

**Texas Tech University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Meeting #242  
April 14, 2004**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 14, 2004 in the Escondido Theatre in the Student Union Building with Vice-President Brent Shriver presiding. Senators present were: P. Johnson, Wilde, Byerly, D'Amico, Dunham, Gray, Harter, Held, Nathan, Roberts, Schaller, Troyansky, Watts, Dukes, Sherif, Baker, Jackson, Masten, Sinzinger, Reifman, Russ, Shriver, Camp, Marshall, Quinn, Dolter, Garner, Gelber, Meek, Curry, Ellis, Marks, Soonpaa and Hoo. Senators excused were: Reed, H. Johnson and Kvashny. Senators unexcused were: Aranha, Buelinckx, Alford, Kuriyama, Williams, Jones, Duemer, Halsey, Hsiang, Marbley, Spallholz and Tacon.

**I. Call to Order.** Vice-President Shriver called the meeting to order at 3:20 pm.

**II. Recognition of Guests in Attendance.** Vice-President Shriver recognized Vice-Provosts Jim Brink and Liz Hall, and Michael Castellon and David Johnson from the University Daily.

**III. Approval of Minutes.** Vice-President Shriver said that he was not present at the previous meeting, and that the minutes should be changed to reflect that. The minutes were approved with that emendation.

**IV. Officer Elections.** Vice-President Shriver said that all senators should have been given ballots as they entered the room. Everyone should have had a chance to read the candidate information sheets. Vice-President Shriver asked if any candidates or senators would like to make statements on their behalf before proceeding with the election. Hearing none, he asked Senators to complete their ballots.

Senator Meek asked if the candidates could be introduced. Vice-President Shriver announced that for Faculty Senate President the candidates are Gene Wilde and David Troyansky; for Vice-President, Liz Watts and William Andrew Jackson; and for Secretary, Richard Meek. He said that the voting would then proceed, and that he would move on to the next agenda item while Senate Parliamentarian Elbow tallied the votes.

**V. Old Business.** Vice-President Shriver said that the Senate would next hear committee reports. He recognized Philip Johnson from Academic Programs Committee. Senator Johnson said that the Senators should have received the committee report that was mailed separate from the minutes. He said that President Reed had asked the Academic Programs Committee to meet to consider the resolution that was submitted by Senator Watts with regard to excused absences. President Reed referred it to committee and asked Senator Johnson to convene a committee. The committee met on February 19<sup>th</sup>, and at that meeting they invited several guests to attend: Robert Baker from the Athletic Committee, John Anderson from the Athletic Department, and Vice-Provost Jim Brink. Senator Johnson and Senator Camp from the School of Law attended the meeting as members of the committee. At the meeting, the policy represented by OP 34.04 was the subject of considerable discussion, particularly as it relates to excused absences. The original resolution that was submitted by Senator Watts addressed the wording of Part 4 with regard to notification of an excused absence by a student to the instructor. One of the changes that were suggested in that resolution was to change the wording from "should notify" to "require." After a wide-ranging discussion, the committee concluded that there should be notification to the instructor by any student who wants to have an official excused absence. They felt that there would be nothing wrong with changing the wording to "require," as they have suggested in the resolution attached to the report to change the wording from "should notify" to "must notify." In their discussion they concluded that the student should notify the instructor in person. They felt that it is good for the student to visit with the instructor and to inform them in person. Thus in their resolution they stated that it should be the student's responsibility to ensure that their instructor or instructors receive notice in advance of officially approved absences. There should also be some mechanism put in place to require that there is some confirmation that the student has indeed informed the instructor of the approved absence. The committee felt that this would be a good addition; to not only require notification but to put the burden on the student to carry out this notification and that some type of mechanism be put in to place to make sure the notification was done in a timely manner. They also

discussed whether there may need to be a universal type of form that needs to be part of the OP in terms of how notification should be carried out, and so they also included a part in the resolution asking that that might be something the Vice-Provost considers in the modification or review of this OP. One of the issues that were also brought out in the original resolution was to put a limit on approved absences. After a lengthy discussion, the committee concluded that to determine a set number of absences would be problematic. There is no doubt that it is to the student's advantage to be in class, and that they should be encouraged to be in class as much as possible. But to put a set number of absences would not really be feasible because there are many different situations that arise that need to be considered. The spirit of the resolution is that we should require notification and that notification should be done by the student, and that there should be some mechanism in place to make sure that that notification is done.

