

September 30, 2002

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 09/30/2002

John G. Flyn
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Flyn, John G., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 09/30/2002" (2002). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 13.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10005390>

This work is available open access, hosted by Northeastern University.

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: JOHN G. FLYM, SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2002-2003 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 30 SEPTEMBER 2002

Present: (Professors) Alper, Alverson, Aroian, Baclawski, Bannister, Barnes, Bruns, Ellis, Flym, Gilmore, Hall, Herman, Hope, Kane, Khaw, Lowndes, Metghalchi, Morrison, Ondrechen, Platt, Powers-Lee, Rotella, Serafim, Shafai, Sherman, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wallin, Wertheim, Wray
(Administrators) Abdelal, Mantella, Meservey, Pantalone, Putnam, Stellar

Absent: (Professors) Brookins
(Administrators) Greene, Onan, Soyster, Zoloth

Convened by Provost Abdelal at 11:50 a.m.

- I. **Minutes.** The minutes of the June 3 organizational meeting were approved.
- II. **SAC Report.** Speaking on behalf of the faculty and the Faculty Senate, Professor Lowndes welcomed Provost Abdelal to the University and to the Faculty Senate and wished him every success and happiness in his new position.
Professor Lowndes then reported on the following.
 - A. **New Senator.** Welcome to Professor Wallace W. Sherwood who has been elected by the College of Criminal Justice to replace Professor Manning who resigned.
 - B. **Parliamentarian.** Professor Barnes has agreed to serve again as Parliamentarian.
 - C. **Grievance Coordinator.** Professor Flym has agreed to serve again as Grievance Coordinator.
 - D. **Senate Meetings.** Senate meetings will be held in two different locations this year. Most meetings will be in the Raytheon Amphitheater, 240 Egan, with the remainder in 308 Snell Engineering.
 - E. **SAC Meetings.** Since its election last June, the Agenda Committee has met four times in regular sessions, some of them long, and once with Provost Abdelal. Professor Lowndes also met with Provost Abdelal three times.
 - F. **President's Response to 2001-2002 Senate Resolutions.** President Freeland responded to a number of Senate resolutions over the summer. These responses will appear in the Annual Report, which will be distributed shortly.
 - G. **Administrator Evaluations.** The evaluation reports on Dean Larry Finkelstein of Computer Science and Dean Stephen Zoloth of Bouvé College have been released for reading in the Senate Office by the faculty of their respective colleges. The evaluation report on the Law, Policy, and Society Program has also been released and is available for review by faculty involved in the program.
 - H. **Searches.** The Provost has charged the Agenda Committee to initiate chair searches for the Departments of Biology and Visual Arts.

Biology (internal).

The committee is staffed and a meeting is being scheduled. Members are:

Professor Frederick C. Davis (Biology)
Professor Charles H. Ellis, Jr. (Biology)
Professor Slava S. Epstein (Biology)
Professor Meredith H. Harris (Physical Therapy)
Professor Philip W. LeQuesne (Chemistry)

Visual Arts (external).

The committee is being staffed.

I. University Technology Council

Faculty representatives:

Anthony P. De Ritis (Music)
 Gerald H. Herman (History)
 A. Bruce McDonald (Electrical and Computer Engineering)
 Richard Rasala (Computer Science)
 Marius M. Solomon (Management Science)
 Robert P. Lowndes (Physics) *ex officio*

