

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE

apprv'd @ FS mtg 11/22/05

<http://www.facsenate.utoledo.edu>

Minutes of the Senate Meeting of November 08, 2005

HIGHLIGHTS

UT Capital Campaign
UPC Update
Log Item 0506-02

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

Chair Jorgensen called the meeting to order. **Senator Steve Martin, Executive Secretary**, called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2005-2006 Senators

Present: Barden, Barlowe, Barrett, Bischoff, Bopp, Bowyer, Bresnahan, Edwards (Sullivan), Floyd, Fournier, Hoover, Hottell, Hudson, Humphrys, Jorgensen, Kennedy, King, Kunnathur, Lambert, Lipman, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Martin, Morrissey, Niamat, Piazza, Poling, Pope, Ritchie, Schultz, Sherman, Skeens, Stoudt, Suter, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Traband, Tramer, Wilson, Wolff (41)

Excused: Barnes, Cluse-Tolar, Olson, D. Reid, N Reid, Spongberg (6)

Unexcused: Komuniecki, Kozlowski, Fridman, (3)

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes–Minutes of the October 25, 2005 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report by Chair, Andy Jorgensen: There are several items in my executive report I would like to relay to you starting with an update on the Faculty Senate committees.

Faculty Senate Committee appointments:

Student Centeredness Committee. Robert Schultz has agreed to be one of the Faculty Senate representatives on the Student Centeredness Committee. Last year we had two representatives on this committee so, at this time I would like to invite at least one other nominee to come forward to represent the Senate. This committee looks at a number of issues related to student activities, such as paying bills.

Student Affairs Committee Martin Ritchie is chair of our Student Affairs Committee and has been charged with developing a plan related to Ohio Senate Bill 24. This bill was distributed to Faculty Senate members at a prior meeting and has been discussed across the state. If you have any remarks to make to this committee regarding this bill, please

express them to the chair at the end of the Senate meeting today. Also, the chair would like members of the committee to meet for a few moments after we adjourn.

Academic Regulations Committee Mary Ellen Edwards chairs this committee which is working on a range of items related to academic policy. One of those items is the use of the instructor withdrawal (IW) grade policy. Other items include the grade delete policy and the honors designation at graduation. Any comments on these issues can be sent to Dr. Edwards. This committee will also be receiving a new charge shortly to look into the very restrictive university medical withdrawal policy. Although this policy does not start with the faculty, the faculty will weigh in on it.

Constitution and Rules Committee John Barrett chairs this committee which has already presented to Senate Executive Committee, a plan on how to equalize the collective bargaining agreement and the Faculty Senate regulations in terms of electing members to the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP). This will be coming to the Faculty Senate floor.

Another issue being investigated by this committee is the continuity of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Currently there is only a one meeting overlap between the outgoing and incoming Executive Committee officers. Because there may be a zero overlapping of people, even though the chair is invited as a courtesy to continue on the committee, we are looking at a means of providing more year to year continuity.

University Prioritization Committee. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee held their regularly scheduled meeting on October 27. An additional, a meeting was held with the co-chairs of the University Prioritization Committee (UPC). You will be hearing from them later in this meeting.

Admissions Criteria

Lastly, as you know our Strategic Plan talks about a long term goal of raising the admissions criteria to the University. This topic has been discussed across campus at various times over the years. President Johnson has informed me that the Board of Trustees (BOT) is interested in discussing this issue at their January retreat. In response to that plan, President Johnson concurred with my opinion that the faculty should have the opportunity to provide input on this issue, given the varied arguments for and against that I have heard. The means worked out for faculty participation on this topic will be to hold two open forums. All faculty members will be invited to express any thoughts they have on the issue of admissions criteria. That would include a range of issues from remedial education and enrollment to finances and anything else. Of course colleges and departments have admissions standards, but the university as a whole does not for graduates of Ohio high schools.

Data like the ACT and high school G.P.A. distribution of our new students, the money involved in teaching remedial education, the head count in remedial classes, all will be provided to faculty as a handout before the forums are held. Steve LeBlanc of the College of Engineering has agreed to serve as a moderator at the forums. One of the forums will be held at a Faculty Senate meeting time, tentatively set for the Dec. 6 meeting. This will not be an official Faculty Senate meeting, but the comments will be

taped and a transcript will be provided to President Johnson to share with the BOT. Individuals may or may not identify themselves with their comments. Since this is an afternoon meeting, the other meeting time has been tentatively set for the morning of Friday, Dec. 2. More information will be forthcoming on this item.