Senator Camp said that one of the things that they talked about as well is that the OP already indicates that excessive absences will have adverse consequences for the student, but what is excessive and what is not, they did not think we could arrive at. They did not think they could come up with a flat number for what is excessive. That is the individual instructor's call. Senator Johnson said that the OP does not guarantee that a student with an excused absence is going to be guaranteed a level of performance. It is still up to the student to perform in class. All it really says is that they will not be penalized. They will be given an opportunity to make up any work that they missed. It is up to them to make it up. Certainly if they have excessive absences, it has the potential to directly impact their performance. It is the student's call as to whether they want to participate in that activity. The proposed resolution that the committee put forward is attached to the minutes and the report. Senator Johnson said that he would move that the Faculty Senate consider this resolution.

Vice-President Shriver said that because this is a committee report it is on the table for discussion. Vice-Provost Hall asked, when the operating policy says "must," what happens if they don't. She said that there are other operating policies that say "must" but that do not specify what happens if they don't. Vice-President Shriver asked if the committee had considered that. Senator Johnson said that the committee did not consider the repercussions of non-performance. Vice-Provost Hall asked what if the instructor does not have an attendance policy. Must the student still inform the instructor if the absence will have no consequence on a grade book anywhere? Vice-Provost Brink said that he could answer that question. The OP was designed, or at least that clause was designed, so that the student is not penalized especially for missing an exam. So even if the professor did not have an attendance policy, the student still needs to have on the books that the student has an excused absence so that the student is privileged to make up that exam. Vice-Provost Hall said that if it is only a lecture, and the instructor does not take roll, then must the student still inform the instructor, and what happens if they don't?

Senator Harter said that she would suggest that the "must" implies that the student loses the right to make up the work if they do not notify the instructor, so the right to make up the work is contingent on the notification. If there is not a test or there is no work to be made up, then there is no penalty if the student does not notify the instructor, but if there is, then the instructor could choose to not allow the student to make up the work.

Senator Schaller said that students may not know what is going to be happening when they are absent, such as surprise quizzes or a quiz that was announced that they have forgotten about, so it is really in their interest to present their excuses before they are absent. Vice-President Shriver said that he agreed and asked if there were any further comments. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the resolution. The resolution was passed.

Vice-President Shriver asked if there any other committees that would like to give a report. Senator Schaller said that he would like to report on the activities of the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee. He said that they had two assignments, one given in the last meeting and one in December. The first one, given at the last meeting, was to look into the possibility of including the Senate in making recommendations for faculty awards. They looked at that in a meeting and decided to make no recommendation as to whether the Senate should become involved in that awards process. They thought that there was nothing that they could really add to that process. If there are some problems and hang-ups in procedures that is a different problem than if the Senate was to put forth recommendations. So failing to see any problem that the Senate could