- J. **2001-02 Senate Unfinished Business.** There is a substantial amount of unfinished business from last year that will be brought before the Senate this year: the reports of the *Ad Hoc* Faculty Handbook Review Committee, the *Ad Hoc* Institutional Management Practices Committee, the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Athletics, and the Standing Committee on Athletics. In addition, the Senate will need to conclude its deliberations on the report of the Standing Committee on Academic Policy concerning the Honors Program.
- K. **Focus for the 2002-03 Faculty Senate.** The University has an announced goal to achieve top-100 status. The Senate Agenda Committee supports this goal with great enthusiasm. The Senate Agenda Committee recognizes that all current top-100 institutions will be determined to maintain their status, and that institutions both above and below us will have the same aspirations as our own. The recent *US News and World Report: 2003 America's Best Colleges* confirms the very competitive nature of our task. For us to succeed, therefore, will require an integrated strategic effort that embraces significant advances rather than small perturbations, and that supports continuing commitments for major improvement and change. In order to succeed, we will need to adopt now the practices and investment levels of top-100 institutions. This year, the Senate Agenda Committee is therefore again presenting charges to its committees that address issues that are vital for the University's advance towards top-100 status. In addition, in this important year prior to semester conversion, the Senate Agenda Committee stands ready to rapidly facilitate discussions on any issue germane to the transition that is brought to its attention.
- L. **Primer on Progress.** The attached report provides a brief progress update on some factors relevant to the University's goal to attain top-100 status, as well as background information for some of the charges to the Standing Committees of the 2002-03 Faculty Senate. The report looks at the latest rankings in the *US News and World Report: 2003 America's Best Colleges*; sponsored research activities; and the declining size of the professoriate.
- M. **Standing Committees of the Senate.** With the above focus, therefore, the staffing and charges for four of the Senate Standing Committees have been completed as follows:

Academic Policy Committee

Membership:

Professor Gerald H. Herman, Chair, (His tory)
 Professor Christopher J. Bosso (Political Science)
 Professor Hameed Metghalchi (Mechanical, Industrial, and Manufacturing Engineering)
 Professor Mary E. O'Connell (Law)
 Professor Robert F. Young (Marketing)
 Provost Ahmed Abdelal
 Linda D. Allen, University Registrar, *ex officio*
 James Brand, Director, Space Planning, *ex officio*

Background:

A presence in the top-100 institutions demands the delivery of an undergraduate education of the highest possible quality. This in turn demands the very best faculty and the very best classrooms. In recent years there has been a constant upgrading of Northeastern's classrooms. Nevertheless, issues with the number of classrooms and with the technology available within them continue to persist. For the longest time, Northeastern has operated on a very high level of utilization of its classrooms. Such a practice leads to obvious scheduling difficulties as well as the scheduling of maintenance and upgrades. In addition, technology is not available in all classrooms and even upgraded classrooms cannot always be made available to faculty desiring them. All of this can lead to significant frustrations for both faculty and students. These difficulties may be exacerbated by the forthcoming conversion to a semester calendar.

Classroom size plays a significant role in the institutional rankings in the *US News and World Report: 2003 America's Best Colleges*. The quality of classrooms surely plays a significant role in the learning process and therefore in retention and graduation, both important factors in the *US News* rankings. In addition, the *US News* rankings focus special attention on the number of classes with fewer than 20 students (the higher the number the better). For institutions in Tier 1, for example, 55% of all undergraduate courses taught have fewer than 20 students; the average for Tier 2 institutions is 44% and that for Tier 3 institutions is 43%. The average for Northeastern is 39% and it is ranked 39th out of a total of 65 institutions in Tier 3 for this measure. Northeastern may need more classrooms in order to improve in this category.

Charge:

The Academic Policy Committee has been asked to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following four-part charge:

1. Assess the current high-utilization classroom policy at Northeastern and identify all consequent problems associated with this, especially those that have impact on our goal for top-100 status.
2. Assess the overall quality of Northeastern classrooms and identify specific changes needed in classroom quality, technology, etc., in order for us to provide an outstanding learning environment commensurate with top-100 status.
3. Make recommendations on any classroom inventory changes needed at Northeastern in order to approach the classroom inventories and operating occupancies at matchmate institutions consistent with our top-100 goal.
4. Make recommendations on classroom inventory changes needed at Northeastern in order to move towards a more competitive position with Tier 1 and Tier 2 institutions for the number of undergraduate classes being taught with fewer than 20 students.
5. The Committee has been asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than April 15, 2003.

The Committee has been asked to present its report on this charge to the Senate Agenda Committee by no later than April 15, 2003.

