

**Faculty Senate Minutes
December 12, 2012**

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. Daniel Nathan, Faculty Senate President

RE: **Agenda for meeting #319, December 12, 2012**
Meeting starts at 3:15 p.m. Senate Room 132 Student Union Building

I. Call to order – Dr. Richard Meek, Past Faculty Senate President
Senators in attendance were: Agnello, Ballou, Barenberg, Batra, Becker, Blum, Boal, Borshuk, Caswell, Cristina Bradatan, Brown, Buchheit, Cole, Coward, Decker, DiPoppa, Dolter, Duffy, Gaines, Gilliam, Held, Juan, Kucera, Lee, Levario, Loewy, Meek, Mills, Mondt, Monroe, Nathan, Peaslee, Perl, Pongratz, Ramkumar, Rice, Ross, Shi, Smith, Syma, Chris Taylor, Colette Taylor, Todd, Watson, Weinberg, Whitfield, and Wong. Senators excused were: Adams, Bayne, Bradatan, Bradley, Brashears, Cole, Cochran, Collier, Davis, Juan, Kvashny, Lastrapes, Marks, Mills, Stodden, Surlles, Valle, Wang and Wood.

II. Recognition of guests.

III. Approval of minutes, Meeting #318, November 14, 2012. Minutes approved.

IV. Speakers:

3:20pm to 3:35pm Alice Young-Associate Vice President for Research (Research Integrity); Rosemary Cogan- Professor of Psychology and current Chair of the IRB and Donna Peters-Manager, Human Research Protection Program. Dr. Young came to speak to the Senate about the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Dr. Young referred to the Human Research Protection Program which was attached in an email to the Senate. Current and possible future issues were discussed.

Senator Meek: The payment of small amounts to our subjects where does that stand now?

Dr. Young: This is posted on the website but if the payment is under \$25 and it is approved in the protocol, there is not identifying information required.

Senator Meek: This had been a tremendous problem in the past years.

Dr. Cogan: Faculty Senate helped.

Senator Howe: We are encouraged to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning and to evaluate our classes all the time to make our own experiments as to what works and doesn't work. Is there some bright line where students suddenly become human subjects where we need to consult with you?

Dr. Cogan: On the website you will find a really helpful link.

Dr. Young: One of the characteristics of the common rule and it is one of the principles under which IRB is operated, and that is the principles of local control. There are IRB policies at other institutions that are not policies at Texas Tech. For example, there are institutions in which most types of oral history requires IRB. Texas Tech IRB has made a decision that oral history as it is described within the AHA guidelines is not human subject specific. That is an example of where Texas Tech's policies might be different than the policies at an institution where a faculty member may have previously worked.

Senator Wong: If I may add to that, Brian Steele and I met with Donna to talk about exactly this issue of oral histories but then especially of what we do with evaluations. Donna explained it according to federal regulations. It has to be a systematic evaluation. It has to move beyond the borders of Texas Tech. There are also other ways in which we can waive those things. If it is a project that is published or presented at a much later date. It was a great conversation and we did talk about Humanities and the relation on Humanities and the IRB regulations. I highly encourage everyone to go talk to Donna about it.

Dr. Young: That would be my recommendation, call Donna. One of the things we have done is encourage Donna and Dr. Cogan as well. They hold certification as IRB professionals. They are expert at this, I am not.

Senator Meek: Some of you may realize that our meetings are recorded for the benefit of posterity and for our secretary. I wanted to mention that in this instance you will notice that I am not manning the camera over there, so if you do speak up, please identify yourself.

3:35pm to 3:50pm Provost Bob Smith-Updates

Provost Smith provided a one page handout.

Dr. Smith: The first item is Policy Revisions in Process. Senator Held pointed out there is a typo in there; it should be 32.17 Approval of Faculty in Non Tenure-acquiring Ranks. These are the OPs that are under current review. Of course I hope you all know that we will look at reviews of OPs and often get University Council involved in those activities. Primarily where there are issues that are raised to us from the deans or other academics across the campus. Once we have a proposal we turn it over to the Faculty Senate and ask for their review and council where we should go next. Sometimes this process takes a long time. It