solve, they felt that they would make no recommendation on that. The second assignment was from December, about the scholarship program for faculty and employee dependents. Several years ago, after Tech had self-insurance for a year or two, there was a surplus. We were charged more than we should have paid. The question came before the Senate as to what to do with that money and the resolve was that a scholarship fund for the dependents and family members of both faculty and staff should be established. Senator Schaller said that he spoke with Jim Brown, the Managing Director of Personnel, who sent him some information. It is \$300 for employees who are taking courses and \$600 for dependents of employees. The endowment is about 5 million dollars short term or 3 million dollars long term, and it earns about \$300,000 annually in interest. Last spring there were 53 undergraduates who were enrolled and 70 graduate students taking more than 3 hours who were Tech employees? There were 15 dependents of either faculty or staff who received scholarships two years ago, and 32 last spring, which was twice as many. In the spring of '02 there were 71 dependents of faculty who were on scholarship and last spring there were 82, so it is relatively constant. This compares to about 200 dependents of staff that had been on scholarships each spring semester. The dollar amount for scholarships each spring was around \$6- or \$700,000. With that in mind, the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee make no recommendations with regard to the existing program of scholarships for faculty and staff dependents. They see no problems with the program, and the amount of money is limited. To increase the number of eligible people would simply dilute it. However, the committee does make the following recommendation: given that the Administration is committed to improving the reputation of Texas Tech University by, inter alia, hiring more senior faculty; and given that Texas Tech University finds it difficult to retain junior faculty who receive attractive offers from other universities; resolved, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Administration establish an additional scholarship program designed to make it more attractive for faculty members to turn down offers from other universities in order to remain at Texas Tech, and for senior faculty at other universities to accept job offers from Texas Tech. Specifically, the Senate recommends that the Administration investigate the feasibility of waiving (local) tuition for the family members of faculty. Senator Schaller said that he understood that only local tuition could be waived, but as we raise our tuition each semester, that is local tuition so that the proportion of tuition that is local would probably go up. He said that that was their one recommendation.

Vice-President Shriver asked if there was any discussion on this. Senator Reifman asked if he heard correctly that the annual interest was \$300,000, but that the cost was \$700,000. Senator Schaller said that he thought that \$300,000 was the correct annual interest. Senator Reifman asked if the \$700,000 figure might be for two years, but that it would still be overspending. Senator Schaller said that Jim Brown said that they are trying to decrease the capita so that they do not spend it down.

Vice-Provost Brink asked if the committee considered the fact that faculty and staff contributed to this fund. In the resolution it only identifies benefits for the faculty. Senator Schaller said that it waives local tuition for faculty, but has nothing to do with taking money from the fund, which is a separate issue.

Senator Johnson asked if tuition waivers for faculty meant for dependents rather than faculty themselves. Senator Schaller said that this was correct. Senator Johnson asked what about the faculty themselves? What if a faculty member just wants to take a history course? Is there any provision so that he as a faculty member could take a course? Vice-Provost Hall said that he could audit a course. Vice-Provost Brink said that there is an OP that addresses faculty taking courses but it does not address cost. Vice-President Shriver asked if there were other comments or questions. Hearing none, he said that the Senate would take a vote on supporting the resolution as it has been read to the Senate. The vote passed with Senator Reifman abstaining. Vice-President Shriver said that, under Old Business, the agenda indicated that Senator Ellis wanted to make some comments on sexual orientation in the Non-Discrimination Policy.

Senator Ellis said that last November the Senate asked President Reed to write to President Whitmore asking him to review the proposal that was made by the Senate some years ago. She included that proposal with her letter. He said that he asks that she write again, asking President Whitmore to respond. Vice-President Shriver said, just to clarify, she did write originally? Senator Ellis said yes. Vice-President Shriver said the issue is that we did not get a response and it is being requested that he be contacted again. Senator Ellis said that he had done a little more research and that the University of Texas at Austin and all of their satellite campuses have sexual orientation included in their EEO statement. Texas A&M does not

have it in their EEO statement but they have a broad statement of diversity. So we want to know what the problem is. Vice-President Shriver said that since this is a follow-up of what the Senate has done already we are just resending the same request that we had sent before. Unless anyone has any objection to that, then President Reed will be instructed to forward that letter to President Whitmore. Hearing no objections, he said that the Senate would request that she do so. Vice-President Shriver asked if there were any other items of old business. Parliamentarian Elbow asked about the election.