Enrollment and Admissions Policy Committee

Membership:

Professor Phyllis R. Strauss, Chair, (Biology)
 Professor Brendan Bannister (Human Resources Management)
 Professor John Casey (Computer Science)
 Professor Dorett M. Hope (Nursing)
 Professor Stephen M. Kane (Cooperative Education and Engineering)
 Senior Vice President Philomena Mantella

Background:

The *US News* 2003 rankings adopts the position that the higher the proportion of freshmen who return to campus the following year and eventually graduate, the better a school is apt to be at offering the classes and services students need to succeed. They use two different factors in their rankings: the graduation and retention rate (20 percent of the overall ranking), and the graduation rate performance (5 percent of the overall ranking).

The graduation and retention rate has two components: a six-year graduation rate (80 percent of the score) and a freshman retention rate (20 percent of the score). The graduation rate is the average percent of a graduating class that earns a degree in six years or less.

The graduation rate performance is defined as the difference between the actual six-year graduation rate for students entering in the fall (of 1995 for the current 2003 rankings) and the predicted graduation rate. The predicted graduation rate is based upon characteristics of the entering class, as well as characteristics of the institution. If a school's actual graduation rate is higher than the predicted rate, then the school is enhancing achievement.

Graduation and retention therefore account for 25 percent of the overall *US News* 2003 rankings. These components will be shaped by the caliber and appropriateness of students who join the University, and we have some degree of control over this. The more difficult part involves the experiences and progress of the students after they have matriculated. Much has been done to improve this aspect. However, one area for improvement may be the development of key information data bases that provide faculty advisors and appropriate administrators with access to real-time data on all students' performance in the classroom, in cooperative education, and in other experiential education activities, as well as any other key information that may affect their retention or graduation. This will be especially true during the semester conversion years, including this year.

Charge:

The Enrollment and Admission Policy Committee has been asked to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, identifying new or existing measures for real-time data bases that may play a vital role in characterizing students' academic and cooperative and experiential education progress and thereby enabling enhanced decision making for improved retention and graduation. The Committee has been asked to report back on these matters by 3 March 2003.

Faculty Development Committee

Membership:

Professor Neil O. Alper, Chair, (Economics)
 Professor Surendra M. Gupta, Co-Chair, (Mechanical, Industrial, and Manufacturing Eng.)
 Professor Ban-An Khaw (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
 Professor Joseph W. Meador (Finance and Insurance)
 Professor Mary Jo Ondrechen (Chemistry)

Background:

Faculty workloads generally have three main components: teaching; research, scholarship, and creative activities; and service. It is the ongoing belief of many faculty that faculty workloads, and especially teaching loads, are high at Northeastern. There is also a growing sense that faculty workloads have grown steadily larger in recent years due to burgeoning administrative assignments and new management practices.

It is critical that Northeastern has competitive teaching loads in order to recruit and retain high-quality faculty, and to provide appropriate high-quality environments for teaching and research that are commensurate with our top-100 goal. Teaching loads that are too high may not yield the optimum educational experience for students, and will provide constraints for the accomplishment of high-quality research and scholarship. Such outcomes will affect our academic reputation.

The common measure for defining teaching loads is the number of courses taught per academic year. In using this measure, however, especially for comparisons with loads at other institutions, care must be taken to normalize for factors such as the number of credit hours involved (many institutions operate with three-credit courses rather than the four-credit course approach at Northeastern). In addition, many institutions provide additional weighting for courses with large student enrollments, and for graduate courses. At the academic unit level, it is recognized that teaching loads will vary by discipline and by factors such as the unit's activity in graduate and research programs. For individual faculty members, it is recognized that the weighting of the components of a faculty member's load may need to change over time to reflect activity levels in these.

Charge:

The Faculty Development Committee has been asked to prepare a report, in both hard copy and electronic form, addressing the following three-part charge:

1. Based on practices at other top-100 matchmate institutions, establish a measure or a set of measures (i.e., number of courses, number of students, class-time, etc) by which teaching loads can reasonably be defined and compared.
2. Recommend a collegial process by which competitive teaching loads can be established for each unit.
3. Recommend a collegial process by which periodic reviews of individual faculty workloads can be made to ensure a faculty member's continuing development and to provide appropriate support and resources to that end.

The Committee has been asked to report back on these matters by no later than March 14, 2003.

