

**Texas Tech University Faculty Senate
Meeting # 305, April 13, 2011**

The Faculty Senate met on Wednesday, April 13, 2011 in the Senate Room of the Student Union Building, with **Faculty Senate President Richard Meek** presiding.

Senators in attendance were: Farmer, Kvashny, Mills, Davis, Loudon, Perl, Biglaiser, Boros, Borshuk, Christina Bradatan, Drager, Fallwell, Harter, Held, Lodhi, Nathan, Stodden, Weinlich, Bremer, Ritchey, Crews, Janisch, Bayne, Lakhani, Leslie, Blum, Fowler, Gilliam, McArthur, Syma, Chambers, Bradley, Chansky, Duffy, Santa, CM Smith, Tate, Wood, Ajlouni, Dodds, Kelleher, Meek, Spallholz and Whitfield. Senators excused were: Cox, Durband, McFadden, Mosher, Rahnama, Rice, Schmidt, Surles, Pasewark, Hendricks, Darwish, Helm, Matis, Wang, Costica Bradatan, Collier, Sharp, Ross, Callender, Ajlouni, Heinz, and Kucera.

I. Call to Order:

Richard Meek, Faculty Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:19 PM.

II. Recognition of Guests:

Faculty Senate President Meek recognized our guests: Stephan Gipson from the Daily Treador. From the Provost office: Provost Bob Smith, Valerie Paton, Rob Stewart and Gary Elbow. Today's speakers, Dr Jon Strauss with RCM; Brian Shannon, Faculty Athletics Representative; Kirby Hocutt, Athletics new Director; Bruce Bills from the Staff Senate. Also at today's meeting is Professor John Howe-History, Felicia Martin from Athletics, Jonathan Marks one of next year's Faculty Senators and Sandy River; the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian.

III. Approval of Minutes:

Faculty Senate President Meek called for any corrections or changes to the minutes to meeting #304 held on March 9, 2011 minutes were approved with corrections made by our Parliamentarian, Sandy River.

Announced a change to order of agenda slightly.

IV. Speaker: Brian Shannon, the Faculty Athletics Representative (3rd year serving as Rep)

Recent academic success of athletes. Graduation rates from 2003 is at 61%, at TTU the rate is 66%. GSR rate slightly higher at 67% (which takes into account transfers). Women's basketball and tennis are at 100%. 93% rate for those who have exhausted their eligibility level for our student athletes. Looking at 2010 athletes, have average 2.96 GPA. Women student athletes are at 3.74, males at 2.77. The women campus wide are outperforming men, both student athletes and women in general. Overall, our student athletes have logged over 2700 hours of community service. Megan Hopper, who played soccer for us, has also continued on in her education beyond a bachelor's degree.

2.5 million dollars was transferred from university to athletics intended as funding towards growth of women's sports.

This year, athletics was asked to undergo cuts just as the university was, and received a 10% cut, which dropped it to 2.25 million. This is a transfer back of over \$3 million for scholarship funds, to the university from athletics.

Our new athletic director came from Miami, where their graduation rate of student athletes was even higher.

Senator Lance Drager: Requested on accounting of where the money given to athletics is spent.

Senator Julian Spallholz: how would FAD feel regarding athletics becoming financially independent of the academic side of the university.

Brian Shannon: It is a long range goal, but if we did it immediately we would see significant challenges. Football is clearly largest revenue sport, and those revenues do go to funding toward non-revenue sports.

Brian Shannon then introduced the new athletic director, Kirby Hocutt.

Kirby Holcutt: A Native Texas is honored to be here. He believes intercollegiate athletics plays a very important role in higher education, but at same time, recognize is a very very small component of higher ed. Lessons taught in practice and in competition complement those taught in the classroom. They prepare our over 400 student athletes to become role models and productive citizens, leaders in our community, productive fathers and mothers. The role that we play, while it is a small role in higher education, is a very visible role. As he pledged to Chancellor, the President, the Board of Regents, he pledges to Faculty Senate that they will always operate a program with integrity, one that brings pride and distinction to TTU. We will operate with transparency fiscally, NCAA rules compliancy, academically and in everything that we do.

I want to be fully integrated with the university. As far as separating financial support from the university, I want us to be assessable and compliant with the university.

Senator Julian Spallholz: I believe athletics plays an important role. My point is not separating athletics completely, but financially. Would you be supportive of this separation so there is not a subsidy that passes from the university to athletics?

