

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE

Official Proceedings

April 4, 2018

Members Present: Keith Whitfield, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair; Louis J. Romano, President, Academic Senate; Robert Ackerman; Jocelyn Ang; Leela Arava; Poonam Arya; Linda Beale; Paul Beavers; Scott Bowen; Timothy Bowman; Tamara Bray; Krista Brumley; Stephen Calkins; Margit Chadwell; Pamela Dale; Victoria Dallas; Susan Davis; Brian Edwards; Susan Eggly; Jane Fitzgibbon; Moira Fracassa; Andrew Fribley; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Goldner; Carolyn Herrington; Billicia Hines; renee hoogland; Michael Horn; Barbara Jones; Nirupama Kannikeswaran; Donna Kashian; Mahendra Kavdia; David Kessel; Fayetta Keys; Christine Knapp; Sarah Lenhoff; Christopher Lund; Karen MacDonell; Katheryn Maguire; Kypros Markou; Aaron Martin; Santanu Mitra; Rayman Mohamed; Bryan Morrow; S. Asli Ozgun-Koca; Victoria Pardo; Rachel Pawlowski; Alexey Petrov; Richard Pineau; Michele Porter; T. R. Reddy; Robert Reynolds; Michele Ronnick; Brad Roth; Anne Rothe; Heather Sandlin; Naida Simon; Richard Smith; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Jennifer Wareham; Robert D. Welch; Hossein Yarandi; Fu-Shin Yu

Members Absent with Notice: Cathryn Bock; Alan Dombkowski; Kelly Driscoll; Smiti Gupta; Lance Heilbrun; Amanuel Tekleab; Jinping Xu; Yang Zhao

Members Absent: Nancy George; Kristen Kaszeta; Todd Leff; Bharati Mitra; Charles Parrish; Izabela Podgorski; Beena Sood; Jeffrey Withey; Xin Wu

Others Present: Jeffrey Bolton, Senior Director, University Budget; Rebecca Cooke, Associate Vice President for Finance and Administration for Health Affairs and School of Medicine Vice Dean for Fiscal Affairs; William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Business Operations; David Hefner, Vice President for Health Affairs; Celeste Lezuch, Assistant Vice President for Academic Administration; James Quinn, Office of the Academic Senate; Karin Tarpenning, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Angela Wisniewski, Office of the Academic Senate

CALL TO ORDER: This regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Provost Whitfield at 1:35 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

I. UPDATE ON THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Vice President Hefner and Associate Vice President Cooke made the report. Mr. Hefner reviewed the financial performance of the School of Medicine (SOM), the University Physician Group (UPG), and the Fund for Medical Research and Education (FMRE) from fiscal year 2013 projected to fiscal year 2019. The decline in the FMRE began in FY

2014 with a deficit of \$3.4 million. In FY 2015 the combined deficit of the SOM, the UPG, and the FMRE was \$32.7 million. Mr. Hefner projects that the entities will not have a deficit in FY 2019.

Seven funds, including the general fund and the research stimulation fund, comprise the entire budget for the School of Medicine. That combined budget is referred to as the all funds budget. It can be misleading to look at only one piece of a budget, such as the general fund. Mr. Decatur has been promoting and the University is moving towards an all funds budget. In an all funds budget expenses can be moved between funds but income cannot be moved.

The all funds category for FY 2017 shows a deficit of \$4.2 million and the general fund category shows a surplus of \$2.5 million. However, the Medical School is doing very well even though it spent \$4.2 million more than it brought in. The research stimulation and other account fund from which money was spent on new faculty start up costs has a \$4 million deficit but there is a year-end available fund reserve of \$32 million across all funds within the SOM.

There are \$11 million in interest in the spending account for endowments. People are not sure how some of the money can be spent. Perhaps it could be used to cover expenses that otherwise would come out of the general fund or another account. Under the RCM model units live off their own revenue and it will be important for schools to look at all of their accounts, not just the general fund account.

Mr. Hefner added that more than \$30 million from the FMRE are owed to the University. That money may never be repaid. If it were repaid, the FMRE would declare bankruptcy. The University and the FMRE are negotiating whether any of that money can be collected. The University has set up an allowance for that amount if the money cannot be collected.