Finally, a note about our agenda today, we were supposed to hear a budget report from Vice President William Decatur and Assoc. Vice President Dawn Rhodes. Mr. Decatur is in Cincinnati this morning and was not sure he would be back in time for today's meeting so his presentation has been moved to the November 22 meeting. Cathy Kwapich, Director of Direct Transfer and International Students will also speak at that meeting in response to your questions on what the University is doing to attract more transfer students.

IV. Reports: Chair Jorgensen: Our first visitor today is Vice President Vern Snyder to talk about the UT Capital Campaign and how faculty can help that initiative.

The Campaign For The University of Toledo

Vice President Vernon Snyder, Institutional Advancement: Thank you Andy, and thank all of you for inviting me here to discuss the Capital Campaign. I would like to begin by giving you a brief background of the campaign, the goals, the strategies and the current status of the campaign.

We have spent a year and a half determining the goals for this campaign. After the initial meeting of the Campaign Planning Committee, a goal was determined that we felt was unreachable. Additional meeting we held and a figure of \$100,000,000 was reached. During this process, the committee tried to treat everyone equally. Following seventeen cultivation meetings with our major donors it was decided to find areas of distinction within the university and projects for those areas, rather than raising everyone up to an equal status. Discussions with the Deans Council provided us with five areas of distinction which we feel are the right things to do.

1. **Reinvent the Campus.** It is time to reinvent our campus to meet and even exceed the highest aspirations of our students and faculty.
 - Scholarship Endowments – vital to helping more students receive a college education. One example of this is the generous donation received from Grower Family of Philadelphia for \$250,000 to be used for scholarships.
 - Endowed Chairs and Professorships
 - Campus Improvements – creating state-of-the-art classroom facilities and laboratories and an enriched learning environment within Carlson Library.
2. **Elevate Research.** It is time to elevate selected areas of research to national distinction.
 - Endowed Chairs and Professorships – concentrating on areas of research where investment will bring national distinction to the University while impacting the lives of our students, our community, our state and our world. These include areas such as
 - Alternative energy sources
 - Math and science education
 - Geographic information systems (GIS) and applied geographics

- Environmental quality
- Astronomy and astrophysical research
- Biotechnology

In getting those endowed chairs, thanks to a \$4,000,000 gift from Dr. Shapiro and a very wonderful request in reforming the dollars for Economics and the English Department scholarships, research and funding for a Great Minds Lecture Series, a tremendous gift. On the other side of the spectrum the ___?___ department just received \$25,000 a year; forever. We have also reached \$1,000,000 for the Islamic Chair Fund.

3. **Culturally Vibrant City.** It is time to partner with Toledo to create a culturally vibrant city.

- The UT Jazz Initiative
- The Great Minds Lecture Series
- Athletics Facilities Initiative
- The Visual Arts Initiative

We are expecting donations toward the Jazz Initiative, some in the 7 figure area. The Savage Hall renovation plans will be completed soon so our donors will have an idea of what they are contributing toward.

4. **Revitalize The Regional Economy.** It is time to be a major force in the revitalization of our region's economy

- The Toledo Science and Technology Corridor
- Endowed Chairs and Professorships
- The Complex for Business Learning and Engagement

Last week the Complex for Business Learning and Engagement received a million dollars in gifts. This puts them at nearly two million dollars toward their three million dollar goal. Engineering also received a major gift to fund an engineering freshman entrepreneurial program. You will be hearing more about this in December.

5. **Issues That Shape The Nation.** It is time to act on issues that help shape us as a nation

- The National Center for Parents
- The Science and Math Education Initiative
- The Legal Institute of the Great Lakes.

The National Center for Parents is endorsed by the Governor and The University Foundation has made a grant to the Center of \$100,000 a year for the next three years as seed money. This will get that program up and rolling so they have an executive director that can identify addition funding.

The Campaign has begun to move. I mentioned in my opening remarks that we would talk about our strategies and how we get the Campaign to move. We have decided to design and develop a national perspective donor base. We now have thirty four active alumni chapters in the country and two in foreign countries. Last year we visited forty three different cities making both one-on-one and group presentations. For the first time in the history of the university, more alumni live outside the magic fifty mile circle than within. We are indeed a national university.