Vice-President Shriver said that it was his pleasure to read the results of the election. For President, the winner is Gene Wilde. For Vice-President, the winner is Liz Watts. For Secretary, the winner is Richard Meek. He thanked everyone for agreeing to run and encouraged everyone to be actively involved. He asked if there were any other items of old business. Hearing none, he moved on to announcements.

**VI. Announcements.** Vice-President Shriver said that he wanted to remind everyone of the new meeting location. He said that Senate Parliamentarian Gary Elbow would like to announce some potential changes to the way minutes are handled in the Faculty Senate. The minutes are very detailed and they really do not need to be a word for word recording of what went on, so he is going to discuss what he feels are going to be some improvements, and maybe in the future encourage more people to serve as Secretary if they know they do not have to do a word-for-word transcription.

Parliamentarian Elbow said the way we are reporting minutes now is to record everything we do including all the debate, and that is not really what minutes are supposed to be. Minutes are supposed to be a record of the actions of the Senate and any debate would only be reported only in the event that it was really relevant to something. Parliamentarian Elbow said that what he is suggesting is to do the minutes in much briefer form. Today, for example, you would simply say the Faculty Status and Welfare Committee introduced a resolution and this is what happened to it, and that is really all you would have to say.

Senator Held said that when the Senate has guests it is useful to have at least a partial transcript of what they are saying because a lot of faculty want to know what President Whitmore is saying, or Buddy Knox is saying, or whoever our guest is. If this could be abstracted if not literally transcribed it would be very helpful. Parliamentarian Elbow said that you can put what you want in the minutes, and as a general policy, if you want a summary of what visitors say or you want a transcription of what visitors say you can do that. Vice-President Shriver asked what is currently in the Bylaws regarding minutes. Parliamentarian Elbow said that there is nothing specific as to what the minutes should constitute. The important thing about minutes is that you are able to go back and check them. We have had a number of situations in the Faculty Senate office when there has been a need for one reason or another to go back-sometimes many years-and see what the Senate did. Generally speaking, that refers to a specific action; was some motion passed and what did that motion say, or was there a recommendation made to the administration and what was the response to that. So that definitely has to be in the minutes, but to include all the debate and all the detail that we have here is really not necessary. Most people never read the details of what is in the minutes. For our purposes, for the archive, what we need to know is what actions are taken.

Senator Wilde said that his department had reached a hybrid solution. They put out brief minutes of faculty meetings, but they also tape the meeting. You can go back and listen to them and they are stored for a brief amount of time, but with digital technology they could be stored in perpetuity. Parliamentarian Elbow said that the Faculty Senate minutes are taped but that he did not believe the minutes are kept, so it would involve buying a few more cassettes. Patty Gisch, Faculty Senate Office Coordinator, said that she did keep the tapes. Parliamentarian Elbow said that the other issue is that they are sometimes difficult to hear. There is not much you can do about that except pass a microphone around. But Senator Wilde's hybrid is a nice compromise.

Senator Gray said that he would like to urge the Senate to continue to archive the conversations. They may be of future historical interest, probably not in ten years, but somewhere down the road. For instance, our conversation about comments by the basketball coach a few months ago is a relatively interesting example of university politics which someday might be of interest to students working on papers. He said that he understood that we may not be able to receive verbatim transcripts but he would urge the Senate to regularize those archival procedures so that transcripts will be available one day.

Senator Held said that he would like to leave it to the discretion of the Secretary. No one is twisting Secretary Quinn's arm to write the minutes in such detail nor do we intend to do that with Senator Meek, but if that is the choice of the Secretary, he would not object to it.

Senator Ellis said that he appreciates the detailed minutes that are now taken. In some respects they reflect the lengthy discussions, but when he was trying to find what had actually happened with regard to the sexual orientation clause, it was the detailed minutes that actually helped him piece the story back together that had been forgotten in the Senate. It was only due to the detailed minutes that he was able to restore that. So he would hesitate to change the way we take minutes unless the Secretary vehemently objects.