Asked what has been done so the SOM does not accumulate another deficit of \$30 million, Mr. Hefner said that the School has reduced the number of under-productive faculty, tightened all expenses, collected all revenues, right sized expenditures in the UPG, and re-negotiated leases.

Mr. Petrov asked how money from endowments could be used because that money usually is restricted for specific purposes. Ms. Cooke explained that they are looking at each gift agreement and looking if the School is doing

something that meets the purpose of the endowment. They may ask the donor if the money can be used to meet another need. If the donor has died, the University can ask the state attorney general if we can use the money for another purpose. The University has asked the attorney general to allow it to expand the purpose of some very restrictive scholarships to use them for a broader population.

Mr. Villarosa asked how much money would be saved through the process to reduce the number of unproductive faculty. Mr. Hefner said that some faculty have opted to retire under the phased retirement program. At the end of that three-year time period, the University will have savings of \$8 to \$9 million per year, including benefits.

The presenters turned to improvements and achievements that the SOM has experienced. A few years ago, Ms. Cooke said, the Medical School was at risk of being put on probation by the LCME, the accrediting body for medical schools. In 2015, the LCME rated the SOM as unsatisfactory in many areas, but in less than one and one-half years, it improved so much that it was given the full eight-year accreditation. The only element still rated as unsatisfactory is curricular design and content because the School is still revising its Year One curriculum. The students entering in 2018 will be the first to use the new curriculum.

The number of applicants has increased from 4,951 in 2014 to 8,673 in 2018. With such a large number we have a more diverse pool of applicants. The School did not lower its standards; it recruited more applicants. The students selected had higher scores and higher GPAs. The number of under-represented minorities increased from 15 in 2015 to 63 in 2017.

After their first year in medical school, students take the USMLE Step 1 exam. If they do not pass the exam, they do not progress in medical school. In 2017 99% passed the exam on their first attempt.

Match Day is the day when graduating students find out with which residency program they have matched. Mr. Hefner noted that the process is very competitive with 6,000 to 8,000 more applicants than there are positions to be filled. Miss Cooke said that 98% of our students matched this year, a record for Wayne State. A majority of our graduates matched into programs in Michigan. Wayne State is populating Michigan with doctors. Most doctors stay where they did their residency. A significant percentage matched into primary care. Our graduates in 2018 placed in 32 states and in two Canadian provinces. Mr. Hefner added that these markers show that the state is getting a good return for its investment.

The SOM accounts for about 70% of the University's research funding. Research funding is measured by

how much money we are spending. Expenditures are a year-over-year measure. The SOM has over \$1 million in grant expenditures.

A program was implemented to retain faculty who are at risk to leave Wayne State. A relatively small amount of money was invested in upgrading laboratories, purchasing equipment, and increasing salaries. The investment resulted in the retention of a significant number of faculty who held 16 grants for a total of indirect costs of \$25 million. Mr. Hefner mentioned that over this period of time, faculty with over \$20 million in grants left the University.

Ms. Cooke continued. The School developed a program to help junior faculty and faculty who were on hiatus of grant funding to submit grant applications. An investment of \$54,000 to hire a firm that assists in writing grants resulted in four RO1 grants that were directly attributable to the program.

The SOM has raised 94% of its goal for the capital campaign. The Association of American Medical Colleges selected the School as one of three finalists for its Outstanding Community Service Award. Students are required to participate in learning projects in the community. This ended the formal presentation.

Mr. Romano asked several questions. In 2015 the LCME rated the School as "satisfactory with monitoring" in finances although it had a \$32 million deficit. On what did the LCME base its rating? Ms. Cooke said that they look at financial information related to whether the School is providing a learning environment for students.

Mr. Romano also asked on what the School spends the money it gets from the FMRE. Mr. Hefner responded. A portion of clinical earnings pay the Dean's tax that funds the FMRE, about \$12 to \$14 million per year. That money goes into the School's budget and the Dean apportions the money. In the past about 90% of the money supported clinical departments but that amount has dropped to about 40%. Very little is spent on new initiatives. Ideally you want the bulk of the FMRE to be used for start up packages and for seed funding. Now it is mostly used to bring salaries up to competitive levels to keep faculty from leaving.