Our alumni's include the top investment manager of the twentieth century, the inventor of the process used in 58% of all heart procedures, the CEO of Alcoa, authors,

poets, and people of importance that make a difference in the world. We are contacting those people and asking them what they can do for this campaign. Our largest challenge to this point is getting the campaign chair. We are contacting some of our largest donors and asking them to step forward in this position although the size of the campaign and the amount of travel involved creates a challenge with busy schedules.

We are in the final phase of this campaign. Your Board of Trustees has contributed over \$1,000,000 toward this campaign, the Cabinet members have all pledged and the faculty/staff campaign is progressing. The faculty campaign will start up again as soon as the UT Charitable Community Campaign has ended. As of November 8, we are at \$31,158,804 with another four million expected within the next 6-8 months.

The faculty/staff will begin with Kelly Repinski and I making visits again, and I hope that if your college or department has not heard from us, please invite us and we will be happy to talk about the Capital Campaign. The Faculty Senate can assist us in this campaign by becoming leaders in this effort. The leadership in the University is what makes a difference. We would like your support. I thank you for your valuable time.

University Prioritization Committee Update

Chair Jorgensen: The next item on the agenda is an update on the University Prioritization presented by the co-chairs, Jamie Barlowe, Mike Dowd and Nagi Naganathan.

Dr. Michael Dowd, UPC Co-chair: At our last report to Senate we talked about the issues that The University Prioritization Committee (UPC) had been discussing over the summer and very early September. That included the enormity of the task before us, deadlines for collecting data, and the problems and fears associated with using a raw ranking of academic and non-academic programs. At the last report we mentioned that the UPC was considering an alternative methodology. Instead of a raw rank order, the UPC had voted to investigate the use of a multi-year continuous improvement model. Subsequently the UPC voted to adopt a Baldrige type of model of continuous improvement. While prioritization will occur, this is a movement away from a raw rank ordering of programs and a movement away from a culture of programs constantly being under threat, to one that affords us the opportunity to make thoughtful decisions about self-assessment, self-improvement, and the allocation of resources.

Our report today is very brief. The UPC voted to adopt the Baldrige model only last Friday, November 4, and there has not been time to prepare documentation for distribution to Senators. Over the course of the next week, we hope to put together the prioritization documents approved by the UPC and with the permission of the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council Executive Committees, mail them to the individual Senate and Graduate Council members for their consideration. At subsequent Faculty Senate and Graduate Council meetings, we would like to discuss the UPC proposed methodology and ask for endorsement by Faculty Senate and Graduate Council. Given the compression of time, and complexity of issues, we ask that you please take the time to read the documents before the discussions at the next meeting.

What was approved by the UPC on Friday was an explicit timeline, which we will ask Senate to endorse. According to the old timeline, we are pretty much where we should be, in terms of the UPC presenting a methodology to Senate and Council. That said, we are behind in that timeline when speaking about college activities. The UPC

approved timeline along with the 60-70 page document on the Baldrige-type method of prioritization will be sent to each senator. The Baldrige documents can also be downloaded from the web at: www.baldrige.nist.gov then hit the link for the educational version.

Questions/Comments

Senator Bowyer: What Faculty Senate passed last spring was a choice between having a single model and having the colleges create their own models, later to be consolidated. What you are doing now is going back to what we voted down since Baldrige essentially is a common model that can be used by all colleges. Is that going to be voted on by this faculty body?

Dr. Barlowe: What we were charged with doing and did during the summer, was to have all College Prioritization Committees (CPCs) construct preliminary prioritization plans for their colleges. These plans were sent to the UPC and one of our sub-committees, the Alpha sub-committee, reviewed all of those documents looking for differences, similarities, conversions and diversions, and so on. That was always part of the plan. The UPC also investigated frameworks and methodology that would allow for cross-college comparisons and comparisons between academic and non-academic units. We have not strayed from that plan.

Senator Bowyer: As one of the few people who voted for a one-model plan, I beg to differ with you, but I am fine with this idea. This brings me back to my point is Faculty Senate going to vote on this?

Dr. Dowd: I believe Dr. Bowyer's description of activities is correct. What happened over the summer when the college committees met and submitted the material to the sub-committee, the material and plans were found to be not operational at the university level. It is my understanding that it would go to the faculty bodies, Graduate Council and Faculty Senate for endorsement or disapproval.