Financial Affairs Committee

Membership:

Professor Bruce A. Wallin, Chair, (Political Science)
 Professor James A. Fox (Criminal Justice)
 Professor Yiannis A. Levendis (Mechanical, Industrial, and Manufacturing Engineering)
 Professor Michael T. Vaughn (Physics)
 Professor Edward G. Wertheim (Human Resource Management)

Background:

The Financial Affairs Committee has been asked to address three issues: faculty salaries, early retirement incentives, and the budget process.

A key area for improvement that will support our top-100 goal continues to be faculty salaries. Two major factors in the *US News and World Report: 2003 America's Best Colleges* rankings are directly related to salaries: academic reputation (25% of the total ranking) and faculty resources (20% of the total ranking).

Academic reputation depends on the quality, commitment and successes of the professoriate. Faculty salaries play a vital role to this end. Competitive faculty salaries are essential for both the retention of existing faculty and recruitment of new faculty. Last year, Northeastern's 2002 ranking for academic reputation slipped somewhat to 125th, down from 105th the previous year. The 2003 rankings show us stable at 125th.

Thirty-five percent of the faculty resources factor in the *US News* rankings is determined by faculty salaries and benefits adjusted for regional differences in cost of living from indices from Runzheimer International. According to the *US News*, Northeastern's ranking for faculty resources has declined steadily over the past several years. In 1996, for example, Northeastern's overall national ranking was 138th but its ranking for faculty resources was 96th; this latter being Northeastern's best ranking of any of the factors used (i.e. academic reputation, retention, faculty resources, selectivity, financial resources, alumni giving, and graduation rate). In 2003, Northeastern's overall ranking is 142^{cd}, but its ranking for faculty resources has dropped to 196th, now its worst ranking of any of the components used.

Why is there this slippage in the rankings for faculty resources? Two factors immediately suggest themselves: faculty salaries and the percent of classes with fewer than 20 students. Last year, the Senate demonstrated in a number of analyses that the growth in Northeastern faculty salaries over the previous decade was well below that of other regional and national matchmate institutions and groups and, as a consequence, that the relative standing of faculty salaries at Northeastern University had declined significantly over this period and our competitive advantage diminished for all three professorial ranks. As a result of the Senate's advocacy, the University responded positively by committing to a multi-year program starting in 2002-03 to rectify the salary problem. A second component of faculty resources is the percent of classes taught with fewer than 20 students. Northeastern is ranked 39th of the 65 institutions in Tier 3 for this measure.

A second key area for change concerns the declining size of the professoriate. Last year, a report to the Senate described a significant decline in the size of the professoriate since 1990-91 despite a sharp increase in recent years in the full-time student headcount to above the headcount levels in 1990-91. To some extent this latter appears to have been compensated for via a sharp increase in full-time lecturers, and the like, rather than via an increase in the size of the professoriate. While advocacy for specific new positions must come from the Colleges and their Deans, the Faculty Senate can address one aspect of this situation. Faculty positions are not only created out of new resource allocations, but also out of existing resources freed up by faculty retirements and the like. A senior faculty line can usually create an opportunity for more than one junior hire. Many institutions actively seek to promote early retirements through incentive packages of one kind or another for precisely this purpose.

A third key area for change is the University budget process. There have been continuing suggestions from faculty for a more open budget process. Many faculty members who have previously served on the Committee on Funding Priorities have been concerned with the limited scope of its operations. This concern has broadened as investments in the Colleges have been limited while major investments have been made in important infrastructure needs elsewhere. During the five-year period from fiscal 1998 to fiscal 2002, for example, the total budgets for the Colleges (i.e. Arts and Sciences, Bouvé, Business Administration, Computer Science, Criminal Justice, Engineering and Law) increased by 16.8% compared to the 38.9% increase for all other budget areas. As a result, the College budgets have slipped from 35.1% to 31.2% of the total operating budget during fiscal 1998-2002. The point here is not to necessarily question these outcomes but rather to emphasize the need to explore ways for improved advocacy and openness concerned the establishment and details of the budget.