Kirby Hocutt: Would it be a goal once I understand the fiscal operations? Sure.

Senator Cristina Bradatan: As it was put before the Senate by another university, how can we argue that we don't have money, if we can spend such large amounts of money on athletics?

Jon Strauss: We work with restricted funds, which can only be applied in certain ways. We will get into this further with RCM.

Speaker: Dr. Jon Strauss with the Responsibility Center Management (RCM)

The plan for today is to talk about what is happening with RCM. We are on schedule to influence the budget for fiscal year 2012. We want to use some RCM data for looking at issues of productivity, in terms of the total university level, as well as down to the college level or the dept level. We will not be looking at it as individual faculty financial productivity.

The committee has looked at how RCM might work together with the university, in the financial works of the faculty and planning. In the process we hope to engage entrepreneurial spirit. One of the greatest challenges we face at TTU is that we are trying to do too much with too little. What we are now seeing is that the public sector is not prepared to support universities like TTU in the style to which we would like to become accustomed. Even as we look to the future, as the current financial crisis will presumably pass, and things will get better again, the question will the state continue to support us not only as it has in the past, but in the way that we really should be supported in order to do what we are trying to do. The answer if you look at other states, is probably not. There is so much competition for the public dollar to support all the things that the government does, that the chances are, (and in other states experience reinforces this) we're not going to get the money we need. We are going to have to find other sources of revenue to support what we do. RCM is hopefully going to incentivize and help us be engaged in that process.

We are working towards budgeting FY 2012. We've had to come up with a 2011 model, based on the as-if models from previous years based on information found in Banner. This enables us to have a starting point for FY 2012. We are in the process of sending out preliminary budgets to all departments, administration, etc, saying here is budget for 2012 based on history, here is revenue we expect based on state support, tuition rates, fee rates, and everything we know that is going on with the college. Almost assuredly, the revenue will not support the expenses, so we will be presenting these as challenges for how to meet the budget based on these challenges. What can be done with enrollment, tuition rates, etc. will be determined by what choices the departments make. Process is moving along. We are trying to do a lot with many challenges, including Banner.

Senator Julian Spallholz: Is the athletic dept subject to RCM?

Jon Strauss: Absolutely. However, athletics runs their own free enterprise, so other areas will be focused more on the unrestricted operating budgets. There is almost none of that in athletics. They operate within their own enterprise. They pay for all their own space related costs. Yes they are part of it, we will be looking at it, and we will be creating a framework in which we can look at their revenue and expenses.

Senator Julian Spallholz: with respect to the RCM model, is football a center? Is basketball a center? Or is the whole ball of wax the center?

Jon Strauss: The question is whether we can separate out each program, as to which ones make money? Yes, we can, but we won't. Just like we can break down all the expenses at the department level within the colleges, but we won't. Some colleges may choose to do that, but some may not. My experience with breaking down financial activity at dept level varies, and it is not varying the way that you think it be would intuitively. For example, the way civil engineering and mechanical engineering addresses the problem can vary widely even based upon the same model. As a result, RCM promotes a certain amount of competition, and engineers aren't interested in competing with other departments within their college. In Arts and sciences, however, where you might picture a financial model being more intuitive, this notion of competition is just fine, because an anthropologist and a physicist don't have nearly the common ground that two engineers in different departments do. And so we see RCM working better in arts and sciences than it does in engineering. There are a lot of subtleties to it. Will we break it down if we are asked? It's not something I'm suggesting, but we can.

Senator Lance Drager: Well I think there is a political issue in dealing with faculty and dealing with outside peoples, when you have a football coach who is making more money than faculty members that you can count on two hands. And more than many of us will make in our entire careers.

Senator Lance Drager: If it is not our money, then fine, but there needs to be a justification for that.

Jon Strauss: We are aiming for transparency and openness in the decisions, and RCM will facilitate that.

Senator Daniel Nathan: Next month when you project FY 12 budget, and based on guesses where the state is going to be in terms of revenue will be, are you thinking about projecting cuts across the board? I mean, if there is a shortfall when you budget FY 12, is it going to be reduced by, say, 10% in every unit, or is it going to be selective?