Ms. Beale asked the source of the research stimulation account that has a \$4 million deficit. Mr. Hefner said that most of the money is indirect cost recovery money that flows through the Office of the Vice President for Research or the Provost. Typically, ICR money is used for bricks and mortar, utilities, and real overhead expenses, not funding start ups.

Ms. Eggy asked about the status of the detouring process. Mr. Hefner replied that a few cases continue in the process. Some faculty who had new

expectations have met or exceeded the expectations. Some have not and they may face the detouring process. He added that expectations of faculty have increased everywhere, not just at Wayne State.

The PowerPoint presentation is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix A.

II. RESPONSIBILITY CENTERED MANAGEMENT (RCM) UPDATE

Provost Whitfield and Vice President for Finance and Business Operations William Decatur updated the Senate on the progress of adopting the RCM budget model.

Provost Whitfield stated the guiding principles of the budget model:

- 1) Create structures that encourage revenue generation, innovation and collaboration.
- 2) Link academic authority and financial responsibility. The money flows more directly to academic programs and research if these are linked.
- 3) Enhance the student learning experience and further our research agenda, especially related to translational, interdisciplinary, and pan-university research and scholarship.
- 4) Attract, retain and support talented faculty and staff.
- 5) Nurture academic integrity, excellence and effectiveness.
- 6) Promote our mission of service to the city, region and world.
- 7) Ensure budget model system and corresponding elements endorse collaboration rather than competition. When RCM fails, colleges compete for courses. As an example, to increase its credit hours and tuition money, a school of business might want to offer a course in English for business majors.

The process of converting to the RCM model began prior to 2017, but the kickoff and the creation of a committee occurred last year. One of the primary goals is transparency and inclusion. The committee members are working on different elements, such as revenue generation, communication, and cost allocations. There is no pure RCM model. It is always modified. Many academic units are not completely self-sufficient. Central administration dollars for providing support services may be used to support academics.

As the budget model is being developed the committee is attempting to meet some of the University's unique needs that are listed below.

- 1) Support the Strategic Plan.
- 2) Provide schools/colleges/divisions with better data to make timely, responsive resource decisions. We have software from the

Educational Advisory Board to build data-driven decision-making.

- 3) Focus on long-range planning. Deans must change from thinking about what happened last year to thinking about what will happen in the next three years.
- 4) Enable strategic decisions with a focus on return on investment. However, we have values that we consider. We have areas that are not big revenue generators, but they are important for a large research university in an urban setting.
- 5) Encourage and reward revenue generation and cost effectiveness, given limited resources.
- 6) Design incentives that encourage ownership at the unit level to appropriately leverage the tuition and fees allocation structure, enable revenue growth, positively impact faculty through more flexibility to increase resources, and enhance the student experience while helping expedite their progress to degree.

Vice President Decatur reported on the preliminary recommendations of the committee. The task force has been looking at the following key variables: revenue, allocation methodology, cost allocation methodology, what kind of incentives do we want to create, how do we provide strategic funding. Some of the task forces have preliminary recommendations. They are seeking feedback about the recommendations to the task forces and the steering committee.

Looking at an EAB compendium of universities with RCM models you find that there is no one model and that no university has a pure RCM model. WSU is moving to an all funds model. The University's budget is \$645 million for fiscal year 2018. Most of the other funds primarily are dedicated to a college or school so they will not be run through the model but they will be budgeted and tracked.

Mr. Decatur mentioned some of the recommendations of the task forces. It is recommended that all of the tuition revenue be allocated to the school or college that is generating the revenue. How much weight do you give to undergraduate tuition revenue? How much weight do you give to the unit producing the undergraduate credit hours and how much weight do you give to the major? There are a lot of costs associated with serving the major. At this time, the recommendation is that 75% of the tuition goes to the college producing the credit hours and 25% to the major.

