FACULTY SENATE
Tuesday, April 27, 2010
3:30 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES


Guests: R. Friedrich (Emeritus Faculty Council), A. Han (Anesthesia), H. Hines (Daily Iowan), G. Hospodarsky (Staff Council), B. Ingram (Office of the Provost), P. Kostle (University Safety and Security Charter Committee), L. Larson (University Relations), B. Morelli (Press-Citizen), R. Porter (Office of the General Counsel), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

I. Call to Order – President Drake called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.
http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.04.27.10.pdf.

II. Approvals
A. Meeting Agenda – President Drake announced his intention to remove the item *Post-Tenure Review Policy* from the agenda and table it. He indicated that he had received many comments from faculty members expressing deep concern about the revision of this extremely important policy; therefore, he wished to have additional time to discuss these concerns before bringing the policy to the Faculty Senate. He noted that the revised policy had already been approved by the Faculty Council. Professor Kurtz moved and Professor Valentine seconded that the agenda item *Post-Tenure Review Policy* be tabled. The motion carried unanimously. Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Robertson seconded that the remainder of the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Faculty Senate Minutes (March 23, 2010 and April 6, 2010) – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Robertson seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Faculty Senate and Council Election Results – President Drake presented the results of the 2010 Faculty Senate and Council elections.

D. 2010-2011 Committee Recommendations (Edwin Dove, Chair, Committee on Committees) – Vice President Dove presented the recommendations of the Committee on Committees for individuals to fill vacant positions on charter, university and Faculty Senate committees beginning with the 2010-11 academic year. He indicated that several vacancies still need to be filled. Professor Kurtz moved and Secretary Tachau seconded that the 2010-2011 Committee Recommendations be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

E. 2008-2009 Motion Summary – Vice President Dove pointed out several of the motions approved: to accept the proposed research track in the Carver College of Medicine, to appoint a standing committee on academic freedom, to amend the Professional Ethics and Academic Responsibility, Responsibilities to Colleagues (Chapter 15) section of the Operations Manual, to explore the formation of a university-level promotion and tenure advisory committee, to examine the post-tenure review policy, to revise the Parental Leave Policy, and to revise the Faculty Senate constitution. Professor Kurtz asked if there was any intention to present the revised constitution to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa again. Vice President Dove responded that this may be done in a year or so.

III. New Business

- **College of Public Health Research-Track Policy (Edwin Dove)**
  
  Vice President Dove explained that the College of Public Health has submitted a proposal to establish a research track. It is very similar to the Carver College of Medicine research-track policy, which the Senate approved last year. Both of those collegiate policies closely follow the university policy. The Faculty Senate Officers and the Associate Provost for Faculty have reviewed the proposal and the Faculty Council recently reviewed and approved it.

  Professor Robertson moved and Professor Vaughn seconded that the College of Public Health Research-Track Policy be approved. The motion carried with one dissenting vote.
President Drake stated that Professor Jonathan Carlson, Senior Associate to the President, who had presented the sexual harassment policy draft to the Faculty Council, had indicated that the version before the Senate now is the final draft of the policy. If, however, any senators have suggestions to make regarding additional edits, they should contact the Faculty Senate Officers or Professor Carlson directly.

Mr. Porter gave a brief history of the policy revision. He explained that in the fall of 2008, in response to a Board of Regents mandate, the university revised its policy on sexual misconduct involving students. Outside consultants were retained to guide that process. The final version of that policy was intentionally created to overlap with the existing sexual harassment policy. In 2009 President Mason ordered a review of the sexual harassment policy to remove this overlap and to incorporate best practices. The same consultants who assisted with the sexual misconduct policy were engaged to assist with the revision of the sexual harassment policy. Following a review of existing policy by the consultants, President Mason appointed a university committee to revise the policy. This committee was chaired by Professor Carlson and included Monique DiCarlo (the sexual misconduct response coordinator) as well as representatives from the offices of the General Counsel, Human Resources, the Provost, Equal Opportunity and Diversity (EOD), and the Dean of Students. Early in 2010, the revised policy was posted to a website for the campus community to provide input. Members of the university committee also met with various campus groups (Council on the Status of Women, Rape Victim Advocacy Program, Women’s Resource and Advocacy Center, etc.) for additional input. Mr. Porter indicated that he would now like to receive feedback from the Faculty Senate on the revised policy.