Jon Strauss: The language is going to change when talking about cuts as opposed talking about revenues. We have broken down the expenses that support colleges, the direct revenues that they earn based on their activities, their indirect expenses as part of the central organization, and their assigned space as far as utilities. And the closing item in the budget (which involves indirect revenue which is a share of several university revenues portioned out to the individual colleges) is based on the fact that we don't all have the same unit price, unit cost value, so somebody should perhaps adjust for that. We also have the different colleges, different contributions to presumably the strategic plan, and perhaps there should be a way for the president and provost to reinforce those activities that most contribute to the strategic plan, perhaps at the expense of those that in somebody's mind have contributed less. That guiding mechanism, that indirect guiding mechanism is something that the president and provost are faced with right now as we think about 2012 and we try to develop an initial set of those values. In the past they represent almost 100 years of the life of the university (70 something years) in terms of where we have allowed expenditure authority. If you look at over all those years, we've come up with a balance. We're now faced with the question: Is that the right balance, do we change it, how much do we change it? If we decide we want to change it, how much do we change it? Those are questions we are facing right now and they will not be addressed in terms of proportional cuts.

Senator Julian Spallholz: Would you reiterate what the shortfall is again, for the university, for 2012? Did I hear an \$80 million figure?

Jon Strauss: It is nowhere near that. We don't have an exact number right at this time, but we will know soon, hopefully within a couple of weeks or so.

Interestingly, in 2010 we had a big surplus that year. We're now in 2011, where we've had these major cuts, \$4.3 million across the university, and we are questioning what that will look like when we get to year end.

Senator Julian Spallholz: But you do have an idea of what the shortfall is going to be, do you not?

Jon Strauss: Actually, I don't today but I will within this week. I have some thoughts, but I don't want to say anything until I reconcile it with what Banner is showing us. The short answer is, I don't think it's as bad as we think it is going to be.

Let me say a little bit about this. We'll see if it's helpful, and if it isn't we'll say less. I wanted to talk about financial productivity in a way that is useful in our environment. Let me start off with what this analysis is not. It is not a breaking statement of individual productivity. We're going to talk about measures of financial productivity, about normalizing by the number of faculty, so that we can look at it in a normalized basis within the college, but we are not talking about individual faculty. We are going to use the data that comes directly out of RCM.

The key concepts that we're dealing within RCM are transparency. Everybody is going to know everything about everybody, which is both interesting and useful, but enormously challenging. We're going to talk about accountability, and how once we know what is going on, we're going to all take greater responsibility for the performance of our individual units. That gets into this notion of ownership. We work together as a college to make that college more productive, and presumably together they will share in some way in the financial performance that that realizes. Will that come down to individual salaries? No, it will not in this early stage. But certainly as a college improves its financial performance taking advantage of those increased revenues, for example, to improve things locally in the college in terms of, for example, library collections, better lifestyle, better compilations, better offices, all of that will be within our grasp.

Then what we're going to look at is a model based on FY 2010 data. Those of you that have read that great voluminous amount of material that was sent out to you or who have read the minutes of meetings where I've made a similar presentation, for that I used 2009 data. Basically using same idea but this data is from a different year.

On the topic of faculty salaries, the different colleges have different percentages of faculty on tenure track and adjunct faculty salaries. We would like to put them all on the same basis, so what we are going to do salary totals which are based on tenure track salaries plus adjunct salaries in the college divided by the average tenure track salary for that college and come up with a number, for example, for the whole university. In the FY 2010, the average tenure track salary was \$84,124 with benefits that cost 25.4%, and if we look at that over the total salary spent by the whole university, you come up with \$116,000. And of course we can do that college by college. This won't surprise any of you, but there is enormous variation in the average tenure track staff/faculty salary across the colleges. There is a high of \$142,000 in 2010 and a low of \$63,017 in CVPA. This is where transparency can become uncomfortable. But if we're going to be transparent, then we're going to be transparent.

The real challenge is going forward, when we can actually influence this. It is very important that we verify this variation and flex appropriately in competitive markets with the faculty in the colleges. I suspect the numbers there reflect all of that, but they will also reflect negotiating skills, all sorts of things.

Senator Charles Crews: Do those numbers include benefits?