did in the case of 32.01. We were at it for four years. We hope that some of these revisions won't take that long. In the case of Faculty in Non-Tenure-acquired ranks, this is to primarily recommend that our academic community consider developing titles of Assistant, Associate and Professor of Practice. Normally those folks who are not appointed in a tenure or tenure track line. There has been some controversy recently that you may have read in the newspapers about this issue. Texas Tech is unique in this in that if you bear the title at Texas Tech of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor, you must be in a tenure track or be tenured. You cannot hold those titles at this institution unless you have gone through tenure track or you are tenured. It is somewhat unique. I have been other places where you could bear those titles and not be tenure track or tenured. That is not true here. So, when people say I want to be a non-tenured professor that is a non-sequitur. It just cannot be. You cannot be a non-tenured professor at Texas Tech. Now, we have of course, a number of faculty who are non-tenured. Typically we appoint them as Research Assistant or Associate or Full Professor as a lecturer or as an instructor. More and more in professional colleges, such as in Business and in Law, we like to have the opportunity to hire practitioner type faculty. Faculty who are out working who may even contribute their time gratis. This is a great asset particularly for professional programs. We also see this in areas like Wind Energy where we might hire somebody whose expertise is in that particular area and who either has no interest in being tenure track or doesn't have that time. They may have another full time job someplace else. It is valuable when you have these people and particularly if you want to hire them full time. To have some kind of professional development ladder wherein they can actually move through a set of ranks at the discretion of the academic unit and recommendation of faculties and deans. So that is why we have recommended this idea of a non-tenured Professor of Practice. In essence we are doing something like this in the Law School and Business School right now. But we tend to use titles like clinical professor. That is fairly common around the country. But it seems to be an oddity that somebody in the law school would be appointed as a clinical professor. We think the title of practice professor is much more apropos. So that it what is before you in this revision and I think that Senator Held may be reporting for you later on.

The second OP that is under active revision is OP 32.09, Selection of Paul Whitfield Horn Professorships. Here we want to clarify the issue of tenure as a requirement for appointment as a Horn Professor. This came up recently in a case where somebody wanted to be a Horn Professor, they put together material to be reviewed but it turned out the individual was not tenured. The question came up: 'Can you be a Horn Professor if you are not a tenured professor?' If you look at our OPs in order to move from one title to another, you literally have to be in a tenure line. The word tenure was not used in the policy in the past so we wanted to make that absolutely crystal clear. We also wanted to make it crystal clear because the issue was raised to us about positive votes going before the Texas Tech University System Board of Regents. There is a review process that involves the faculty, the dean of the college, a vote by a committee that is

organized through the Provosts office and then the vote of the Provost and vote of the President. Typically we only make positive recommendations for appointment to the Board. Likewise in Promotion and Tenure considerations as you well know. If a person does not receive appropriate approval particularly at the Provost and Presidential level, those recommendations do not go forward to the Board. Now a faculty member has the right to appeal whatever action is taken through that chain of command. Clearly we do not send negative recommendations to the Board. So we wanted to make that absolutely clear. We also wanted to codify that because there is language in the Regents Rules excellence in teaching, research and service, we wanted to reference in the OP that in order for one to become a Professor, a tenured Professor at Texas Tech, they would have had to have been evaluated for excellence or very high quality teaching, research and service. That is in there in the revision. We also make a note about experience in graduate education where applicable.

In terms of Policy Revisions to come, we are going to be taking a look very closely at OP32.02, Faculty Non-reappointment, Termination and Tenure Revocation: Process clarifications. There is some language in that particular OP, and I think many of you may recall that what is now 32.02 was embedded in 32.01 in the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. We thought that was kind of an odd juxtaposition of policies so we distilled out the language for the Non-reappointment, Termination and Tenure Revocation to 32.02. As we look at that and think about how it may apply in particular cases we think there is some need to take a look at clarification of the process. We will of course bring that to the Senate at the appropriate time.

Likewise we think there is a need to look at Conflict of Interest policy 32.07. Particularly because there have been new federal regulations related to conflict of interest and we want to make sure that that is a totally clear policy.

In terms of faculty hiring the good news is that we have now authorized 143 searches for faculty around the campus. This is probably a record number. It is consistent with what President Bailey and President Schovanec and the rest of the Administration clearly have indicated that we want to add new faculty each year over the remainder of this decade to tackle the issue of student/faculty ratios and the quality of education at the University. Those are going forward.