Mr. Porter stated that there had been no substantive change to the definition of sexual harassment in the policy revision. He added that some efforts are being made to encourage individuals to report incidences of unwelcome sexual behavior, whether or not they consider those behaviors to be sexual harassment. Those were intentional efforts suggested by both the consultants and various campus groups, for a variety of reasons. First, individuals who experience sexual harassment may not necessarily identify it as such. Then, administrators can refer to the policy to determine whether sexual harassment has occurred; therefore, the risk of instances of sexual harassment going unreported is minimized. Second, even if the conduct is not deemed to be sexual harassment, early non-disciplinary intervention can reduce the risk of these behaviors eventually rising to the level of sexual harassment. Mr. Porter commented that the goal is to encourage more, not less, reporting of potential sexual harassment. Also, he explained that a scope provision has been added to the policy, to be consistent with other university policies and to make explicit that it is not just on university grounds that sexual harassment is prohibited but anywhere university-affiliated activity takes place. The revised policy provides for an enhanced role for the sexual misconduct response coordinator. This allows for more timely, victim-sensitive communications as well as providing one office for individuals to contact to receive accurate information on the process. Some amendments have been made to the definitions of “administrative or academic officer.” The variability in the definition of that term which was present in the original policy has been removed. The informal resolution process has been retained in the revised policy, at the insistence of victims’ rights
groups who voiced concern that some victims may never come forward otherwise. However, the informal resolution process has been tightened up; previously, any administrative or academic officer could resolve an informal complaint. Now, the Senior Human Resources Leadership Representatives for each unit take on this responsibility. The formal resolution process has also been strengthened. In the former version of the policy, EOD had to make an investigation and present a finding whether or not sexual harassment occurred. EOD sent this finding to the sanctioning authority and then had no further role in the process. This may have led to situations in which actions were or were not taken against individuals that were not consistent with the EOD investigation results. Under the revised policy, EOD remains in communication with the sanctioning authority throughout the process. Finally, the sexual harassment prevention training previously mandated by President Mason has been formalized in the revised policy.

Secretary Tachau commented that she recalled the phrase “early resolution” rather than “informal resolution” being used by Professor Carlson when he presented the revised policy to the Faculty Council two weeks ago. Mr. Porter responded that the committee has struggled with that wording and others, including finding a substitute for the word “complaint” that would point toward arriving at a resolution of the process. Professor Bohannan noted that the word “instructor” was not included in line a. under section 4.2. Scope of Policy, while “faculty, staff, or students” are included. She referred to a situation in which judges might be invited to lecture at the College of Law for a week and asked whether the policy would apply to such temporary instructors. Mr. Porter stated that it was the intention of the committee that such situations would be covered under 4.2.b. Acts by persons other than employees or students, while acknowledging that there may be some individuals (e.g., fans outside a football game) who simply fall outside of the university’s control. He thought that the judge in Professor Bohannan’s example would fit into the category of faculty, however. Professor Kurtz then raised the question of the definitions of “instructor” vs. “faculty.” Mr. Porter asked if “instructor” should be added to 4.2.a. Professor Bohannan noted that the term “faculty” is very narrowly defined elsewhere in university policy. If “instructor” is added to 4.2.a., it would imply that instructors and faculty are two separate groups.

