

4-2-2007

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, April 2, 2007

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/
archives_senate_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes)

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Faculty Senate

April 2, 2007, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes of March 5, 2007**
http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Mar07SenMin_000.pdf

3. **Report of the University President or Provost**

4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**

5. **Old Business**
Items A – C are brought forth by Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC
 - A. COLA Program Change: B.A. French
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/french.pdf>
 - B. COSM New Program: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Microbiology & Immunology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/biomiopt.pdf>
 - C. COSM New Program: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Ecology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bioecopt.pdf>
 - D. Senate Resolution on Parking – Senator Tom Sudkamp (Attachment A)

6. New Business

- A. Lake Campus New Program: B.A. English
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/lcbaeng.pdf>
- B. Proposal of (+) (-) Grading System – Maher Amer, Chair, Student Affairs Committee

Adoption of the following grading scale is recommended by the Student Affairs Committee:

A-	3.70
B+	3.30
B	3.00
B-	2.70
C+	2.30
C	2.00
C-	1.70
D+	1.30
D	1.00
F	0.00

7. Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment B)

- A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer
- B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Cathy Sayer
- C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
- D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: Jim Amon
- E. Information Technology Committee: TK Prasad
- F. Student Affairs Committee: Maher Amer
- G. Student Petitions Committee: Alan Chesen

8. Council Reports

- A. Graduate Council – Jay Thomas

9. Announcements

- A. Nominations, including self-nominations, for Faculty President-Elect (2008-09) are being accepted through Friday, April 13, 2007. Qualifications for the office of Faculty President are stated in the Faculty Constitution located at: <http://www.wright.edu/academics/fhandbook/>

The following is applicable via Provost Memorandum No. 82-3, May 1, 1982:

“The President of the Faculty shall have a two course, or two-third, reduction in his or her full-time teaching load during the Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters of his or her term of office. The President Elect of the Faculty shall have a one course, or one-third, reduction in his or her full-time teaching load for the Spring Quarter of his or her term of office.”

B. Next Faculty Senate: May 7, 2007, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union.

10. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

Faculty Senate Resolution On Parking To President Hopkins and the Board of Trustees

Because the current parking on the main campus does not adequately or effectively serve the students, faculty, and staff, the Faculty Senate strongly recommends:

1. That at least 500 additional parking spaces be added to the main campus by the beginning of the Fall quarter 2007;
2. That the design and construction of the parking facilities incorporate landscaping to provide an aesthetically pleasing view of the campus from Colonel Glenn Highway;
3. That efforts be made to relocate any educational and student life facilities that may be affected by the new parking; and
4. That, by September 2007, the administration submit a report to the Faculty Senate that provides a comprehensive, long term parking plan to accommodate future increases in students, faculty, and staff.

For safety and student convenience, the location of the additional parking should be within 2000 feet of the center of campus and minimize pedestrian traffic over campus roads.

ATTACHMENT B

Senate Committee Reports April 2, 2007

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – James Sayer

The Faculty Budget Priority Committee met on Monday, March 12, 2007 in the Office of the University Faculty. All members were present, with Jon Dunlap present via audiotape.

The meeting had been called to get-together with Mr. Keith Ralston from Budget Planning & Resource Analysis to discuss summer revenues and expenditures, but, unfortunately, Mr. Ralston was ill and could not attend the meeting.

However, Mr. Ralston had provided the committee with data regarding summer budgets, thus allowing the committee members to discuss those numbers and to discuss summer budgeting protocols in general. From that discussion, the following questions emerged:

- Do colleges “skim” some money from their summer allocations, money that does not, therefore, go into faculty summer salaries?
- In looking at the overall revenue/expenses scenario for the summer, it appears that the University takes in \$12 million while spending about \$4.5 million in faculty summer salaries. What is the needed administrative overhead, and what specific formula is used to determine how much of the overall total is distributed to the colleges?
- What are the actual costs of offering summer courses?
- What has been the impact of our Intersession offerings on both summer enrollment and budgets?