I recently met with the interim Dean in Arts & Sciences where they have 53 position openings and he tells me the response to those have been very robust. I am told in Philosophy for example, there is something like 90 applications for an Assistant Professorship. I am also told that there are very high quality candidates applying. We are excited about that. We have had a record in the past where we haven't always been able to fill positions during the year. It looks like we are in a very favorable situation this year and we are actively encouraging all deans along these lines. Because we have now invoked Responsibility Centered Management type budgeting, the monies for those positions are all in the colleges now. At one

time we held those monies centrally and put people through a dance in coming to the Provosts office figuring out how they could get the release of individual lines. All of that is gone away. The deans have considerable flexibility in terms of unfilled position funding. But we have been going around, we meaning the President, CFO, the Vice President for Research and myself, talking with the deans and talking about various options they might have for using that lapsed salary. We've been encouraging them to put it into student support and in some cases we have made alliances with the dean's offices wherein if they will put some in student support particularly graduate students this year, we will provide some additional funds for the next year so that at least master's students might be able to finish their work with appropriate funding.

In terms of the last item, and then I will be delighted to take questions subsequently. Just a reminder, I'm reminded by Martha Brown and I hope that you know her; she's the Associate Vice Chancellor for State and Government Affairs. She is a brilliant person who I think understands the Constitution of the State of Texas Legislature inside and out. She reminded me again, and this has happened every place that I have been, that as we go into a new legislative session we need to remind ourselves that as state employees we are not permitted to lobby for bills. If we are asked by the Legislature for information about legislation, we want to work through whoever our legislative liaison is in our various colleges that provide that information if it is officially coming from the University. This does not prohibit people from acting as good citizens and writing to their legislators but we always recommend that when you do that make sure that you distance yourself from your official state position because we officially do not have that authority to do that we'd get ourselves in trouble.

Senator Held: How many of the 143 new and replacement positions are new?

Dr. Smith: I would say Senator Held that typically we hire 50-70 replacement positions per year. So we have a significant number of truly new positions.

Senator Held: You said the number was consistent with President Bailey's prediction of 100 new faculty a year.

Dr. Smith: No, no, 50. We said that we would try to hire 500 in this decade. The decade he was describing at that time had to do with the business plan that he wrote in 2012 which was to come to fruition in 2022. It was 500 over that decade.

Senator Becker: That was my exact same question.

Senator Ross: I just wanted clarification on Professor of Practice. You have Assistant, Associate and Professor. What's the distinction?

Dr. Smith: The idea is that we would have the flexibility to appoint at different levels. That would be the decision of the faculty and of the deans. The Provost does not enter into those issues very much, only on long-term continuing employment of non-tenured faculty. The Provost will have to sign off after 5 or 6 years. Typically we do not get involved in those; we trust the judgment of the academic areas. For example would it not make sense if you had a relatively new practicing attorney coming in as a Professor of Practice to appoint that person as an Assistant or an Associate Professor of Practice? After some period of time you might then promote them to Professor of Practice. It might be an appropriate set of remunerations for those different levels. Again the idea of professional development, there is a tendency in the non-tenured world, and I do not mean this overly critically, but I think there is a tendency to not recognize growth in positions of this type. I think professional growth and professional development is important for all people.

Senator Ross: So this would be a non-tenured appointment would be like long term contracts oftentimes clinical practice or clinical professor? Other schools have long term contracts.

Dr. Smith: It is in one of our OP's about it. If you are in that kind of position for 6 years you have the right to go into a longer term contract wherein you cannot be terminated except for cause. That is the differentiation, where you are non-tenured, less than six years then you can be subject to non-reappointment without cause. Once you have established a record over a period of year's fairness would dictate that you would give that person some benefit of the doubt. It is not as lockjaw as tenure and not as lacking in liability as tenure but definitely gives you some advantage.

Senator Rice: I am from English, maybe this is semantics, a quick wonk if you will. There's a difference between Professor of Practice and Practice Professor. In the text you say Professor of Practice but you said at least twice Practice Professor.

Dr. Smith: I am intending to mean the same thing but in the language of the OP it is Professor of Practice.

Senator Rice: Moving forward that would be better because for some people who are unclear they might think of this person in line to become tenure track.

Dr. Smith: Might have some pejorative connotation.

Senator Loewy: Mr. Provost I wanted to ask you about the limitations on lobbying definition. Although I have not done so here, a number of times in North Carolina I testified before the state legislature on a various bills usually having something to do with my professional expertise, obscenity, flag burning, that sort of thing. I assume that that does not constitute lobbying.