Jon Strauss: No. those are just the salary numbers. The benefits would be 25.4%. There are other things here to take a look at. As you know, we earn our appropriation from the state based on student credit hours and these hours are weighted course by course based on a survey of the cost of presenting those courses across a number of

institutions in the state. The challenge that is relative to the cost of the course and the answer is no. This complicates our life in talking about whether we have to somehow reflect the fact that unit price/unit cost at our different colleges don't necessarily match. You have to look at how variation in this has developed over the years. Some of the variation is obviously quite intentional, and some has just happened. Some reflects the fact that different beings and different supports have affected the variation for different colleges.

One of the challenges that we're going to have in RCM is now that we're going to have this data in front of us, and now that we have some sense of what we're getting for what we're spending, now we have a chance to influence this proactively going forward. For example: Looking at the average faculty salary, and what it produces, \$106,000 salary produces \$168,000, just in tuition revenue. This varies dramatically across the colleges.

It turns out if you look at the total unrestricted direct revenue, produced per faculty member across the university, we've already accounted for \$168,000 from tuition, but if you bring in all the other sources of funding, like course fees, and gifts, and other things that support the programs at the individual colleges, in direct revenue, you come up with \$202,000. So the salaried faculty member earning about \$106,000 produces almost twice as much in terms of direct revenue, which is comforting.

Now we get into what I mentioned before in direct revenue, and this is the subsidy that is going to come from the president and provost. If you look across what this subsidy is in 2010, across all colleges, it was about \$61,000. That number in Law is \$155,000 and in Arts & Sciences (which in this university is virtually the cash cow) is about \$14,000. That kind of financial productivity is something you should be comfortable with.

Then figure in all of the costs of making these things run, the expenses for utilities and building space, the percentage to the president and provost's offices. There is a lot of variation in costs to each college, based on space and total costs.

Once you can see the revenue and cost across the entire university, you begin to see a value set that is less arbitrary and more something that you have influence. RCM also looks at research revenue, endowments, gifts, carry forwards from prior years, etc., and we can pursue this more.

Comment from Valerie Paton: Some of the faculty will know that in the fall we were asked to do an analysis and it is posted on the IR website. We did that analysis on the basis of rank and college, and not individuals. Want to thank you for RCM's analysis and sort of keeping from having to file down to the individual level. There are no state bills right now that require us to do that. If we become required to do that, it will be coming from executive order most probably. But if that happens, the glory of this is that we will have two different analyses that in fact triangulate and find faculty at TTU are highly productive, and the investment is a good investment for the state. That's the best thing in sort of trying to lead in a thoughtful, productive way as we deal with some of this treacherous water issue. So, thank you.

Speaker: Bruce Bills from the Staff Senate.

There are new Distinguished Staff awards, which replaces the Quality Service Staff awards program that HR has been running past several years. It is restructured these are ways of nominating the staff that you work with, and would encourage you to do that for anyone who has stood out as doing a good job. Online forms are available at staffawards.ttu.edu. Another is the new Bravo award which has been sent out on TechAnnounce. This is a way for anyone on campus with an eraider account to log in and give a shout out, a positive note for someone who has gone above and beyond their job. It is just a note of thanks and appreciation. That is bravoaward.ttu.edu. That also will tie into the staff awards.

FACULTY SENATE OFFICER ELECTIONS:

All candidates are on post. Either just write them in or check them off. Ballots passed out to senate.

V. New Business: DISCUSSION OF THE OP'S

OP 32.01

Senator Lewis Held: *This comes to the floor w/o the need for a second as the committees who wrote them voted in favor for each OP. We now open the floor for discussion. Committee went through multiple drafts before they approved the OP. The most contentious issue previously had been the discussion in the OP of the comparable institutions. We might want to address that. In the most recent discussions about the revisions, we agreed to take down the list, but there are good arguments made that there are very good institutions that are comparable but that are not American, and those did not make the list. The decision was made to remove the list while still making reference to it in some instances, and info will be made available on the strategic plan website. This leaves it open to*

a variety of other institutions. Also made clear by the provost that this is a list of exemplars, but that it is not restrictive at all. The Faculty Senate and committee are on same page

OP 32.xx

Senator Lewis Held: Revocation of tenure. Notice was made that this is pretty much the existing OP yet is being moved to separate this policy from OP 32.01 as it is a different issue. It was argued is that what is being proposed is not a substantive changes, but rather an aspect of format. Moving it out of the policy for tenure and into another section separates the question to revoke tenure from the issue of acquiring tenure.

Call for question. First, OP 32.01, vote made. All approved. OP 32.xx yet to be numbered, vote made. All approved. Both passed.