Professor Menninger commented that he had not found symmetry in the language for the accuser and the accused until line 755 of the marked-up copy (4.5.h. Protection of the respondent). He suggested that this section be moved to a more prominent place and be taken account of throughout the document. Professor Menninger then asked for definitions of “specific” and “credible” allegations to warrant investigation. Mr. Porter responded that there were no definitions of those words in the policy, but generally “specific” refers to who is alleged to have committed the act, where the act is alleged to have occurred and when the act is alleged to have occurred. Professor Menninger suggested that “what is alleged to have occurred” also be added to that list. He continued by noting that during an informal resolution it appears that no further fact-finding is done after the initial allegation, nor is the alleged offender notified of the investigation. Mr. Porter agreed that there might be a case in which the alleged offender is not notified; however, such an informal resolution cannot result in discipline to the offender because this would create a due process issue. For example, a student who perceives that she is being sexually harassed by a professor could be allowed to transfer out of that professor’s class,
with no action taken against that professor. Professor Menninger responded that even in this situation, a record would still be kept of the allegation and the action taken, even though no further fact-finding took place. Mr. Porter agreed and added that a record must be kept in case similar situations occur in the future involving this same professor. Professor Menninger stressed that a record is therefore being kept about an allegation that is possibly unfounded, frivolous or malicious. Mr. Porter responded that no black mark against the alleged offender is kept in that person’s personnel file, although he acknowledged that the university would somewhere keep a file that could come to light in the future. Professor Menninger questioned whether this was nevertheless a violation of due process, since no fact-finding is done, there is an informal resolution, and a record is kept about an allegation that is potentially unjustified. He stated that this was not symmetrical to all of the protections offered to the accuser under the policy. Professor Kletzing added that what was more worrisome was that the accused remains unaware of these allegations. Mr. Porter responded that the reasoning for this situation was that otherwise a victim might not provide enough information about the alleged incident to pursue a resolution and also because a victim might not come forward at all if s/he knew the accused would be informed. The committee struggled to find the right balance in the policy between the consequences for alleged perpetrators and the risk of victims not coming forward.

Professor Wadsworth commented that he supervises counselors in training in field sites. He noted that it appears in the policy that a supervisor could be completely excluded from any investigation of sexual harassment that occurs among students s/he supervises. However, a supervisor in his position would need to immediately remove an alleged victim or alleged perpetrator from the counseling situation in order to protect clients. Mr. Porter thought that in a situation such as this, which differs from the typical instructional context, the supervisor would be notified and would play a role in the resolution. Professor Wadsworth responded that perhaps a student would not want the supervisor notified, in order not to create a negative impression. He also commented on the peculiarity of a situation in which the student’s supervisor would be notified of the alleged harassment, but the accused would not be notified, as might occur during an informal resolution. Mr. Porter said that such a situation would be relatively rare, since a victim must first agree to an informal resolution. He reminded the group that during an informal resolution, disciplinary action cannot be taken against the accused and information about the allegation does not appear in the personnel file. Professor Wadsworth responded that nevertheless a client may be harmed by the situation, damaging the alleged perpetrator’s career. He suggested that language be inserted into the policy indicating that supervisors in a clinical setting must be involved in any investigation.

Secretary Tachau suggested that before the policy is finalized, a meeting with individuals in supervisory situations such as Professor Wadsworth’s be held so that appropriate language can be incorporated into the policy. She also suggested a meeting with Professor Menninger so that his concerns about the informal resolution could be addressed. Mr. Porter commented that some institutions do not even allow informal resolutions. However, formal resolutions do not necessarily provide the best outcomes for either alleged victims or alleged perpetrators. Victims may be discouraged from coming forward while alleged perpetrators will need to go through a disciplinary process.
Professor Kletzing suggested that the policy specifically state that the record kept of an allegation cannot be used in any other deliberation. Another professor commented that as long as a record is kept, it could still be legally used outside the university. He asked to what extent the policy is designed to discourage sexual harassment and to what extent is it designed to shield the university from liability. In his opinion, the informal resolution process accomplishes more of the latter than of the former, as the informal resolution process does not provide an incentive to change inappropriate behavior. Professor Pendergast asked whether records are kept on individuals who repeatedly make allegations of sexual harassment. For the sake of parity, there should be such a record kept. Mr. Porter thought that there was a record kept by the university.

There was a brief discussion of how the Senate should proceed. President Drake initially suggested that the policy be put to a vote with the caveat that the Senate members’ suggestions be incorporated into a final version of the policy. However, senators indicated that they had strong objections to the current version of the revised policy, so a vote was not taken. Professor Kurtz reminded the group that Senate votes are not binding; they are advisory only. Mr. Porter suggested that the objections raised be brought to Professor Carlson’s attention. The policy will then be brought back to the Senate at a later date for a vote.