Charge:

The Financial Affairs Committee has been asked to prepare reports, in both hard copy and electronic form, on the following three-part charge:

1. Based on current information and any other analyses that it may wish to undertake, the Committee is asked to make recommendations on appropriate merit raises and equity adjustments for 2003-04, with a particular emphasis on restoring Northeastern's earlier competitive advantage. The recommendation for equity/market adjustment raises should include consideration of matchmate data collected by the Office of University Planning and Research, appropriately adjusted for cost of living factors if possible. The

Committee has been asked to present its recommendations on these matters to the Faculty Senate in its meeting scheduled for November 4, 2002.

2. The Committee is asked to address the following as part of a new initiative to encourage retirements in general, and early retirements in particular, with the ultimate goal of generating resources for renewing and increasing the size of the professoriate:
 - Review the University policy for continuation of medical insurance for retired faculty and compare with policies in the top-100 national research universities.
 - Evaluate national incentive models for early retirement of tenured faculty and recommend an early retirement plan for Northeastern University.
 - Review the University 403B retirement plans and make suggestions for improvement if needed.
 - Recommend any additional suggestions for inclusion in such an initiative.

The Committee has been asked to present its recommendations on these matters by 1 February 2003.

3. Some members of the Committee will serve as faculty representatives on the Committee on Funding Priorities. The Committee members should consider all appropriate issues as they relate to the well being and success of the University. The Committee members should report back on the progress of the Committee on Funding Priorities in a timely and appropriate manner. Along with the Chair of the Senate Agenda Committee, the members of the Financial Affairs Committee serving on the Funding Priorities Committee have been asked to carefully consider and report back to the Senate by no later than 1 March 2003 any suggestions for improving the annual budget process.

N. **Next Meeting.** President Freeland will attend the next Senate meeting, on 21 October. Faculty are invited to submit written questions for the President to the Faculty Senate Office (442 Ryder) by 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, 15 October. Please note that the meeting will be held in 308 Snell Engineering.

Senators were offered refreshments, courtesy of Provost Abdelal.

- III. **Provost's Report.** Provost Abdelal said that he was delighted with the warm welcome from the Northeastern community. He then reported the following.
 - A. **Top-100 Status.** Provost Abdelal reported that we have a good deal of leeway in reaching top-100 status in that we can select the *U.S. News and World Report* factors that are in harmony with our goals of retention and graduation rates, and academic reputation. We can enhance our reputation by attracting the best faculty, strong research productivity, and outside funding. Getting to Tier 2 is a major but intermediate step. In addition, research and graduate programs can reinforce economic and social development in synergy. It is important for academic institutions to contribute to national connections and to explore international initiatives, and this in turn better prepares students for the global marketplace.
 - B. **Space and the Budget.** Provost Abdelal's focus since his arrival has been the details of the budget and utilization of space in terms of teaching and research.
 - C. **Semester Conversion.** Provost Abdelal has been working with Vice President Mantella and the deans. His analysis indicates that we now have to integrate assumptions and recognize areas that need to be refined. The curriculum needs to be integrated with tuition rates and degree requirements. In the transition from quarters to semesters we need to allocate resources where there is demand and evidence that the applicant pool is in harmony with the standards of admission. Decisions on use of space must be based on need. Therefore, budget requests with all items included will be on the table. Provost Abdelal will share his findings with the Senate. He advocates transparency and collegiality in decision-making, and he is committed to 360 degrees of accountability so that people can see how decisions are made.

IV. **Question and Discussion Time.**

Professor Alper expressed concern about winter quarter classes beginning on January 3, which is a Friday. He suggested scheduling the first day of classes on the following Monday instead. Also, since on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving all sequences will not be treated equally if we cancel classes after noon, he suggested that some adjustment be made. Provost Abdelal agreed to look into both matters. He thought that the required number of classroom hours had played a part in the scheduling.

- V. **Ad Hoc Faculty Handbook Review Committee Report.** Professor Ellis moved Resolution #1, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves, in principle, the organization of the Faculty Handbook represented in the revised draft table of contents submitted by the ad hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Ellis briefly explained the various handbook-related documents that had been distributed. The Handbook, which was divided many years ago, is being reunited with the *Academic Operations Manual*. He pointed out that the Table of Contents that was distributed is inadvertently missing sections VI.B and C, and section VIII. Adoption of the resolution will include these sections. The starting point is to organize the document.

There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote: PASSED by unanimous voice vote, 35-0.