Mr. Decatur next spoke about the allocation of state appropriation to units. The state appropriation currently just about covers the cost of the non-revenue-generating operations such as Finance and Business Operations. Some universities allocate all of their state revenue to their schools and colleges that are then taxed to provide revenue to the non-generating units. Some universities use their state's

funding formula as the allocation methodology to distribute the state funding to their schools and colleges. The State of Michigan's distribution is based on last year's appropriation with any increase being based on the performance funding model.

If all of the appropriation is distributed to the schools and colleges, we have to decide on what basis to do it. If all of the revenue is allocated to the schools and colleges, how do you allocate the overhead costs, the costs of the non-revenue-generating units? Now space is a free good. The task force is considering applying cost allocation to space. A key variable in the model is how do you provide a pool of strategic funding for new initiatives. If we are starting a new academic program we have to provide money for a number of years. Then, hopefully it becomes net income producing for the unit and the strategic dollars can be used for another initiative.

Mr. Decatur explained subvention methodology. In a pure RCM model, schools and colleges only get the revenue that they generate. Some schools and colleges are net generating; some are not. At the minimum schools and colleges need time to adapt to a new model. If we were moving to a pure RCM model, the schools and colleges would need several years to make adjustments to grow revenue. In the proposed model, we are not drilling down to the department level, but Deans may.

Several schools and colleges are small and, because of accreditation, have low student-faculty ratios. Their tuition is at or above market. They are nationally ranked but they will never be net positive. We have to provide subvention or subsidization.

Mr. Decatur next spoke about methodologies and incentives for other revenues. Currently ICR money is distributed among the principal investigator, the department, the college, the Vice President for Research, and the central general fund budget. The most common distribution that universities use is the allocation of 100% of the facilities and administrative cost recovery to the school/college/division that generates the revenue. It is recommended that Wayne State do that, also.

One concern about the RCM model is that schools and colleges may go into a silo mentality and not be interested in working in multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary research. A task force is researching the methodologies used by other universities to see what works best to incentivize these goals.

A task force is looking at what student success means and how to incentivize it.

Mr. Decatur said that a team is selecting and implementing budget software, building pro formas to see how the model works. They will share it with the Deans, the Vice President for business affairs,

and faculty. They will educate the campus community about the budget model.

The target date for finalizing the budget model is December 15, 2018. It is to go into effect the following fiscal year, and fully implemented in FY 2021.

Mr. Volz mentioned that it appeared that the implementation of new budget models worked differently if an institution was at a point where it was cutting its budget or if it had new revenue coming in. He asked Mr. Decatur if he has projected what the rate of growth might be in FY 2021. Mr. Decatur said that tuition revenue has been growing 3 to 4% every year. Governor Snyder's cap in his budget proposal for fiscal year 2019 is 3.8%. The variable in determining revenue is enrollment growth.

Mr. Romano expressed concern about the timetable. Important questions still needed to be addressed. More input is needed from units. We don't know which colleges produce revenue and which do not. We don't know which units will receive the general fund money from the state or how much the subvention will be. Town halls ought to be held after these questions are addressed so the faculty have a better understanding how their units will be affected. Mr. Decatur said that there would be input on the model before the town halls that will be held in the fall.

Ms. Rothe, who served on one of the committees, said that there was extensive faculty input into the process. She likes that success is being rewarded and that units that are valuable to the University are being supported. She asked why the model did not drill down to departments. Mr. Decatur believes that there will be many departments that will not produce revenue. There is a risk in creating a budget model that will lead to conversations about eliminating departments that do not produce enough revenue. Some people have said that the purpose of the RCM model was to eliminate departments. That is not the purpose. The purpose is to incentivize schools and colleges to produce more revenue and to put Deans in a position of entrepreneurship and leadership. Some Deans may take the model down to the departments because the departments may be able to modify their behavior to generate more revenue for the school or college.