Senator Watts asked if the minutes are posted on the Senate web site. Patty Gisch, Faculty Senate Office Coordinator, responded that they normally are but that they do not have a webmaster this year. Past years have been posted, however. Vice-President Shriver asked if there were other comments. Parliamentarian Elbow said that he had the sense that the Senate wanted to continue reporting minutes as they have been.

Senator Reifman said that the circumstances are limited when you would have someone who would want to get a detailed history of an issue and that the tapes should suffice for that, so he would be in favor of trimming down the minutes.

Senator Ellis said that tapes as an archive might be fine but as a faculty member who was trying to put this together in one month, to have recourse only to tapes would have made him angry.

Vice-President Shriver said that he agreed. If you are going to go into detail, even using the tapes to do that can be difficult. Going back to the tapes to try and find the original material is always difficult because you have to try to find the right spot and sometimes the sound quality degrades after they are stored for a while.

Senator Watts asked if the Senate had a little money that could be used if it wanted to set up an archive. Faculty Senate Office Coordinator Gisch asked what kind of money are you talking about? Senator Watts said that we would have to decide what kind of archive we want. Faculty Senate Office Coordinator Gisch said money is very limited, but there is some.

Vice-President Shriver said that if the archiving could be done digitally, perhaps on CD, that would be alright. His concern is that the audio tapes will deteriorate in quality over time, or that they could jam in a machine. We are going to be losing a lot of this information over time as the storage medium degrades.

Senator Gray said that this will not address the needs of faculty to reference recent meetings, but for long-term preservation he thought that the records should be turned over to whatever body handles the university archives. So every five or ten years it would be possible to turn over material in regular increments to official university archivists so that the Faculty Senate does not have to worry about the cost of maintaining these materials.

Senator Marshall said that this would be the Southwest Collection which manages records for the university. They have the facilities to archive the material, preferably in digital format. It would be advisable to turn over the material to Southwest, and they can preserve the material on very stable archival quality CDs, and they would be accessible to anyone on campus or visiting campus. He said that he assumed that there would not be any limitations placed on who could access the records. Senate Parliamentarian Elbow said that they are open records and subject to the Open Records Act, so there would be no limitations. He said there is another issue. The graduate school puts their minutes on their web site; they do not distribute paper copies. There is no reason why the Faculty Senate has to distribute paper copies of minutes. They could be posted on a web site, and this would save a substantial amount of money. One of the things that should be discussed if this issue is referred to a committee is making sure there is someone in the Faculty Senate Office or there is someone who the Faculty Senate has access to who can put those things on the web on a monthly basis. Then you will not have to bother with paper copies except for something for the record.

Senator Meek asked if the graduate minutes are posted on the web before or after they are approved. Vice-Provost Hall said the minutes are sent electronically to the Graduate Council prior to the next meeting, they are approved at that meeting, and then they are posted.

Senator Reifman said that if there is going to be a committee to discuss this, in order to ease the burden on the Secretary, perhaps they might consider hiring a stenographer or a transcription service. There are professionals who are used to quickly generating transcripts and it could be done a lot more efficiently than by any one of us.

Vice-President Shriver said that perhaps the best way to handle this is to look into setting a policy and have a committee come back and make recommendations. Vice-President Shriver said he would refer it to President Reed so that she could assign it to a committee. He asked if anyone had any other announcements.