Senator Bowyer: You mean the methodology? So you will be sending us this 60+ page document to us and we are supposed to vote on it?

Dr. Dowd: Yes

Dr. Barlowe: One of the reasons the UPC and others recommended and approved Baldrige, is that even though each unit - from the smallest reviewable unit all the way up to the university as a whole - answers the same set of questions and conducts and performs the same quantitative and qualitative analysis, each college can answer those questions in a way that is unique to them. The outcomes produced by the colleges will not be exactly the same but the Baldrige methodology will allow the UPC to make comparisons and recommendations.

Senator Edwards: Did you have any endorsements by the college UPC's, for the Baldrige method?

Dr. Dowd: There are many different groups we have to meet with on campus to discuss everything we do, and we are in the process of trying to meet with the college committees on this now to approve the timeline approved by the UPC.

Senator Niamat: What are you asking for from the University Administration now, an extension of the model? An extension of the time deadline? How many more months?

Dr. Dowd: First, the UPC has designed a revised timeline; second, the UPC has voted to adopt a method of continuous improvement. If you follow the original timeline, colleges

would have already have had to prioritize every academic unit by now and the Senate would be considering a university-wide method. The university level prioritization would take place sometime in January and finish in March. What we are proposing to FS and GC is a method that would span a period of not less than 12-14 months. However, there are issues we have not yet resolved. Issues like will UPC and CPC activities continue over the summer. At his point we do not know if the university would be willing to provide stipends again. If not the timeline will shift the timeline down by the appropriate number of months.

Dr. Barlow: The timeline the UPC approved on Friday begins with every unit in the University involved in the first phase of Baldrige, which is a organizational profile. All units will begin at the same time and complete their profiles at the same time. Then a number of selected units that have volunteered will then begin the second phase. When you receive the timeline, you will see how the process moves in a staggered fashion so that new units are beginning different phases of Baldrige at different times, but only the selected group will begin the second phase immediately after the first.

Dr. Dowd: Perhaps Professor Barlowe remembers the non-academic units that will be starting the process first.

Dr. Barlowe: Human Resources and Educational & Information Technology (EIT) are the first on the non-academic side. As far as the summer is concerned, non-academic units can continue the process even if academic units do not. Decisions about academic units working during the summer have not yet been made.

Dr. Dowd: Last year there was a concern that faculty would only be involved in this process if there were assurances that the non-academic prioritization would continue as well. The non-academic units have really stepped up to this process and quite a number have volunteered to begin immediately.

Senator Stoudt: Do you have a sense of the reaction of the central administration and the Board of Trustees to this decision?

Dr. Naganathan, Co-chair: What we presented at the last BOT meeting was to give them a sense of what might be the next steps. What they are requesting is a more specific timeline with concrete steps.

Dr. Barlow: We will be returning to the BOT meeting in December.

Dr. Dowd: As of Friday we haven't proposed this to any other university body.

V. Calendar Questions: Log Item 0506-02 Necessity of Spring Convocation

Chair Jorgensen: Glen Sheldon, Chair of the University Affairs Committee will speak on the log item previously sent to his committee.

Log Item 0506-02 Necessity of Spring Convocation

Glenn Sheldon, Chair, FS University Affairs Committee: Good afternoon. The FS University Affairs Committee was charged with looking into the issue of the necessity of Spring Convocation and was asked to report on this item in November.

CHARGE: Provost Alan Goodridge asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to investigate the need for a Spring Convocation. This program was originally meant to be a summary of the year recognizing outstanding teachers, advisors, scholars, new emeritus and university professors. The

number of attendees has been dwindling and perhaps this program might be redundant or possibly unnecessary. Could there be a better avenue for this recognition, perhaps a rejuvenation of Honor's Day or perhaps moving the program to the fall when attendance might improve. The FSEC would like the University Affairs Committee to investigate the need for a Spring Convocation and suggest improvements or alternatives to the program.

In early September members of the committee began speaking with individuals who were willing to discuss the Spring Convocation. A notice was also sent out on the UT Daily message board asking for responses from individuals who had attended Spring Convocation and what their reactions were to the program. We are still looking into the history of the Spring Convocation and since no members of the committee have ever attended the program and we would like to make an informed recommendation, so my committee is moving that the question be considered informally by this body.