Dr. Smith: As long as you say I am speaking as an independent citizen of the State of North Carolina or the State of Texas as it were, there is no problem there. As you know in those hearings, anyone can sign up to offer testimony. Now I have offered testimony many times in other legislatures, I've not done that yet in Texas. Typically that will be organized through the government relations office. Often they will even give priority to an official representative of the institution. Then typically you will read from points that have been discussed at the university level. If indeed you are a representative of the university.

Senator Loewy: No, I am assuming that I am not representing the University but as a law school professor in a particular area I have a certain level of expertise like legislature sometimes wants. Typically they would refer to me as professor.

Dr. Smith: Well if the legislature asks you to testify in your capacity as a professor, then in fact that is an action that they have taken purposefully. Then that is above board. Though as a matter of courtesy to the institution so we know what is happening, just run that by various people here at the University.

Senator Loewy: I would certainly be very clear should that happen and should my title be used I would announce that I am speaking as a citizen and not as a representative of the University.

Dr. Smith: We have on many occasions had situations where the legislature said we would like a representative of the University to testify in a particular area. Then that is totally legitimate.

Senator Held: In your answer to Senator Ross' questions you said that you in this revision to OP 32.16 would want to amend it in such a way that you 'trust the judgment of the academic areas for the hiring of these Assistant, Associate and Professors of Practice' I have seen the preliminary draft of the revisions and there is nothing whatsoever that allows any participation in the hiring or the promotion of these individuals. So, I'm sincerely hoping that in the next revision there could be something included to allow that to happen.

Dr. Smith: It is certainly implied. No appointment letter for these folks comes out of the Provosts Office. As far as I know have never come out of the Provosts Office.

Senator Held: I think since we vet these OP's on a regular basis, prefer that it be explicit rather than implied.

Dr. Smith: Sure.

Senator Held: My additional preference would be that this hiring should be initiated by the academic unit not necessarily from the top down.

Dr. Smith: It never has been.

Senator Held: I would also request that that sort of language be included in the revisions.

Dr. Smith: Ok.

Senator Drager: I think we are thinking of a famous case.

Senator Held: Yes, but we are not going to mention it here. Can I just also get you to specify you said 'typically there are 50-70 replacement positions offered per year' do you know what the actual number is this year?

Dr. Smith: I honestly do not but I will find that out.

Senator Held: I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Senator Kucera: I was just wondering, in our particular department we have joint appointments with A&M and if they are less than 50% Texas Tech appointments they are non-tenured track. I wondering how this OP might apply to them because Ag related extension they might be considered professor but then what would the language be?

Dr. Smith: We actually have surveyed our entire faculty and my understanding is there is only one other non-tenured professor on campus who happens to be 75% Agri-life from Texas A&M and 25% from Texas Tech. As far as we are concerned that person is primarily an employee of Texas A&M. They have their own rules about tenure and non-tenured professors. Some others may be interested to know that there is quite a split in extension around the country in various land grant Colleges of Agriculture. Some you will find have extension faculty are tenured, other times they are not. But they do bear that title. Likewise in the library. A lot of people don't know that there are libraries in many prominent universities where there are no tenured faculty. Here we have tenured faculty in the Library.

Senator Held: Since you and I and your staff and my committee worked for three years on OP 32.01 and OP 32.02, I must ask what is it that causes us to have to revisit any of these policies.

Dr. Smith: 32.02, when we looked at it and we were looking at a case recently about how that might apply, when we looked at the language we realized there's some elements of the process that seem somewhat confusing. So what we would like to do is to think about how we might clarify that. Not to make it necessarily more rigorous but just to make it clearer to people what the language means.

Senator Held: So you discovered something in the application.

Dr. Smith: Exactly right. Looking at a particular case saying, well how would this apply? It was not entirely clear as to how the process would play out.

Dr. Meek: Thank you very much Provost Smith. I would like to take advantage of the unique position I find myself in this afternoon unexpectedly and as immediate past President to share our sincere appreciation to the dedication to the concept of shared governance.

- V. Old Business: University Councils/Committees & Liaison Reports:
Senator Ramkumar reported on the Staff Senate. He spoke about OPs pertaining to the Employee Assistance Program.
- VI. New Business: Senator Held: Copies of the draft to OP 32.09 were supplied.