Faculty Affairs Committee – Cathy Sayer

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 2 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/7fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Jim Amon

Information Technology Committee – TK Prasad

Student Affairs Committee – Maher Amer

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

**Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
April 2, 2007
2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union**

1. Call to Order

Faculty President Jim Sayer called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

Present (in bold): Akhbari, M.; Allen, J.; Baker, B.; Cavanaugh, J.; Doorley, J.; Goldfinger, M.; Gray, B.; Huang, C.; John, J.; Kay, J.; Killian, J.; Mateti, P.; Mirkin, D.; Nagy, A.; Norris, M.; Otto, R.; Rattan, K.; Sayer, C.; Schatmeyer, K.; Schuster, R.; Self, E.; Slonaker, W.; Small, L. (substituting for Shepelak, N.); Sudkamp, T.; Tarpey T.; Walbroehl, G.; Wenning, M.; Zryd, T.

**Faculty President – Sayer, J.; President - Hopkins, D.; Provost – Angle, S.;
Parliamentarian – Sav, T.; Secretary – Zambenini, P. (Staff)**

2. Approval of Minutes of March 5, 2007

http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Mar07SenMin_000.pdf

Minutes were approved as written.

3. Report of the University President and Provost

President Hopkins

- Welcome to Dr. Angle, our new Provost, who will be a tremendous addition to the university.
- ArtsGala – The excellence of Wright State students in theatre, music and the visual arts was on display at the eighth annual ArtsGala Saturday night. It was a tremendous success in raising scholarship dollars in support of our very talented students.
- Roger Fecher, a biological science major at Wright State, was one of 317 students selected from a field of 1,110 students from across the nation as a Goldwater Scholar for the 2007-08 academic year. The scholarship program honoring Senator Barry Goldwater encourages outstanding students to pursue careers in mathematics, the natural sciences and engineering.
- To commemorate Wright State University's 40th anniversary and the 10th anniversary of the University Center for International Education, the theme for this year's International Friendship Affair is "Celebrations Around the World." Scheduled for Saturday, April 14, from 1:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the Student Union on campus, the International Friendship Affairs is annually one of the most popular, exciting and anticipated events on campus.
- Highly acclaimed actor, producer, director and activist Edward James Olmos will speak at Wright State University on Thursday, April 12, on the topic "We're in the

Same Gang” which ties in with the 7th annual Quest for Community – A Call for Action Conference on April 13.

- State Budget – Governor Strickland issued his budget recommendations for higher education, which include an increase in state formula support of 5% in the coming year and an additional 2% in the following year as part of a covenant that would require no tuition increase this year and no more than a 3% increase in the following year. His budget also continues the phase-in of Ohio College Opportunity Grant (the new, enhanced state need-based aid program) as well as some targeted increases for research, teacher education, and other priorities. A significant portion of these increases is funded by elimination of a voucher program for students attending proprietary schools and a program for students attending private, non-profit colleges except those eligible for need-based aid.
- Governor Strickland’s covenant also includes a requirement for demonstrated cost efficiencies of 1% in the first year and 3% in the second year. We do not know how compliance with this requirement will be measured or whether our recent initiatives will be counted as contributing to these goals.

Vice President Filipic: There is an unusual degree of uncertainty surrounding the legislative reception to the Governor’s proposal for an increase in state funding. For the first time in 12 years, we have a Governor and legislature of opposite parties. The increase in formula funding for public campuses being recommended by the Governor is not coming from new revenue, but rather a reallocation of other programs within the higher education budget; principally, the private college voucher program. If legislature doesn’t accept the source then what we will receive is in question. We’ll be putting together a budget before the legislature finishes its work.

Senator question: Over the last few years, what have the total tuition and state subsidy increases been?