Professor Ellis moved Resolution #2, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the Section VI preamble paragraphs presented in the Revised Draft (4/30/02) from the ad hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Ellis explained that this resolution applied only to the first paragraph and simply defined the three categories of faculty and introduced the section. The "added" items were in the old Handbook and are in the current *Academic Operations Manual*.

Motion. Executive Vice Provost moved to delete "full-time" from the fifth line of the preamble, and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Vice Provost Meservey asked about the roles of faculty as "agents" in line 3. Professor Herman responded that, while some overlap exists between tenure-track and professorial faculty, the Senate bylaws and Definition of Faculty adopted this language.

There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote on the resolution, as amended.

Vote: PASSED by unanimous voice vote, 35-0.

Professor Ellis moved Resolution #3, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the Section VIA preamble paragraphs and Sections VIA.1 and VIA.2 presented in the Revised Draft (4/30/02) from the ad hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to go into effect when published in the revised edition of the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Ellis noted that this section relates to tenure-track and non-tenured faculty. The title "Instructor" is within the AAUP guidelines as tenure-track. Executive Vice Provost Pantalone noted that there are only two

instructors presently at the University. Vice Provost Meservey added that five or six years ago the decision was made not to hire in that category any more.

Professor Platt asked whether this could cause confusion for new lecturers. Professor Herman responded that lecturers will be covered in section VI.B rather than VI.A.

Professor Hall asked when the AAUP changed definitions with regard to instructors as tenure-track. Provost Abdelal responded that it allowed a possible point of entry to tenure-track positions. When they get terminal degrees, they can become assistant professors. According to AAUP guidelines, the clock starts when one is hired as an instructor, who then begins to exhibit scholarly activity. Professor Herman added that the lecturer position does not start the tenure clock.

Motion. Vice Provost Meservey moved to add, as a friendly amendment, "The University no longer makes appointments at the instructor level."

Discussion ensued as to whether this issue should be covered in section VI.A or VI.B.

Vice Provost Meservey wondered if it would be better to make clear to faculty who are hired with terminal appointments or allowed to continue without being on the tenure track, to have a guarantee of reappointment but not with the same *de facto* status.

Professor Lowndes suggested that changing the title would eliminate the problem. Professor Aroian replied that changing the title would generate a whole new set of problems. Professor Herman suggested that the two instructors, who have been with the University for many years, will continue in rank to the end of their service.

Professor Wertheim expressed concern about the next paragraph's allusion to faculty having outside activities in the community.

Motion. Professor Alper moved to amend by deleting the sentence, "Faculty should at all times be accurate, exercise appropriate restraint, show respect for the opinions of others, and distinguish their own independent judgments and opinions from those of their institution." The motion was seconded.

Professor Ellis read from the current Handbook (p. 24):

"The purpose of academic tenure is to insure academic freedom for the faculty member — the right to teach, study, and engage in research free from restrictions and pressures which otherwise might inhibit independence of thought and expression. A college or university is a marketplace of ideas, and it cannot fulfill its purposes of transmitting, evaluating, and extending knowledge if it requires conformity with any orthodoxy of content and method. In the words of the United States Supreme Court, "Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die." Academic freedom and tenure imply collective duties as well as rights. The college or university teacher has a special position in the community, which imposes special obligations. He or she should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. He or she should at all times be accurate, exercise appropriate restraint, show respect for the opinions of others, and make every effort to indicate that he or she is not an institutional spokesperson."

Professor Ellis pointed out that this quote was in accord with the "1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure."

Professor Vaughn suggested that the paragraph made sense without the sentence.

Professor Platt noted that there might be differences between the beliefs of faculty and their work here.

Professor Hall pointed out that the University likes for faculty to be quoted in their fields, but faculty should not refer to their university affiliation when speaking for themselves.

Professor Sherwood suggested that the sentence before the one Professor Alper moved to delete also be deleted. It reads as follows: "He or she should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances." Professor Alper did not agree to add this deletion to his amendment. Professor Sherwood withdrew the suggestion.

Motion to adjourn. Professor Herman moved to adjourn.

Adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Flym
Secretary, Faculty Senate