- **University Safety and Security Charter Committee Charge Revision (Pam Kostle, Chair)**

  Ms. Kostle referred the group to the handout listing the current charge to the University Safety and Security Charter Committee and the proposed revised charge. She explained that the committee has been reviewing and revising its charge this past year to bring it up to date. In February the committee submitted a letter to the shared governance bodies indicating the proposed changes and requesting permission to make those changes. One of the major changes was to drop item (e) regarding faculty, staff and students participating in “monitoring” and “building watch” activities; with current technology, this activity has now become obsolete.

  Staff Council has already approved the revised charter. Last month Ms. Kostle appeared before the Faculty Council, which approved the revised charge with the exception that the committee consider language indicating its role in the selection of the Director of the UI Department of Public Safety. Following the Council meeting, however, the committee identified a passage in the general charter for all charter committees that provides for a committee role “concerning the criteria for appointment of new University-wide administrators, some of whose functions come within the scope of the committee’s advisory role...” 2.8(6)k(3) The committee believes that this language addresses the concerns raised by the Faculty Council.

  Professor Kurtz noted that the section cited begins with the words “When requested by the President of the University...” and commented that the committee might not play a role if the President does not make a request of its members. Ms. Kostle acknowledged that this was a possibility, but added that the committee always has the opportunity to offer advice. Also, she had reviewed the charges of the other charter committees and did not find language there specifically stating a role for those committees in the selection of university-wide administrators. All of the charter committees would be governed by the language in 2.8(6)k(3).
Professor Kurtz moved and Professor Robertson seconded that the revisions to the charge of the University Safety and Security Charter Committee be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- President Sally Mason

President Drake introduced University of Iowa President Sally Mason. President Mason began her remarks by commending the faculty and staff for showing tremendous patience in the face of many difficult budget adjustments over the past months. She noted that Iowa City has been spared some of the pain that other areas of the country have experienced during the recent economic crisis, but she did not wish to minimize the difficulties encountered here. She thanked the Faculty Senate leadership for their role in maintaining support for institutional efforts to handle the budget crisis. The state appropriation remains the most problematic portion of the budget, while some other aspects of the budget are doing well. In FY2011 there will still be an appropriations cut to deal with, but the situation is much less dire than it was at the beginning of FY2010, when the university experienced an appropriation cut of $34 million. This was followed several months later by an additional $23.5 million cut when the governor ordered a 10% across-the-board reduction to the budgets of all state entities. However, the university received $34 million in ARRA funding which helped it through the crisis. Fourteen million dollars, and later $5 million were given back to the university from the state several months ago. This partially-restored funding has allowed the university to refund a $100 surcharge that had earlier been imposed on students.

Although FY2011 will continue to present budgetary challenges, President Mason said she remains optimistic that the university will emerge stronger at the end of this economic crisis. She cited several guiding principles according to which budgetary decisions have been and will continue to be made. These principles include maintaining affordability for students, protecting faculty and staff, and supporting our growing clinical and research enterprises. About 140 stimulus grants were funded at the university in the amount of approximately $53 million. Overall UI workforce numbers do not indicate a shrinkage, but in fact 400 positions paid from general education funds were lost; however, grant funding created many new positions. Flood recovery remains a high priority for the university, in spite of the trying economic times. Regarding student success and accessibility, the university continues to increase financial aid, especially need-based aid, the demand for which is growing. There are also plans to increase the number of living-learning communities. President Mason then announced that she would request a 2% salary increase for faculty and professional and scientific staff at the upcoming meeting of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa. Given that the bargaining units will have raises this year, she felt that it was fair and equitable for everyone at the university to have raises, especially since many are taking on additional duties these days.