Ms. Bray was concerned how the state appropriation would be allocated. She thought there ought to be a balance in terms of incentivizing and cutting costs. It did not seem that the Administration was being asked to do likewise. Mr. Decatur said that the state appropriation barely covers all of the administrative operations. This puts more pressure on administrative units. The state appropriation has not even covered the cost of compensation increases. He thinks there will be more pressure on the support operations to reduce costs. The

academic units are being held to a bottom line target. In his experience, universities have developed assessment processes for support operations that provide systematic feedback from faculty and other users, such as satisfaction surveys, comparative analyses with other universities, and financial analysis.

This concluded the discussion. Provost Whitfield encouraged faculty to attend the town hall on April 18 to get their questions answered.

The PowerPoint presentation is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix B.

III. MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE

A. Proposed Amendment to Article X, Section 9 of the Bylaws

The proposed amendment to Article X, Section 9 of the Bylaws regarding voting at Senate meetings was presented and discussed at the March 7 meeting. Mr. Romano explained the reason for the proposal. The current language is as follows: "Voting shall ordinarily be viva voce or by a show of hands, but at the discretion of the Chair or when requested by two or more members, the Senate President shall poll the members present and record each individual's vote or take a secret ballot." As it now reads, two members could ask that the vote be by secret ballot and two members could ask that members be polled and the votes recorded. The body would be at an impasse.

In December 2017 an amendment was proposed that required an affirmative vote by a majority of Senate members present to vote by secret ballot or to have a roll call vote. That amendment failed. In the discussions about that first proposal some members believed that people might favor having more than two members but less than a majority of the members supporting a motion for a secret ballot.

Policy Committee revised the proposal. If one third of the members present and voting by voice or show of hands requested a secret ballot, it would be done. Policy Committee removed the statement about a roll call vote to avoid conflict between a request for a secret ballot and a request for a roll call vote.

Although some members thought the Bylaws should remain as they are, others spoke to the fact that the Senate is a representative body and, unless there are unusual circumstances, constituents should know how their representatives vote. In addition, in some cases voting on every issue before the body could take a long time.

Policy Committee believed there should be some rationale for voting by secret ballot.

The proposed amendment is as follows with the change italicized.

Section 9. Voting

Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws, a majority of those present and voting shall be sufficient to pass motions. Voting shall ordinarily be by voice or by a show of hands. *At the discretion of the Chair or, following a seconded motion, by a vote of one third of the members present and voting by voice or show of hands, the vote may be taken by a secret ballot.* Any member who has not explained a personal position in the debate prior to voting shall be permitted to do so after all the votes have been recorded and before any new matters are considered. Such statement shall be reported in the proceedings upon his/her request.

Mr. Volz stated that he would vote against the proposed amendment. He believes in the power and validity of the secret ballot. There are a number of instances where in confidence the Senate can recommend to the Provost on academic policy and can voice what we fundamentally believe in. If someone was to reduce the number of science courses required in the general education program or reduce the need for a Governmental Affairs office a price would be paid that need not be paid. Senate members should be able to exercise academic freedom by voting as they see fit. The proposed amendment is an attempt to limit access to the secret ballot, and he is opposed to that kind of initiative.

Ms. Beale said that as members of academe representing the various bodies that elect members of the Senate they have an obligation to the people they represent to be willing to voice their views openly. Openness and transparency is a key value and the Senate should support that academic value in this representative body. A secret ballot is appropriate when handling personnel issues but openness and transparency should be used when voting on educational policy. The Senate wants to carry weight with the Administration and the Board of Governors. It does that when we state our views on educational matters. Ms. Beale is very supportive of having open and transparent voting on most topics and requiring more than two individuals to call for a secret ballot.

Mr. Romano pointed out that the Policy Committee is not stating that the Senate should not have secret ballots; in some instances they could be advantageous. However, the threshold should be more than two people. A member who wants a secret ballot should make an argument to convince a significant number of the members

that we should vote by secret ballot. Requiring only two members is unfair to the rest of the body.

The proposed amendment PASSED. The vote was 43 in favor, 8 opposed, and 1 abstention.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of March 7, 2018. PASSED.

V. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

Mr. Romano made his report.

The Presidential Symposium on Big Data was very well done. The talks and discussion were interesting.

A Presidential Symposium on School Choice in Urban America will be held on April 18. It is hosted by the College of Education. This symposium and the other symposia are held in conjunction with the sesquicentennial celebration. The events may be found at 150.wayne.edu.