Vice President Filipic: Before receiving a share of the special allocation of \$30 million by action of the state controlling board last June, we received less funding from the state than before my arrival, notwithstanding that those were years of enrollment growth. Since funding is tied to an enrollment base, one would have expected a considerable increase. In those same years, tuition was roughly \$4,000. This last fall it was over \$7,200 – an 80% increase. A result is that the shares of our revenue sources have changed considerably. A consequence of the Governor asking us to share in a pool that is growing 5%, is that we calculate a weighted average and the end result is slightly below a 2% increase in the combined revenue. This is a major challenge, and we will need to work together to reduce our budget and produce one that does not damage the accomplishment of our mission.

Senator question: Recent press reports have revealed that some universities engage in “sweetheart” closed loan deals with private loan companies, who according to the New York Times, “pretend to work for the college but actually have a vested interest in selling the costliest loans.” Further, according to NY state Attorney General Cuomo, a university may promote a specific loan firm in return for kickback monies. Do you agree that Wright State students should not be limited on free market options when seeking loan products, since many such students will graduate with thousands of dollars in student loan related debt?

President Hopkins – Yes. We believe there should be a choice and are looking at options where we believe we can facilitate a group of choices that provide the very best options for students. Concerning Wright State University, our student loan default rate is the lowest in the state and we are below the national average for student debt. We work very hard in counseling students and making a WSU education affordable.

Provost Angle

I look forward to working with everyone. There are interesting issues for us to deal with together. Just being here a short time, one of my first impressions is in regards to our students. I am very proud of them. The ArtsGala was incredible. I have recently met with Student Government and was so impressed about how they care about the institution and are considering the long-term picture. We should all be very proud of our students.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

- The next Executive Committee meeting is April 23 and we will be preparing for the May 7 Faculty Senate meeting.
- A member of the Executive Committee raised an issue of concern regarding theft from faculty offices. We requested that WSU Police Chief Simone Polk address these concerns and present data for the last 18 months regarding incident reports. The data indicated there were 19 reported thefts, seven of which were from Fawcett Hall. The total dollar loss was \$18,681, and all were either books or laptop computers. Chief Polk recommends that faculty close and lock their doors as an added measure of security. There is no way to measure how many thefts go unreported.
- I would like to report that the classrooms located across Colonel Glenn Highway in University Park are magnificent. The rooms are clean, bright and spacious. I commend Registrar Marian Hogue and her staff, the CTL, and CATS for preparing the rooms prior to the start of classes.
- Please note that at your seat is a Resolution that recognizes the efforts of this year's men's basketball team and also last season's NCAA bound baseball team and the great success of the swimming and diving teams. I would like to move that this resolution be adopted. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted by the Faculty Senate. It was requested that President Hopkins relay the Resolution to the Athletics Department.
- Official approval of the new "Appointment, Promotion and Termination of Faculty in Non-Tenure Track Positions" policy, approved by Faculty Senate in January 8, 2007, was received from Provost Angle and is effective April 2, 2007.

5. Old Business

Items A – C are brought forth by Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC

- A. COLA Program Change: B.A. French
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/french.pdf>
 - 1) Moved and seconded to approve.
 - 2) Approved.
- B. COSM New Program: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Microbiology & Immunology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/biomiopt.pdf>
 - 1) Moved and seconded to approve.
 - 2) Approved.
- C. COSM New Program: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Ecology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bioecopt.pdf>
 - 1) Moved and seconded to approve.
 - 2) Approved.
- D. Senate Resolution on Parking – Tom Sudkamp
(Attachment A to the April 2, 2007 Senate Agenda)
(<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/April07SenAgn.pdf>)
 - 1) A motion was made to consider the proposal.
 - 2) Motion to consider seconded and approved.

Discussion:

Senator question: Could you review what happens to a resolution that Senate approves and what influence it has?

Faculty President Sayer: If this body approves this, or a modification of this resolution, I am duty bound to report it to the President and Provost so they are aware of the sense of the Senate.

President Hopkins: Our procedure for the last two years has been to respond to any forthcoming Senate resolutions at the next Senate meeting. We have been studying the issue of parking along with you and are anxious to respond, which hopefully would be at the next Senate meeting, about what we will do in regards to this issue. We will take this resolution seriously, as we always do, and respond in a timely fashion.