Senator Held: Some OP's are extremely detailed and dense and take extraordinary amounts of time. OP32.01 took three years or more. This is at the other end of the spectrum. I got this draft revision printout three days ago and I am hoping we can get this taken care of today. It's a very simple set of revisions which are highlighted in green thanks to Patty. These are relatively minor changes. We had one concern expressed by a committee member that I will relate to you on page 2 section 3 part B. The member of my committee inquired why is it necessary to even mention teaching and outreach in a policy that concerns research excellence. That is all the Horn Professorship as I understand was endowed to acknowledge. If this were a substantive insertion I would object to it. The way it reads to me is that it is a formality because tenure and promotion have clauses in them that allow for teaching and outreach as they presently stand thanks to the revisions that we went through. The strategic plan of the University has requested that those terms be inserted into our Operating Policies as appropriate. So the disclaimer there I think prevents any damage from being done to this policy is the phrase 'as confirmed by having tenure at Texas Tech and prior appointment or promotion to professor'. If they have already been tenured and promoted defacto they have qualified for it this way too. I think it is just a semantic insert that should not do any harm. That is just my personal opinion. I think that addresses my committee members' objection. But if you have any additional concerns or objections please feel free to raise them now.

Senator Boal: In the College of Business we have one contentious person who has a national reputation. They don't want tenure, is a full professor. He was tenured as a full professor in Minnesota but has not wanted it here. He has been here ten years or more. He has wanted the Horn because he is pretty famous but because he is non-tenured.

Senator Held: So that one word was inserted because of this one guy?

Dr. Smith: I have to take exception to that. It was not to prevent anyone from getting the position it was to be consistent with our policy. Our policy clearly states that you cannot be a professor at Texas Tech University unless you are tenured or in a tenure track. One presumes given the language of the Horn Professor OP that one has to be a rank of some period of time to qualify for Horn. Typically 5-10 years. One would presume that one would be tenured. When this issue came up in the review, I raised the question; did the committee want to go forward on this? They said they wanted to. But I did not feel comfortable in the spirit of shared governance to make a singular decision for all the Horn's and all the faculty at the University for this one case. So that's why we wanted to put it in there very explicitly that you have to be tenured. It has always been implied and in fact there is a case study several years ago and one of our professors here who wanted to be a Horn and was not tenured, back when Don Harrigan was the Provost. He went to the Provost and Don said, no you cannot be a Horn - you go back and get tenured and then you can apply. He did and he became a Horn professor. When I polled the Horn Professors the overwhelming majority said you did the right thing. We would have been very angry with you had you made that decision unilaterally.

Senator Held: I just want to validate what the Provost just said. I discussed the revisions with head Horn Professors who then circulated it to all the Horn Professors and they got back to me with at least twelve responses all of which were affirmative. They all said that they had been forewarned about the revisions by the Provost at a dinner of some sort.

Dr. Smith: We have a dinner every fall with the Horn Professors where we talk about issues.

Senator Held: So this does not come as a surprise to the Horn Professors. According to this liaison were unanimous in their agreement with these changes. Unless you have any objections I think we are ready to vote.

Senator Lee: Could you just repeat one more time what the deal was with the word outreach.

Senator Held: Provost Smith could explain that.

Dr. Smith: We typically use the terminology teaching, research and service. In recent years people have been equating the term service outreach. Outreach meaning more of a positive and purposeful engagement with society. Sometimes we can do service that is relatively passive. Looking at some dossiers for an award or for a national society. But outreach implies active involvement. For example in our College in Education many of our education faculty are actively involved in school systems helping to mentor teachers, helping to work with them, helping to find new ways of doing teaching and learning in the K-12 system. It is a semantic thing but it is one that is taking on more national recognition.

Senator Lee: Is there any danger here of muddying the distinction between research and outreach? I think there are people who want that outreach to be thought of more as part of research than it is service. I mean is this in any way taking sides on that?

Senator Drager: I don't see how. If you already a professor then you have met the requirements.

Senator Dippra: It's not specifying any requirement.

Senator Held: I think we are all looking at it legalistically and Jeff's looking at it philosophically.

Senator Lee: People don't usually, they think they are thinking of things legalistically but then there is sort of this soft thinking that you get used to the idea and say, well you know this is what it is really all about, that's what Horn Professor is all about. You know you are not there to go, that's what. You have got to be careful about what kind of attitudes and reading between the lines.

Senator Held: I fully agree with you, I think what we can do and the saving grace of all of this is if these OPs come up for renewal and reevaluation on a cyclic basis. If we find on the next cycle that it has been misapplied or abused in any way shape or form we can go back and reedit it. Like I say, the Horns are similarly in favor maybe on a trial basis at the very least. Any further discussion?