Senator Marks said that he wanted to give a rant about the lovely new space that the Senate was meeting in. He said that it was appropriate for the Faculty Senate because at some time in the future we are told that we are going to have a new performing arts center. The usual way of building performing arts centers is from the top down. The sponsoring institution obtains money from a prestigious donor, finds a wonderful architect, and builds a wonderful space. Beforehand they reassure the potential tenants who will live there that they will be consulted at every step along the way; that their needs will be fulfilled because they are going to be the ones that will use it. The donor has ideas, the architect has ideas, and the tenants are forgotten. Texas Tech University assures us, with the best of intentions, which we will have input in a performing arts center. We are now occupying the most recent theater built on campus. It is a lovely little spot, so sweet to walk in to. He read in the UD a few months ago that an all-purpose theater was being built in this new place. He said that this place is virtually useless as a theater. It has almost no purpose. It is better for a Faculty Senate meeting than it is for a theater. This lovely stage looks good in the architect's portfolio but you cannot put any scenery on it. You have to be careful with wood like that. You would not want to put a nail in it, which we naturally require for a theater set. It is not the right size for a musical recital, but for a moment, listens to the quality of the ambient sound. It is rather noisy. It will probably work as a classroom and may be a little hard to maintain. I see that there are cobwebs already, and they are well lit. But when we build more theaters, pay attention to the faculty; we need to be consulted. Vice-President Shriver asked if there were any comments.

Senator Dunham said that she could not hear the stage from back where she was sitting. Vice-President Shriver said that it was either this or Lankford Lab. Patty Gisch, Faculty Senate Office Coordinator, said that they are starting to hold more classes in the Lab, so they could not accommodate the days that we need to be able to meet. She said that we were hoping to get into the Senate Room quicker than what they have told us. They are not doing any construction work on the room but because of asbestos abatement they would not allow us to meet there. This was about the best choice we had. Vice-President Shriver asked about meeting in the library. She said that she had not checked into that. She said that she feared changing locations frequently because we might lose someone along the way. Vice-President Shriver said that it is important to get a room that can be used consistently. She said that this is where the Staff Senate and the Student Senate meet too. It is not the best place, especially with regard to the lighting, but at least we know we can get it consistently.

Senator Meek said that as incoming Secretary, he is already considering the idea of doing minutes digitally and archiving them on CDs, but a major requirement is going to be one of sound. We need to find a room where we can all hear one another easily and be able to record the session easily.

Vice-Provost Brink suggested the Senate might enlist the help of Senator Marks to make the room better. Perhaps a few mikes could be dropped along the ceiling so that Senators could speak into the mikes and be heard better.

Senator Held asked if Senator Marks was being forced out of the old theater. Senator Marks said that he was not. He said that he felt that this was a wonderful little space that has just been ill equipped and ill considered in its details. It would have been nice for us to be able to occasionally send student projects over

here, for example. It was like a bonus that turned out to be no bonus, and unfortunately, a detriment to the students for whom it was intended.

Vice-President Shriver said that if we were done with this issue, that he was going to ask Faculty Senate Office Coordinator Gisch to check and see what other options are available out there and to see if we could do it with a minimum of disruption and perhaps get someplace where we can hear a little better.

Senator Troyansky said that he would like to follow up on something that Senator Schaller said earlier. Retention of faculty is something that some of us have been very alarmed about recently. He said that he ranted a little bit about this at an AAUP meeting last week and it got picked up and ended up on the front page of the UD. The response that came from the administration was basically that they are trying to raise salaries but we do not have oceans and we do not have mountains. He said that he would like to see the Senate address this issue more thoroughly. One of the things that were talked about was the problem of salary, and that was an issue that was also raised by Senator Schaller. But people also leave for other reasons. They leave because of teaching load or lack of research support or problems with peculiar departments. We have ways of finding out why. We can ask them individually, which he has been doing, and we can also find out how to get access to exit interviews. Individuals have spoken with deans and associate deans in the past. He said that he does not know what happens to the record of those conversations.