Senator question: How likely is this to turn into a parking structure?

President Hopkins: Regarding this particular resolution, it would not be in the near term. Long term it is something we would consider. This resolution would be addressed with the land we have available.

Senator Sudkamp: When we saw the presentation from Dr. Rizki last month with the estimate from the Walker report of \$9 million for a structure, the resolution, at least for the time being is prudent. Also, the CUPA study indicated that only 6% of the respondents would be willing to pay the estimated \$600/yr. to utilize a parking structure, and certainly that is not feasible for many students. The fourth item of the

proposal asks for long-term solutions and if the campus grows, a structure may be the only solution but the resolution does not call for that.

It is worthwhile talking about the costs. Vice President Filipic asked for cost estimates to build lots with 500 spaces, the estimate is about \$1.5 million. All parking costs come from parking fees from students, faculty and staff. We should consider the cost of alternatives. One additional shuttle is \$64k per year. The estimated life of a parking lot, minimally 20 years, means the cost of the shuttle is close to being the same. It is cheaper to build parking lots then add two shuttles.

Senator comment: About five or six comments were received from my COSM constituents. None supported the addition of parking lots but rather to work with the surrounding communities to encourage less car use and find solutions that don't infringe upon green space – most importantly the woods area. Also, to aggressively promote use of the remote lots.

Senator Sudkamp: Along the same line, CECS desired to receive input from faculty, staff and students. I developed a survey for the college's use and along with it, distributed all three proposals from B&G, PAAC, and SG along with a three-bullet summarization of their impact on parking accessibility upon implementation. I'll note that Mr. Turner, SG President, contacted me and disagreed with my characterization of the SG proposal. Forty CECS faculty responded and 38 support the resolution presented today. Two supported the B&G proposal. Twenty-seven staff responded. Twenty-three supported the resolution; four supported the B&G proposal. Five-hundred and eleven students responded. Sixteen percent supported the B&G proposal, 66% supported the resolution, and 18% supported the SG proposal.

Mr. Turner shared concerns that the cost was not addressed in the CECS survey. While true, the idea was to get feedback on parking accessibility. Had we included the projected cost of \$600/yr., there would likely be less support for the B&G proposal. This was not a scientific survey but rather to get a flavor of the desires of the faculty, staff and students in CECS.

Senator comment: Thank you, Tom, for a wonderful presentation and also, thank you to the three committees for their efforts. Students are idealistic and insightful. Dr. Amon is a tireless defender of the importance of environmental considerations. However, I believe Dr. Rizki wins the prize. The problem is that 83.7% of students attending WSU are commuters. They must have somewhere to park. The resolution should call for 1,000, not 500, new spaces. The issue of parking is essential to the growth of the university. With those suggestions, I am happy to support the resolution.

Senator Sudkamp: Thank you, Mel, for the nice words. Please note that the phrasing in the resolution says "at least 500 spaces." We have lost over 950 spaces in the last 15 years. Sixteen percent of our parking has disappeared. One thousand spaces added now would put us just ahead of where we were 15 years ago. I don't want to recommend to the administration as to where the lots should be. Simply, here is the problem and here is the direction the faculty would like you do go.

Senator comment: I did an informal poll of my planning classes. I would like to point out that after thoughtful conversation, they agree that more parking is needed but were concerned that the proposals were separated from a broader understanding of campus planning and building. They felt it was a short-term plan that wasn't integrated and we need to have a long term plan. I agree that as goes parking, so does our retention and feel we need to be more thoughtful, not just about parking, but also about traffic, classroom expansion and enrollment.

Senator comment: The university has grown and will continue to. Growth requires expansion of our infrastructure. This is a deliberative and appropriate way to demonstrate that. I believe this is as careful and realistic a plan as we can see ourselves with the idea in mind that we will continue to grow. I support the resolution. We may need more, but I don't want to miss the opportunity to take care of the problem quickly.