President Mason commented that a number of university officials, as well as the Faculty Senate, have voiced their support for the 21-only ordinance that the Iowa City City Council has implemented. She stressed that this initiative is not about prohibition, but about the health and safety of our community and of our students. Turning then to comments on the arts and humanities, she stressed that the university is committed to providing world-class facilities for faculty, staff and students in art and music, areas that had been hit particularly hard by the
flood. She also noted that many faculty members in the arts and humanities had expressed concern about the Strategic Initiatives task force reports that had been released earlier this year. President Mason stated that there is no more important component on a campus like the University of Iowa than the liberal arts and sciences, an integral part of which is the humanities. She then enumerated some recent accomplishments of UI faculty, staff and students: Tim Barrett, of the Center for the Book, has won a MacArthur Award; Paul Harding, of the Writers’ Workshop, has won a Pulitzer Prize for Fiction; Ethan Canin and Paul Michaels, both of the Writers’ Workshop, have been awarded Guggenheim Fellowships; and Garrett Stewart (English) and Marilynne Robinson (Writers’ Workshop) have been elected to the American Academy of Arts & Sciences. These are honors that only come to universities of great stature that strongly support the arts and humanities.

Returning to the topic of flood recovery, President Mason noted that a location for Hancher Auditorium has been set. A site for the School of Music has not been identified yet, but the university is investigating downtown locations. Sites for the art museum have been suggested by the Museum of Art Envisioning Committee. The ground floor of the IMU should be open by spring break of 2012. Art Building West still remains closed, but she expressed hope that there would be good news about this building within a year. A new art building will be designed by Steven Holl, who also designed Art Building West.

Referring to her earlier comment about certain pieces of the university budget doing very well, President Mason remarked that last year there was a 10% increase in the amount of research funding obtained by the university and this will most likely be another record-setting year for research funding. Last year was also the university’s second best year for private fundraising. The University of Iowa was one of a handful of universities that received multi-million dollar gifts from an anonymous donor. Having a female president seems to be the only common characteristic of the institutions receiving these anonymous gifts. President Mason also cited generous gifts from the Pappajohn family and from ACT, the latter gift supporting graduate fellowships. UI students continue to do remarkable things; Dance Marathon this year again raised $1 million for research on children’s cancer. UI students have also recently earned three Goldwater Scholarships, a Churchill Scholarship, a Udall Scholarship, and a Truman Scholarship. This is a tribute to our students and to our Honors Program.

Concluding her remarks, President Mason noted Iowa City’s designation as a UNESCO City of Literature and the appointment of Jeanette Pilak as Executive Director; she anticipated much joint programming between the university and the community for City of Literature events. International recruitment efforts are paying off; the University of Iowa was listed among the top ten international universities in the U.S. by Asian Correspondent. Sustainability efforts continue to move forward on campus, including the opening of the Energy Control Center. Many UI graduate programs ranked in the top ten in the recent U.S. News and World Reports rankings. She thanked the current Faculty Senate Officers, as well as the senators, for their leadership efforts.

In response to a question from Professor Kurtz, President Mason acknowledged that the past three years had been challenging for her personally as well as for the university and local
community. She noted, however, that the flood may have helped to prepare the university for the economic crisis. In the immediate aftermath of the flood, the university had substantially scaled back spending since at that time it was unclear how funds would be obtained for reconstruction.

President Drake thanked President Mason for speaking to the Senate.

IV. From the Floor – There were no issues from the floor.

V. Announcements

- Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (David Drake)
  President Drake announced the winners of the 2010 Regents Award for Faculty Excellence: Thomas Boggess (Physics & Astronomy); Michael Duffel (Pharmacy); Sarah England (Physiology); Witold Krajewski (Civil & Environmental Engineering); Lauren Rabinovitz (American Studies); and Satish Rao (Internal Medicine).

- Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa (David Drake)
  President Drake announced the winners of the 2010 Michael J. Brody Awards for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa: Samir Bishara (Orthodontics); Bernard Sorofman (Pharmacy); and Katherine Tachau (History).

- Concluding Remarks of the 2009-2010 Faculty Senate President
  President Drake commented that the university had dealt with a series of budget cuts during the past year and that the Faculty Senate Officers had done their utmost to protect the interests of faculty during these trying times. He expressed his appreciation to the other officers for their efforts. President Drake thanked the outgoing councilors and senators for their service.

  President Drake stated that it was a great honor to have served as Faculty Senate President. He added that Ed Dove had been an outstanding vice president who was more than ready to take on the role of president. President Drake thanked President Mason, Provost Loh, and Senior Vice President Doug True for their willingness to engage the Faculty Senate Officers and their commitment to shared governance.