Vice-Provost Hall said that she has them. Senator Troyansky said that he thought the Senate ought to look into this. Vice-President Shriver said that he thought that at one point in the past Faculty Status and Welfare looked into this sort of thing, e.g. faculty satisfaction. About a year or so back they were looking at number one issues that people thought were related to faculty satisfaction and those sorts of things. We need to check back and see exactly what we were doing at that point in time. He said that he knew we were talking about those kinds of issues. There was the issue of whether faculty feels that there are adequate day care facilities and those kinds of issues. He said that he did not recall how formally we were getting into it, but the minutes may help us go back and see what we were doing on those kinds of issues. Vice-Provost Hall said that there is an Operating Policy that requires exit interviews. What happens to those is that the dean sends them to the Provost Office and Vice-Provost Hall takes them and summarizes them for the Provost. For as long as she has been Vice-Provost she has had them in her desk drawer. She said another thing that the Senate might be interested in knowing is that a week from Friday the Womens Studies Council will sponsor the twentieth annual All-University Conference on the Advancement of Women in Higher Education. At least from a gender issues perspective, Senator Dunham will be the keynote speaker at the luncheon to present findings of the Gender Equity Taskforce which may be of interest from a broader point of view if any members of the Senate are interested in the issues that Senator Troyansky brought up. At a minimum, what she will report is an interesting way of studying. Her methodology might be useful for people to understand. Vice-Provost Hall encouraged everyone to sign up for the luncheon, which costs \$15.00. Vice-President Shriver said that when he was on the Faculty Council in Human Sciences, they were trying to revamp the exit interviews, so they were looking at the exit interviews that were being done by other colleges and programs. You notice a wide discrepancy in the type of exit interview that is done. Some of them look like a ten-page questionnaire and some of them are "is there anything you would like to say about your experience before you leave?" The other problem we had is that a lot of people declined. They were given the opportunity to do the exit interview and they just said we do not want to. So you wonder what data we are missing. You would guess that maybe it is the most disgruntled individuals that decline to even do the exit interview. Vice-Provost Hall said that even in the college with the most sophisticated process, which happens also to be the largest college, the response rate is very very low. You would never allow your graduate students to use this as a resource. Vice-President Shriver said that perhaps we need to get at the issue of why people would like to leave, even though they have not. They are still here but what are the issues that are making them consider leaving.

Senator Harter said that there have been several recent surveys that the administration has done. One was on job satisfaction and one was on diversity issues, and we never get any results of those surveys. We are asked to participate in them but she has been in the Faculty Senate for three years and she has never seen any of the results. It seems like some of the things that are done to gather information from the faculty should be made available to the Faculty Senate on a routine basis. Vice-President Shriver said that is

something we need to do, to look into where these reports are, how we can get to them, and how we want to go about reviewing them.

Parliamentarian Elbow said that from a historical point of view, twenty years or so ago, a lot of things that were regularly forwarded to the Faculty Senate Office do not seem to be forwarded there any more. Some of this may have happened in the process of transition. When you have turnover in the Senate it is hard to keep things going, but it is something as an organization that you need to keep tabs on. It is not necessarily that the administration is unwilling to let you have these things. It is something that falls into the cracks, and so you have to keep reminding people. As Presidents change and Provosts change, you have to keep reminding them that we used to get this; why are we not getting it any more? If the Senate wants to look into this, one of the things that a Senate committee might do is make a list of things that the Senate wants to have. The list could be standardized so that you have something to refer back to. One of the problems now is that you do not know what you are missing, so you do not know what you are supposed to be getting. A committee could come up with a list of things that come out on a regular basis that you want to have and also perhaps irregular things, which are harder to obtain. Vice-President Shriver said that he would bring this to President Reed's attention and then she can refer that to one of the committees. He asked if there were any other announcements. He said that he had one: President Whitmore would like to have a reception for the Faculty Senate before our last meeting. This is something that has not happened in the past. At that meeting, we will also have the new Senators. That will be an opportunity for them to interact and to recognize them as well. It will take place out in the hall and then the Senate will meet in here afterward. It is very nice that they are recognizing us. So put it on your calendar to come a little early to partake of refreshments.

**VII. Adjournment.** Vice-President Shriver asked if there were any other announcements. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting at 4:29 pm.