Questions/Comments

Chair Jorgensen: Dr. Sheldon and I had discussed this prior to today's meeting and decided a binding vote by the Faculty Senate was not necessary at this time, but just a sense of the Senate. That is why the committee is requesting that we consider this issue in an informal way. It does not need a second, coming directly from the committee.

Senator Morrissey (Assoc. Dean, College of A&S): I would like to have some clarification. You are talking about not having a spring convocation but certainly that does not include programs held in the individual colleges.

Chair Jorgensen: Absolutely not. It is because colleges have these spring ceremonies, we are asking do we need a university-wide event. That is the motion under consideration right now.

Senator Bowyer: What do you mean for us to consider the motion informally?

Dr. Sheldon: That suspends all of the rules of Senate and allows us to discuss the issue and gather additional information.

Chair Jorgensen: Senate can vote in the end, but a vote is not an official statement of the Senate as to whether we should or should not have the Spring Convocation.

Senator Fournier: Can you define what the Spring Convocation is or what it should be?

Dr. Sheldon: My committee is still looking into the history of the convocation. I guess it has evolved over the years and used to have something to do with an honors day and scholarship day. Since I have not been at this institution long enough to comment on this, I would invite someone here from the Senate floor that is better informed to perhaps answer this question for us.

Senator Floyd, Dir. Of Special Collections & Univ. Archivist General Libraries: This program started out as an university-wide honors day with classes recessed for an afternoon and a top name speaker was brought in. At that time all honor societies would have the opportunity to honor their new initiates, indicate who their scholarship winners were, and I believe the ceremony also included the university outstanding professors and researches. This gave colleges a chance to honor these individuals in a single ceremony that carried a lot of prestige. Parents could attend one event. That then changed into a Spring Convocation that I believe at this point, only involves faculty and staff honors, not

student honors. Student honors are now left to the individual colleges and organizations to sponsor their own ceremonies and parents are invited to attend. This gives parents the opportunity to attend smaller, more intimate, and meaningful ceremonies.

Having served on the Executive Committee of Phi Kappa Phi, which many know as the interdisciplinary university-wide honors society, I think the problem is that it is very difficult to get parents and students interested in something that is university-wide. They have already attended the college level and individual organizational ceremonies so by the time you get to a university honor, there is little interest. I know former Phi Kappa Phi president, Dr. Michael Dowd, has been on the bandwagon for returning to an honors day. If you decide to do away with the Spring Convocation there would be no opportunity to honor researchers and outstanding faculty except at a Spring Commencement.

Dr. Dowd: One of the problems is that parents have to try to coordinate which event to attend when they come here for their child's awards. Quite often when you get into April and the scheduling of events, there are only so many things that can happen on those April Saturdays. Often one parent attends one child's award ceremony while the other parent attends a different ceremony for another child. The notion of a university-wide honors day would make the scheduling of events simpler, and would add much prestige to each organization. In addition, such an event would restore the prestige to the students being recognized by university-wide and multi-disciplinary honor societies such as Phi Kappa Phi.

Chair Jorgensen: I believe the former honor's day was held in Savage Hall with the stage placed in the center, so one half of the floor was set up. The ceremony was held in the late afternoon so families could attend. At that time colleges did not have separate honors ceremonies. Since that program ended, the colleges have picked up the event at different times around graduation weekend. Outstanding faculty for teaching and researcher have been announced at commencement, as a stand-up sit-down type of thing. It was a little higher profile in the Honors Day celebration.

Senator Barden: There is also a banquet for the faculty researchers, advisors and teachers.

Senator Boyer: How much does it cost to hold the Spring Convocation and is this an issue?

Dr. Sheldon: The committee has not heard that concern what-so-ever. The only concern was the lack of attendance, which seemed disrespectful or wasteful.

Chair Jorgensen: Dr. Dowd, when you referred back to the potential of the university program, did you mean instead of the college or in addition to college honors?

Dr. Dowd: At this point I would say instead of the college honors programs.

Senator Morrisey: One problem is that we now have the system down, in fact we combined our honors with a commencement event. I think everybody does it somewhat differently. I think it would be, from the standpoint of the college office, that planning these events takes a lot of person-power to get them launched and make them run smoothly. This would be still another event in the spring, so I guess I am endorsing what Dr. Dowd is suggesting, that we would have to have one event or the other. Perhaps there would be an inclination on the part of some colleges to cancel their activities in favor of participating in this one event instead.