  Professor Wasserman read the following resolution in honor of President Drake:
  WHEREAS University of Iowa Faculty is part of a University Community that requires dedicated leadership; and
  WHEREAS President David Drake has worked with the other Senate officers to forge a dedicated leadership team; and
  WHEREAS David Drake has asserted and sustained the concept of shared governance within the University and the Board of Regents; and
  WHEREAS David Drake has offered important guidance to President Mason and Provost Loh during the worst fiscal crisis in the history of the University; and
  WHEREAS David Drake has carefully and thoughtfully considered the concerns of the faculty; and
WHEREAS David Drake has worked diligently on behalf of the Senate and the entire University community during this difficult year
BE IT RESOLVED that We the Senate express our gratitude to President David Drake for his dedicated leadership and service to us all.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Kurtz moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Drake adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.
FACULTY SENATE
2010-2011 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING
Tuesday, April 27, 2010
5:00 – 5:15 pm
Senate Chamber, Old Capitol

MINUTES

I. Call to Order – President Dove called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

II. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (Katherine Tachau and Anthony Han, Elections Committee)

The new and continuing senators were requested to move into the center seating area. Although outgoing senators were free to leave, they were invited to remain, if they wished, but to be seated in the side areas.

The candidate for Faculty Senate Vice President was Richard Fumerton, Philosophy. The candidates for Faculty Senate Secretary were Jon Garfinkel, Finance, and Carol Scott-Conner, Surgery.

Paper ballots were distributed, collected, and counted.

III. Opening Remarks of the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate President Edwin Dove

President Dove began his remarks with the comment that the past two years had been far from quiet for the university. Both President Drake and President Mason had mentioned the great financial stress that the university had endured recently. He then turned to a discussion of the positive role that the Faculty Senate could play in the next year in resolving some of the issues that confront us. He declared that the new Senate leadership team would continue working with the administration to protect the interests of faculty and students. For example, he noted that the university anticipates hiring 200-300 additional faculty. A portion of these hires will take place within certain “clusters.” The faculty must play an important role in identifying the subject areas of these clusters, and determining whether they complement existing university strengths, enhance the scholarship of current faculty, and offer new meaningful educational opportunities for students. Regarding the non-cluster faculty hires, faculty must also play a role in determining in which areas these hires are made.

President Dove stated that faculty must also ensure that any increase in teaching loads does not reduce scholarly and research activity. The university cannot risk the loss of stature that would accompany such a loss in productivity, as well as the corresponding drop in external research support and the impact on teaching quality. The officers will work with the Board of Regents, State of Iowa to ensure that the Board understands the faculty’s leadership role in the university’s response to financial challenges and that the Board maintains its commitment to UI’s identity as a comprehensive research university, where students enjoy quality teaching and learning and faculty contribute to the production of knowledge and new scholarship. The officers will also continue to work with local representatives to advocate the necessity of adequately funding public university education and the dangers of not doing so. President Dove added that there will no doubt be many unforeseen challenges that arise during the coming year,
as well. The Faculty Senate Officers plan to call on the Senators and Councilors to shoulder some of the responsibilities of working on the many issues the university faces. In conclusion he quoted Thomas Jefferson, “... A public institution can alone supply those sciences which contribute to the improvement of the country...”

President Dove expressed his appreciation to the outgoing leadership team, “agreeable and knowledgeable colleagues.” He stated that during his year as vice president he had learned that shared governance plays an important role in determining how the university responds to its challenges. In the coming year the incoming Senate leadership team will continue to work with the administration to ensure that the campus moves forward and becomes an even better place in which to study, to teach, and to create.

The Faculty Senate Officers presented gifts to outgoing secretary Katherine Tachau and outgoing past president Michael O’Hara. President Dove thanked Faculty Senate Program Assistant Laura Zaper for her work.

IV. From the Floor – There were no issues from the floor.

V. Announcements
• Officer Election Results – President Dove announced that the new vice president is Richard Fumerton and the new secretary is Jon Garfinkel.
• 2010-2011 Meeting Schedule – President Dove reminded senators that the meeting schedule for 2010-2011 could be found in their meeting packets.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Kurtz moved and Professor Wasserman seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Dove adjourned the meeting at 5:15 pm.