Senator question: Why wasn't the use of Lot 20 included in the resolution?

Senator Sudkamp: This resolution doesn't preclude any of the other suggestions. It addresses the real issue. There have been multiple attempts for people to park in Lot 20 with mixed success. One can do other things such as increase the use of the shuttle, but there is a cost. SG suggested enticing people to Lot 20 with coffee and doughnuts but this is at a cost of \$22k for one year. Doing so for 20 years equals half a parking lot and people don't want to be down there. We don't want to rearrange deck chairs on the Titanic. The real issue is there is a shortage of parking and the resolution addresses this.

Senator comment: It seems inevitable that we will need to build parking structures. With projected growth, and we won't stop, why not build the structures now?

Senator comment: Going back to the Lot 20 issue, the idea was suggested about limiting commuter students to parking in Lot 20. I'm not sure I support that, but we haven't discussed it and I would like to hear realistic discussion.

Faculty President Sayer: Are you suggesting that we would require all first year students to park in Lot 20?

Senator Sudkamp: I don't think that is viable. We are a commuter campus and does this serve our students? If Meijer's studied for 20 years and found that they were having a parking problem, then decided that they would build a lot across the street and have new customers park there and be shuttled back and forth, their new customers would be happy to shop at Target and Walmart. We are a commuter campus. People are coming from work and other areas and struggle to get here. The idea of shuttling doesn't suit our clientele.

Senator question: The resolution refers to making efforts to relocate the playing fields. Is there any thought as to where that space would be relocated?

Faculty President Sayer: Assuming the resolution is passed and the administration finds a way to implement it, I wonder if playing fields would be relocated down Colonel Glenn, towards Meijer.

President Hopkins: Yes, playing fields could possibly be relocated in the grassy area towards Meijer.

Senator comment: Growth is inevitable. As long as there is no architectural vision, we won't have green spaces or parking spaces. Although we have sprawl, we can go vertical. There are many architectural examples that have made different utilization of their space because they were limited. We need to change our architectural vision and cannot allow building because we need a unified structure surrounded by green space.

Senator question: The resolution doesn't mention anything about the bridges or pathways to the area behind Meijer where there is student housing. Including language to address that would stop more cars from entering campus. The prairie areas are about 250 spaces. What other spaces would make up the rest of the 500 spaces requested in the resolution?

Faculty President Sayer: The B&G proposal suggested that additional lots would be in the prairie grass and the other out lot by the softball field. Is that what you were thinking, Tom?

Senator Sudkamp: I wanted to leave that open.

Discussion closed.

- a) Motion to accept the proposal as written.
- b) Voice vote with four nays.
- c) Motion approved.

6. New Business

- A. Lake Campus New Program: B.A. English
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/lcbaeng.pdf>
 - 1) Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- B. Proposal of (+) (-) Grading System – Maher Amer, Chair, Student Affairs Committee

A-	3.70
B+	3.30
B	3.00
B-	2.70
C+	2.30
C	2.00
C-	1.70
D+	1.30
D	1.00
F	0.00

Discussion:

Dr. Amer: This proposal began with a request from Student Government. We have been looking at this issue and collecting research for two or three quarters. The consensus was that this new grading scale would provide faculty with a better assessment method. With the current system, if students slightly miss receiving an "A" grade, they are awarded a "B" grade. We believe it is more fair for the students and research we reviewed by other institutions supports this. It does not require any more effort by the faculty to assess the students. Our Banner system is able to accommodate the change so there is no cost to implement it. We are recommending that this system, which is used by Ohio State University, be adopted. It adds 1/3 of a point for the +/- grades. This provides faculty with a better assessment method that is more fair for the students. The Student Affairs Committee vote on the proposal was: seven-yes, zero-no, one abstention.

Faculty President Sayer: I asked our registrar, Marian Hogue, if there would be a problem implementing this and she assures me there is not. Also, would a faculty member be required to utilize this new scale?