New Faculty Senate officer vote tally discussed. Dr. Daniel Nathan is new President, results were 36 positive with zero against; 34-0 for Dr. Sam Bradley running for Vice President and 34-0 for Dr. Deborah Fowler as Secretary

VI. New Business: 2 Thank you Resolutions.

Senator Lewis Held: Resolution reads:

Whereas Dr. Burns has served TTU in multiple offices since 1969, and whereas his service as chair, dean and provost among other roles has been marked by honor, loyalty and dedication to the university and his teaching and research missions, and

Whereas his ongoing leadership has earned the abiding respect of the faculty,

Therefore be it resolved that we, the members of the TTU senate, gratefully acknowledge his longstanding service, many contributions, and caring compassion, than we wish him a happy retirement.

This resolution comes unanimously from my committee so, there is no need for a second, but if there is discussion, please feel free. Otherwise we will vote. Call for the question. Voted. All in favor. Resolution one passes.

Senator Lewis Held: Second resolution is to honor Dr's. Shonrock, Childers, and Elkins, whose positions were recently eliminated. Reads as follows:

Whereas Dr. Michael Shonrock, DR. Jan Childers, and Dr. Greg Elkins have faithfully served TTU over many years with honor, loyalty and dedication, and

Whereas their leadership and stewardship of the division of Student Affairs has earned our abiding respect and gratitude,

Therefore let it be resolved that we, the members of the TTU faculty senate and TTU student senate, who have already passed it, jointly acknowledge their longstanding service, their many contributions and their caring compassion for the welfare of the students of TTU.

Call for question. Voted. Accepted resolution.

Guns on Campus:

Senator Carolyn Tate: Last item on our agenda in new business, is the guns on campus issue. It is stalled in the state legislature at the moment. The council and faculty senate has gone on record this last year to be not in favor of guns on campus.

Senator Michael Farmer: Quick review of material he had. I talked to few staffers in Austin recently. The Bill has been forwarded almost every session since 2004, it had been in committee this year, and had been amended in two important ways while it was in committee. The two main amendments were giving some discretion at universities on whether or not to control concealed weapons in dormitories or in other university settings. The bill as it stands is no restrictions in public areas, including classrooms. There were two bids where it looked like the university might have some options. It has passed the committee. That is where the law stands, it has passed the committee and is out of

the House. It has stalled in the Senate, Wentworth withdrew it on Thursday because they didn't have a majority, it looks like because he tried to call the question while two senators were out, an 8-1 vote, for a two vote margin in the Senate. While other states have this, only Utah has an unrestricted law similar to our Texas proposal. Colorado has an option that allows each university, including private ones, to decide.

Senator Lance Drager: I was not quite clear about the classroom issue. Was that yes or no?

Senator Michael Farmer: Yes. All public areas, which include classrooms would be allowed. As far as I can tell, there are three things we can do. Do nothing; we can bring it up next month if we want to bring up exceptions or advice for the university on the areas that we control, or we can attempt a short resolution at this meeting. Those three are really up for discussion.

Senator Carolyn Tate: I feel that since this is an issue that is in front of the state legislature, and because a lot of other similar institutions have weighed in to the legislature on whether their views should be supported or not, that this discussion should be had at TTU. Michael Farmer has laid out our options with the major points, and it did stall out as of yesterday, and it was not voted on in the Texas Senate. I am here because a lot of my colleagues have voiced some concern, and would like this body to take a vote and see whether it has an opinion one way or the other, and whether it is appropriate to ask the administration to initiate some kind of dialogue, where we can have some kind of policy in place to deal with this issue should it be passed. Also, whether we would need to consider some kind of financial cost such legislation would have on the university. I just want to put those issues out and let people have some chance to speak to them.

Senator Lance Drager: Question of whether other institutions have polled or expressed opinion on the issue. Several smaller institutions have. There has been a study by somebody in Wisconsin, from the AP, shows a poll that 80% of campus police chiefs think that guns on campus is bad. There is not a lot of data, not a lot of research that has been done, and that makes it doubly concerning that we might proceed with this measure, with this law, without really knowing what to expect.

Senator Elizabeth Louden: Is the reasoning behind this generally so that everyone can protect themselves in case of a shootout on campuses; is it self-protection, and the right to keep and bear arms.

