend: It would probably be a good idea to ask for volunteers to populate the handbook committee now.

Dr. Campa: Yes, we will do that now. Are there any volunteers?

Drs. Covino, Purkey, and Simmons volunteered.

Patrick Sweetman: I am Patrick Sweetman of the Department of Theater and Speech. I am currently the president of the university club, and would like to extend an invitation to everyone to come by the Patton House on Friday. We meet at 5:00. It is a social organization. We get together and blow off a little steam, chat with some people and things like that. So we are accepting memberships right now. Membership fees are \$35.00 per the entire year. It's just a fun time. You don't have to serve on handbook committees and things like that, especially if you are serving on handbook committee. I'm here and I'm available and we'd love to see you on Friday.

Dr. Campa: Patrick [Dr. Sweetman] is doing a bang up job with the University Club, so we appreciate that.

9. Announcements

10. Adjournment 16:05