The combined undergraduate and graduate summer enrollment is up about 6%. Enrollment for the fall term also is predicted to be up slightly.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of February 26, 2018, and March 5, 2018. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix C.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Elections Committee

1. Election of the Senate President

Prior to the meeting, Linda Beale was nominated to serve as Senate President for the 2018-19 academic year, and she accepted the nomination. Ms. Simon, the Chair of the Elections Committee, opened the floor for additional nominations. There being none, Ms. Simon MOVED to CLOSE nominations. SECONDED. PASSED.

Ms. Simon MOVED that the Senate ELECT Ms. Beale by acclamation. SECONDED. PASSED.

Ms. Beale thanked the Senate members for their confidence in her.

2. Proposal to Amend Article VII, Section 7 of the Bylaws

Mr. Romano introduced the proposed amendment. For the past several years the number of nominees for the Policy Committee has equaled the number of seats to be filled. The Senate has voted only to elect the person who would serve the three-year term. Mr. Calkins, the Parliamentarian, said that procedure was not in agreement with our Bylaws. In addition, Mr. Romano said, the procedure for electing the Committee is confusing. The Elections Committee, the Policy Committee, and Ms. Beale wrote a proposal to revise the Bylaws governing the election of the Policy Committee.

Mr. Romano gave an example. If there were more nominees than there are positions, i.e., if there were six nominees for five positions, the top five nominees would be elected if each one received a majority of the votes cast. If all did not have a majority, the people who had a majority would be declared elected and would be removed from the ballot. The Senate would vote on the nominees who were not elected to fill the remaining open seats. All who are elected would have to receive a majority of the votes cast.

When all vacancies are filled another vote would be taken to elect the person who will serve the three-year term. All the newly elected would be on the slate. The person receiving the highest number of votes would be elected to the three-year term.

Discussion and the vote on the proposed amendment will take place at the May 2 Senate meeting.

VII. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Whitfield reported that three outstanding candidates for the deanship of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences would visit campus this month.

The Provost took questions from the members.

Mr. Edwards relayed problems that arose when the Department of Biochemistry, Microbiology and Immunology hired a new faculty member. Provost Whitfield will look into the matter.

Mr. Mohamed asked whether, as he had heard, in April Provost Whitfield would approve the requests for faculty hires for fall 2019. He stressed that it was important for his department to hire faculty, especially minority candidates, between November and January for the following academic year. The Provost said that is his intention. The call for faculty positions will be released to the Deans relatively soon. There will be fewer positions than

in the past. He will encourage interdisciplinary hiring. This does not mean that a faculty member would have to span two departments, but that faculty in different colleges would work around a substantive area. We cannot proceed until we have some preliminary ideas what the budget will be, but he does want the process to begin earlier.

Ms. Maguire provided information about the town hall on the RCM budget model. It will be live streamed and recorded. The RSVP will be sent out soon. People will be able to submit questions in advance.

Ms. Beale said that if we have a town hall on RCM we need to have more information than was presented today in order to comment on it. Ideally, we should see the recommendations from the task forces whether or not they were approved by the steering committee. We need to know what the faculty and administrators have been talking about in order to respond.

Ms. Maguire said that in September and October the Steering Committee would have what they are calling "The Road Show" when some of the blanks will be filled. A modified version of what was presented to the Senate today would be tailored to each college and presented individually to the colleges. That will be the best opportunity for feedback.

Mr. Fribley noted the death of Deepak Bhalla, Dean of the Eugene Applebaum College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, and he asked if a search for a new Dean would be carried out. The Provost said that Catherine Lysack, Professor of Occupational Therapy and Deputy Director of the Institute of Gerontology, has accepted a two-year appointment as Interim Dean of the College. Dean Lysack is very experienced and led the College in the past.

There will be other searches for Deans. For example, the search for the Dean of Medicine probably will begin this summer to replace Dean Sobel in July 2019. The new Dean of Medicine will be involved in the search for a Dean of Pharmacy.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis J. Romano
President, Academic Senate