Senator Wolff: Does Faculty Senate have jurisdiction over the student convocation?

Chair Jorgensen: We were asked for an opinion, that's all.

Senator Bowyer: At my son's university they have a university honors around the Friday before commencement, that lasts for about an hour. Following that, there is another hour that is specific to the student's individual college. This essentially kills two birds with one stone. If the parents want to meet the faculty member(s) responsible for helping get their child through college, they can do that in a smaller setting after the university honors were presented and in the same afternoon. This packs everything in one weekend avoiding parents having to make multiple trips to campus.

Chair Jorgensen: Some of our colleges now due Friday night, some Saturday, honors related to graduation.

Senator Bowyer: They could be honors related to a junior or sophomore too, just held at the Friday of finals week with staggered times.

Dr. Dowd: I have gone to the University Spring Convocation every year. It has become a year-end summary of university events and administrative actions. Administrators from the Provost to the police captain are given an opportunity to speak. The current focus is substantial different from what was originally intended. That is, it began as an event to recognize academic achievements. Whether it was recognizing faculty research and teaching activities or student honors, the focus was to be on academics. What should the university be celebrating at the end of an academic year? Administrative actions? I would like to see the focus return to the outstanding achievements of faculty and honors earned by students.

Chair Jorgensen: I have been informed that the present convocation costs about \$2,000. It costs \$400 for the Doermann Theatre alone.

Senator Barrett: When practically everyone in this room says I don't know what happens at Spring Convocation; that tells me we have a problem already. It's broken. Now the question is how do you want to fix it? One way is to discontinue it. Another way is to get attendance up. Whatever you do, needs to be mostly focused on good things to get the attendance up. Honoring a handful of faculty will not do that. If you start pulling in college honor ceremonies, you have a lot more recipients and their parents, which potentially will lead to a critical mass. If you want to fix this, you need to have enough things going on that are of interest to enough people to have a dignified and respectful attendance, therefore, making it worthwhile.

Dr. Sheldon: The question is what is enough? When we asked several people what would it take to get you to come, they said they wouldn't. These were faculty members.

Senator Barrett: So you have to target the group getting the awards. That sounds like the solution. However, it strikes me that this is an either/or proposition. You also need to ask are you going to lose something taking individual honors ceremonies out of the colleges-such as attendance of professors who want to be there for their students. So improving convocation might have a non-monetary cost.

Senator Barden: The College of Arts and Sciences ceremony is very well attended and it is because it specifically awards the departmental and college level outstanding students. All the parents are there and all the good work is noted. It is a popular event and it really fills the house.

Chair Jorgensen: I believe not only the name of the top student in each program, but every student graduating who is present also gets their name read.

Senator Humphry's As a member of the Dr. Sheldon's committee, now that we have heard some more input, would it be appropriate at this time to move for a vote.

Chair Jorgensen: We can do a straw vote for you to take back to the committee. The vote would be either do away with the Spring Convocation or scale up the Spring Convocation.

Vice Provost Robert Sheehan: What about the college ceremonies being planned for this spring?

Senator Morrissey: I am wondering if there might not be a way to look at whether or not colleges still might want to do something individually especially since in this day and age, we are all concerned about alumni support and funding. The College of A&S would be reluctant to give up our own ceremony. To include a university-wide event to this, really would significantly increase the degree of ceremonial activity we are engaged in this spring.

Chair Jorgensen: So you are recommending to the committee to check with the individual colleges to see their thoughts as part of the next process.

Senator Morrissey: Yes.

Senator Bowyer: It doesn't have to be a either or. You could still have a college event after this university's events.

Senator Morrissey: Then you need some coordination on the part of the university with the college activities.

Chair Jorgensen: Let us take a straw vote.

All in favor of doing away with the event and letting the colleges do what they want-show of hand.

All in favor moving to a different model but continuing a convocation-raise your hand.

Significant majority supported doing away with the event

Dr. Sheldon: I thank you for your time.

VI. Other Business:

Old Business: None

New Business: None

VII. Adjournment: Chair Jorgensen adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven J. Martin
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Betsy Welsh
Office Admin. Secretary