Senator Howe: The one thing in here though, your 3B clause does refer specifically back to the tenure process. So the tenure process which does use the old language 'recognition of excellence in teaching and service' but we are in fact not creating a complete parallel with the clause to which we are previously referring. Teaching and outreach whereas the traditional teaching, research and service. The triad was what people were evaluated on for the tenure and promotion proceedings.

Senator Held: That's were, past tense. I think you were on the committee when we revised that so now outreach is actually in OP 32.01.

Senator Howe: Yes but isn't service still there.

Senator Held: Yes. We are conflating those two by using a single term.

Senator Drager: So you are saying it would be better if it said teaching, service and outreach.

Senator Howe: Or service/outreach if we think the terms are conflated. We don't have an exact parallel to the policy to which we are referring.

Senator Lowey: Just for clarification, I certainly read this as saying particularly with the way C is worded that teaching and outreach are irrelevant except to the extent that they were necessary to obtain tenure and that what we are looking at is assuming you have the teaching and outreach necessary to obtain tenure. What we are looking at is super high quality national and international distinction for research and other creative scholarly activity. If that's what it is, that's fine. I have no objection to that. I just want to make sure that is in fact what we mean. If it is what we mean I almost wonder why we even need this except to make sure you have somebody having tenure.

Senator Drager: As previously stated seems to be inserted just to make people feel good. That we are recognizing these values.

Senator Rice: 1B says tenured professors so 3B is moot unless you want to add something like this: Recognition of excellence in teaching and outreach as a tenured professor. So it is sustainable. Even if you are a full professor you don't sit on your laurels at that point. That earns you the next rank to Horn. Otherwise it's just saying this is a good thing, it's not saying it is sustainable.

Senator Drager: I think that's what it was supposed to say, this is a good thing.

Senator Held: What you are requesting Senator Rice is actually a change that would require reevaluation of the Horns because that is a substantive change. That is saying it is not enough that you have tenure and been promoted to full, you also have to have demonstrated above and beyond that certain qualities. Which may or may not be consistent with the intent of the award. As it stands now it is redundant perhaps it is completely unnecessary but I think also that it's innocuous.

Senator Kucera: You could just write must have achieved tenure at Texas Tech. Just get rid of that first part.

Senator Drager: You could also write we've decided to make a lot of trouble over nothing.

Senator Kucera: Just delete everything up until the word tenure. Write must have achieved tenure or obtained tenure at Texas Tech. Then that is all in the body within 32.01.

Senator Held: I think one of the dangers of the Senate, and I love the Senate, is that we tend to want to wordsmith things to death. I think we are on the cusp of that right now. When you get into that sort of debate with intellectuals, academics, professors, we usually talk at least 50 minutes at a stretch. This could go on forever. So, with your permission, I would like to call the question and vote.

Senator Meek: Let me call if I may on our parliamentarian, Dr. Howe as to how we should proceed. This right now is a committee report.

Senator Howe: If the question is called, you can say if there is no objection we will proceed to the vote. The question in theory is that two-thirds vote if we had a formal vote on stopping debate. The aim being to respect the rights of minorities who still have to speak. Most people have had their say so you could just ask if there is any objection to the vote.

Senator Meek: And we are voting on, Senator Held would you?

Senator Held: Approving these revisions and having them posted on the Texas Tech website.

Senator Rice: Second.

Senator Meek: Not hearing any objection may we proceed to the vote? We have one nay the report stands passed.

Meek: Further reports under new business?

VII. Announcements:

Senator Meek: There are a couple of announcements from our President, Danny Nathan. One has to do with our administrative search committees. There is one faculty senator needed for each of these: Mass Communication, Grad School, Visual and Performing Arts, and for the Honors College. Patty will be sending out an email to you soliciting your suggestions and volunteerism.

Also from Danny Nathan, he expresses his regrets that he is not here today. He wishes to wish Happy Holidays to everyone and I would certainly like to do the same.

Senator Held: Some of you have been here long enough to remember Margaret Luther. She was the Media and Public Relations Representative at the University under many of our chancellors. She died today.

Senator Meek: I wish to suggest for the holidays you might attend the Madrigal dinners.

VIII. Adjournment 4:18

If you would like to view a CD of the Faculty Senate meeting in its entirety, you may do so by visiting the Faculty Senate office and requesting the CD for this meeting.