Senator Carolyn Tate: I don't think that would apply, but there are a lot of people that have very strong opinions that it does, I've talked about this with some of my colleagues, and some of them are very much against it, some are very much for it, and if you look at the argument between them I think it is very much against it.

Senator Julian Spallholz: I'm thinking that if you were a state legislator and this came up about whether it should be a law or not, can you imagine voting and making this law, and then within a few weeks or a year or so, some student carrying a gun legally shoots a professor? And you voted for it? That to me would be a terrible thing. I know the argument is that if everybody is carrying guns that the people who see somebody pull a gun is going to pull theirs to shoot first. That's the argument. And I agree with the police chiefs, I think it is a terrible decision. Anyone who had a concealed carry license, that could be faculty, or staff, or students, could be carrying one.

Senator Sam Bradley: Talking about the data, Arizona passed it Monday. Their state legislature passed it, and public opinion is overwhelmingly against it. Unlike Texas, Arizona has straight concealed carry, you don't need a permit, anyone can conceal or unconcealed carry a weapon. With the Arizona law, there are still a few days where their governor can veto that law.

Senator Daniel Nathan: I think is very important that we bring this up in this body, because it is faculty members who take away, just as Virginia Tech experienced, it is faculty members who get shot and killed. It's highly disproportional, so it is our business in some sense, and I think it would behoove this body to address it. Senator Isis Leslie: We also have to pay attention to how these bills are being formulated, through the American Exchange Council, that has been putting together all of these laws of public and dominancy (?) AEC has a large number of Republican membership, and has successfully lobbied, has sat down with their corporate members and written legislation together. Then they bring it before the state legislature. A lot of legislation is being put forward in Republican states that is hostile towards and endangers public servants. Public servants are being villainized, across the board, so that needs to be taken into consideration as well.

Senator Bruce Wood: Is it legal in TX to conceal and carry weapons in House and Senate?

Faculty Senate President Richard Meek: Yes. it's not.

FS President Richard Meek recognized History Professor John Howe: How would TTU enforce such a law if it were to pass? Consider working with student admin, etc. to oppose deadly force, as part of being part of TTU.

Senator Lance Drager: It very likely the bill will pass. Though need to realize is being pushed by a very small group of enthusiasts.

Senator Carolyn Tate: I did unofficial survey in the college of VPA, about 150. I got 54 responses, 53 were opposed to the legislation. Typical comment brought up issues of faculty perception, that many already felt that they were threatened, in their offices, classrooms & homes by students to whom they had given unwanted grades. And that if this bill were to pass, they would feel they had no academic necessity to uphold any sort of academic rigor. Why bother to give anything but an A if that student has any easier access to inflicting bodily harm on the faculty. Many felt this way. Need to better understand what the faculty perception is to this.

Senator Daniel Nathan: If this is close to passing in the Senate, I would feel it important to weigh in before this passes?

Senator Charles Crews: Does the bill exclude athletic events?

Senator Michael Farmer: No, there is an exclusion for athletic events. So, we could still have people holding guns at their tailgates.

Sentiment: **Senator Carolyn Tate** *makes the motion that it is the sentiment of the Faculty Senate that we oppose legislation currently in the Texas legislature, Senate Bill 354, that concerns concealed carry handguns, or unconcealed handguns.* Resolution seconded **Senator Elizabeth Louden.** Call for question. Motion carried.

Senator Lance Drager: Two issues that should be looked at getting onto the agenda at some time, one of them being about the sick leave policy, lot of people in the Math dept. had a very negative impression of how the policy read. In practice, the policy works well, but it reads badly so we should look at that. Another is that there seems to be some feeling that the state is going to raise our insurance rates, as a stealth way of cutting our salaries, and believe we should look at that.

Faculty Senate Richard Meek: Something new has happened in terms of communication with our administration. Your president of the Faculty Senate along with the president of Staff Senate, and of SGA have been invited to participate in monthly meetings with an Advisory Council for the University President. We had the first one today, in the business office, and I am pleased to report among other things that they are working on the endowed scholarship restrictions to allow monies to be used more broadly and spread out. They are also looking at the number of students with high GPA's, ways of giving support to the next top 15% of graduation high school seniors.

VII. Announcements: Former Faculty Senators Elizabeth Watts (MCOM) and Sue Couch (HS) have announced their retirements. We wish them well.

Our Chess team has become National Champions.

Adjourned.