Dr. Amer: If a faculty member decides they don't want to use the new scale, they do not have to.

Senator question: Would you be prepared to present the research that was persuasive to you at the next Senate meeting?

Dr. Amer: Yes.

Senator question: Did you consult any faculty who grade totally on subjective grading of writing and presentation about whether the new scale may require additional work?

Dr. Amer: Where will the additional work come from?

Senator comment: From trying to decide the difference between a B- paper and a C+ paper.

Dr. Amer: If faculty find this is an extra burden, they can use the straight scale.

Senator comment: Except faculty will be unpopular with the students if they don't.

Senator comment: The "A" is left off your scale. Can we assume that is a 4.0?

Dr. Amer: Ohio State does not give A+ - just A which is 4.0.

Senator comment: What about the D- which would be .5?

Dr. Amer: There is no D-.

Senator question: If faculty use the straight scale – 89-80/90-100; how would those numbers fit into your chart?

Dr. Amer: Some faculty use the 60/70 - 80/90 which goes A, B, C, D. It is up to the faculty if they want to use the +/- . We have 10% between A and B but if you want to use this scale you can use the 83/86/90. You add almost 1/3 of a degree which is 1/3 of 10%. Again, it is up to the faculty.

Dr. Sav: I can't speak on behalf of the UCAPC because we haven't had the opportunity to review this proposal, but we studied this issue in 1997-98 and brought it to the Senate and it was decided then that it would not be beneficial to implement a +/- grading system. However, during that research we found the vast majority of +/- grading systems around the country on a .33 grading system meant a C- would be 1.67, a C would be 2.0, and a C+ is 2.33. You are suggesting a scale that rounds up on the - side and down on the + side. This proposal imposes harm on the + student and benefits the - students relative to the vast majority of +/- grading systems.

Also, there will be a great deal of pressure on faculty who do not wish to adopt this system that will come from the + students and could create a volume of student petitions. The other issue is the transfer of grades from other institutions not on a +/- system or that are on a +/- system that is different from the one you're proposing, such as the .33 scale. I believe these issues need to be sifted out and the transfer issue needs to be addressed. Last January, Faculty Senate approved a Transfer policy on +/- grades which you may want to look at.

If you look at the research we did in 1997-98, the vast majority of systems recommend faculty use 80-82 as B- and 83-86 as B, and 87-89 as B+.

Senator comment: Does this proposal pertain to both undergraduate and graduate students.

Dr. Amer: No, this is for only undergraduate students.

Senator Sudkamp: Can we get the opinion of UCAPC?

Dr. Sav: If you want to commit it to us then yes, but we cannot have anything prepared by the May meeting because we would need to update our research. At that time, of the 13 public institutions in Ohio, eight were not on +/- and five were. That may have changed.

Faculty President Sayer: Thank you for being with us and I hope you can join us for the May meeting and thank the Student Affairs Committee members.

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment B to the April 2, 2007 Agenda.
(<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/April07SenAgn.pdf>)
- The Faculty Budget Priority Committee met early in March but due to illness, Mr. Ralston was not able to attend. The committee will continue discussion on summer budgeting and revenues, and generated a series of questions

regarding how formulae are determined in terms of how money is dispensed in the colleges and departments for summer salaries.

- A written report from Faculty Affairs was distributed. The committee looked at the recently approved Appointment, Promotion and Termination of Faculty in Non-Tenure Track Positions and how it can be implemented, and developed criteria for the new Senior Lecturer position that was recently created.
- Alan Chesen will replace the retiring KT Mechlin as the chair of Student Petitions. He has provided a report today.

8. Council Reports

- A. Graduate Council – Jay Thomas (The report was distributed at the meeting.)
- Transfer credit
 - Graduate faculty status
 - Master of Information System (RSCOB) has been forwarded to OBR

9. Announcements

- A. Nominations for the position of Faculty President, including self nominations, are being accepted through Friday, April 13.

10. Adjournment

- A. The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, May 7, 2007, 2:45 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz