

December 15, 2004

Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 12/15/2004

Charles H. Ellis Jr.
Northeastern University

Recommended Citation

Ellis Jr., Charles H., "Faculty Senate meeting minutes: 12/15/2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes*. Paper 59.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2047/d10004695>

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

TO: FACULTY SENATE
FROM: CHARLES H. ELLIS, Jr., SECRETARY, FACULTY SENATE
SUBJECT: MINUTES, 2004-05 FACULTY SENATE MEETING, 15 DECEMBER 2004

Present: (Professors) Alper, Bannister, Bansil, Blank, Bobcean, De Ritis, Ellis, Futrelle, Glod, Hansberry, Heiman, Herman, Krishnamoorthy, Kruger, Lowndes, Margotta, Marshall, McKnight, Melachrinoudis, Morrison, Peterfreund, Powers-Lee, Reynolds, Sherman, Sherwood, Vaughn, Wray
(Administrators) Abdelal, Falcon, Hill, Moore, Onan, Soyster, Stellar, Zoloth

Absent: (Professors) Robinson, Schaffer, Shafai, Wiseman
(Administrators) Finkelstein, Spieler

Professor Lowndes convened the meeting at 11:56 a.m.

- I. **Minutes.** The minutes of November 17 were with President Freeland, and those of December 1 were in progress.
- II. **SAC Report.** Professor Lowndes reported the following.
 - A. **SAC Meetings.** The Agenda Committee met twice in regular session since the last meeting.
 - B. **Additional Senate Meetings.** Due to the number of agenda items that are in hand plus a number of issues that we have been advised will be coming to the Senate for action in the next month or so, SAC has added two Wednesday meetings—**January 19** (in McLeod) and **February 9** (in 450 DG), 11:45 a.m. to 1:25 p.m.
 - C. **2003-04 Senate Annual Report** will be posted on the Senate website within the next few days.
 - D. **Faculty Development Committee.** This committee has been staffed. Committee members are:
 - Professor Edward G. Wertheim, Chair (CBA, Human Resources Management)
 - Professor Robert N. Hanson (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
 - Professor Ganesh Krishnamoorthy (Accounting)
 - Professor Susan J. Roberts (Nursing)
 - Professor Bahram Shafai (Electrical & Computer Engineering)

The four-part charge given to the Committee concerns 1) online employee fringe benefits; 2) tuition reciprocity with other institutions for employees; 3) continuing e-mail support for retired employees; and 4) parental leave or family leave policy. The specific four-part charge is:

1. The FDC is asked to contact the office of the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, the office of the Vice President for Human Resource Management, or any other pertinent administrative unit, in order to obtain statements of policy regarding restrictions on employee tuition benefits for online courses and study abroad programs. The FDC should also ask for any statements justifying such restrictions. The FDC should then contact the units providing such courses and/or programs and ask for comments regarding the cogency of the restrictions and any statements justifying them.

Acting on the basis of the investigation described above, the FDC is asked to report back to the SAC on this charge, in both hard copy and electronic form, by no later than 1 March 2005. If there is need of a resolution or resolutions regarding the current policy, such a resolution or resolutions should accompany this report.

2. The FDC is asked to contact the office of the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance in order to ascertain the degree to which the University is willing to enter into discussions with a consortium of current overlap institutions as to the feasibility and desirability of entering into a tuition reciprocity agreement. Under the terms of such an agreement, the dependents of benefits-eligible University employees admitted to other consortium universities would be able to pursue an undergraduate degree with the same tuition benefits currently applicable to such study at Northeastern, or at a deeply discounted cost. The benefits-eligible dependents of the employees of other consortium universities admitted to Northeastern would likewise be able to pursue an undergraduate degree with comparable benefits.

Acting on the basis of the inquiry described above, the FDC is asked to report back to the SAC by no later than 15 March 2005 as to the University's willingness to explore such an arrangement and offer a resolution or resolutions as appropriate to speed that exploration. The report should be in both hard copy and electronic form.

3. The FDC is asked to contact the office of the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, the office of the Vice President for Human Resource Management, the office of the Vice President for Information Services, or any other pertinent administrative unit, for the purpose of determining the feasibility of offering access to Northeastern's e-mail system as a benefit for retired University employees.

Acting on the basis of the inquiry described above, the FDC is asked to report back to the SAC by no later than 15 March 2005 as to the desirability of such a benefit for retirees and the University's willingness to offer such a benefit and offer a resolution or resolutions as appropriate to speed that benefit's implementation. The report should be in both hard copy and electronic form.

4. The FDC is asked to contact the office of the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, the office of the Vice President for Human Resource Management, or any other pertinent administrative unit, in order to extend the current interim maternity leave policy as a parental leave or family leave policy. The FDC should also ask for any statements that justify limiting the current policy to maternity leave.

Acting on the basis of the inquiry described above, the FDC is asked to report back to the SAC by no later than 1 April 2005, with a resolution or resolutions regarding the policy. The report should be in both hard copy and electronic form.

E. Research Policy Oversight Committee. This committee has been staffed. Committee members are:

Professor Ahmed Busnaina (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Paul M. Champion (Physics)
 Professor Matthias Felleisen (Computer & Information Science)
 Professor Jeffrey A. Hopwood (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Graham Jones (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
 Professor Barry L. Karger (Chemistry & Chemical Biology, Director, Barnett Institute)
 Professor Albert Sacco (Chemical Engineering)
 Professor Michael B. Silevitch (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Vladimir P. Torchilin (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
 Professor Carol M. Warner (Biology)
 Vice Provost Srinivas Sridhar (*Ex Officio*)

The three-part charge given to the Research Policy Oversight Committee (RPOC) concerns 1) general identification of major infrastructure problems for research; 2) radical improvement in accounting support for research grants and contracts; 3) formulating a strategy to capture and sustain a more diverse funding base such as that offered by commercial research contracts and corporate joint ventures. The specific charge is:

1. **To continue its roundtable discussions of last year to identify major issues where actions are needed to improve the University's competitiveness in sponsored research, and to develop solutions to accomplish this. The SAC asks the RPOC to report back briefly to SAC on these activities by no later than 15 April 2005.**
2. **Over many years, including discussions last year in the RPOC, principal investigators have labored under a poor and time-consuming accounting system for their grants and contracts. Some solutions were discussed last year. The RPOC is asked to report back to SAC by no later than 1 March 2005 on what has been done to rectify this problem, and what, if anything, remains to be done.**
3. **The University's sponsored research activities have been faltering in recent years. The attached table summarizes total research expenditures for the University and by field for 1990, 1995, 2000, 2001, and 2002 (the most recently available ranking). Nationally, the total research expenditures for all institutions increased by 21% during 2000-2002, but at Northeastern they increased only by 9%. During this same time period, the total federal research expenditures for all institutions increased by 25%, but at Northeastern these declined by 10% (and this includes two large grants for CenSSIS and Physics). Northeastern's 2002 ranking for total research expenditures was 160th, and for federal research expenditures was 159th. These are disappointingly close to our corresponding rankings in 1990 (i.e., before smaller and better).**

Obviously, the University must do better since sponsored research activity is a measure frequently used to assess the caliber of the faculty and graduate programs at an institution, and thereby some measure of its academic reputation. There is a strong correlation between sponsored research activities and top-100 institutions.

Unfortunately, forecasts suggest that marked reductions may lie ahead in key funding areas by the federal agencies, and our exposure to such may impact the growth projections of our academic investment plan. Nevertheless, the Colleges must move aggressively, supported by the Office of the Provost, to significantly improve our sponsored research funding levels through these agencies. In addition, though, the University must explore opportunities to capture and sustain a more diverse funding base such as that offered by commercial research contracts and corporate joint ventures. There is a substantial market for joint ventures with partners both in the public and corporate sector and for technology transfer of intellectual property to the local and regional industrial sector. These opportunities are likely to grow as the economy regains momentum and relate well to the NU brand as a leader in experiential education.

To assist in this effort, the RPOC is asked to formulate a strategy for the effective development and management of such partnerships that addresses issues such as the appropriate marketing of our expertise base, expeditious and professional handling of administrative matters, and excellent communication between our research office, corporate partnerships and development offices. The RPOC is asked to provide its report and recommendations on this matter to the SAC by no later than 1 April 2005.

- F. **School of Technological Entrepreneurship Dean Search.** The search is external. Committee members are:

Professor Ahmed Busnaina, Chair (Mechanical & Industrial Engineering)
 Professor Kenneth P. Baclawski (Computer & Information Science)
 Professor Graham Jones (Chemistry & Chemical Biology)
 Professor Ralph Katz (CBA, Human Resources Management)
 Professor Michael B. Silevitch (Electrical & Computer Engineering)
 Professor Vladimir P. Torchilin (Pharmaceutical Sciences)
 Dean Thomas E. Moore (College of Business Administration)
 Dean Allen L. Soyster (College of Engineering)

Trustee Jean Tempel

- G. **Counseling and Applied Educational Psychology Chair Search.** The search is internal. Committee members are:

Elected Members:

Professor Carmen G. Armengol (Counseling & Applied Ed. Psychology)
 Professor Mary B. Ballou, Chair (Counseling & Applied Ed. Psychology)
 Associate Dean Ena Vazquez-Nuttall, Chair (Multicultural Education)

Appointed Members:

Professor Stephen G. Harkins (Psychology)
 Professor Susan J. Roberts (Nursing)

- H. **Sociology and Anthropology Chair Search.** The search is internal. Committee members are:

Elected Members:

Professor Winifred Breines (Sociology and Anthropology)
 Professor Catherine S. Dolan (Sociology and Anthropology)
 Professor Matthew O. Hunt (Sociology and Anthropology)

Appointed Members:

Professor Donna M. Bishop (Criminal Justice)
 Professor Suzanne P. Ogden (Political Science)

- I. **Excellence in Teaching Awards Judging Committee.** Committee members are:

New Members:

Professor Mary B. Ballou (Counseling Psychology)	[10/06]
Professor David Massey (Mathematics)	[10/06]
Professor Sheila M. Puffer (General Management)	[10/06]
Professor Neal Rantoul (Visual Arts)	[10/06]

Continuing Members:

Professor Marilyn A. Cairns (Cardiopulmonary Sciences)	[10/05]
Professor Uichiro Narusawa (MIE)	[10/05]
Professor Michael L. Woodnick (Communication Studies)	[10/05]

- J. **Special Committee on Academic Policy.** SAC has appointed Professor Brendan Bannister to replace Professor Edward Wertheim who resigned in order to serve as Chair of the Faculty Development Committee.
- K. **University Standing Committed on Tenure Appeals.** SAC has appointed Professor Harlow Robinson to replace Professor Mary Loeffelholz, who resigned.
- L. **Resolutions.** President Freeland responded to the three Financial Affairs Committee Resolutions that the Senate passed on October 27, "Informational, no action required."
- M. **Next Meeting: Wednesday, January 12, in Raytheon Amphitheater .**

- III. **Provost's Report.** Provost Abdelal reported that his office was continuing to work on the budget and on enrollment targets.
- IV. **Question Time.** There were no questions.
- V. **Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook.** Professor Ellis moved the Resolution on Bylaws. The motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves the revised Faculty Senate By-Laws as presented in the Revised Draft (12/8/04) from the *ad hoc* Committee to Review the Faculty Handbook, to be submitted to the Teaching Faculty for a ratification vote.

Professor Ellis explained that this revision of the bylaws would go to the faculty for a vote and could go into effect perhaps even before the Trustees finish their review of the Handbook. The bylaws need these revisions at the least because the Senate has approved the establishment of several committees as standing committees. The revisions have streamlined the Senate election process in the Colleges to eliminate the pre-nomination step, and the words "Teaching Faculty" have been replaced by "tenured or tenure-track faculty" or "term faculty" as appropriate.

Professor Herman noted that "quarter" is replaced by "semester" and other adjustments have been made with respect to the new academic calendar.

Professor Alper referred to the first paragraph and asked whether SPCS faculty would be eligible to serve on the Senate. Professor Ellis responded that this is not the intent of the committee. He pointed out that the language indicates the membership of the Senate to be thirty tenured or tenure-track faculty. Professor Herman added that the bylaws would have to be further amended to give SPCS the explicit right to appoint professorial faculty in order to elect a Senator.

Professor Alper asked about the footnote on presidential appointments to the Senate. Professor Herman explained that this was a necessary relic.

Dean Zoloth pointed out that Bouvé has extended voting privileges to the class of faculty called clinical specialists for the purpose of electing faculty to the Senate, although they themselves cannot sit on the Senate. He suggested as a friendly or quasi friendly amendment to include voting at the college level as determined by that college's bylaws. Professor Ellis did not consider this a friendly amendment.

Professor Herman noted that, while academic specialists in Arts and Sciences have been allowed to participate in departmental affairs to the extent their departments wish, he thought it would be unwise to open the University-level door to those other than the senior academic body.

Dean Zoloth thought the distinction in Bouvé was less clear. He favored the inclusion of clinical faculty who are involved in teaching and the day-to-day operations of the college.

Professor Lowndes considered this a serious issue. He pointed out that the colleges do not have the right to "trump" the rules or policies of the University and the same, with a certain amount of courtesy, should apply to the Senate. To change the representation of the Senate to include term faculty would have a dramatic effect on the number of Senators from some colleges at the expense of others. He urged that the amendment be withdrawn or voted down and recommended instead that a proposal for the clinical specialist category be presented as a separate motion at another time.

Professor Blank thought that a college should have the right to extend its electorate with the approval of the Senate.

Professor Peterfreund explained that the major stakeholders in this university are the people who constitute its ongoing teaching and research mission. Clinical and academic specialists perform valuable functions, but

they are not “citizens” of the University in the same sense and should not be voting in the colleges.

Provost Abdelal pointed out that the current Senate bylaws state who at the college level can vote for Senators.

Dean Zoloth withdrew his amendment for the time being.

Professor Wray asked for clarification of the General Regulations section on page 3, item 4) b), which stated, “In the Department of Cooperative Education, each full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member may vote for one candidate for the position to be filled.” Professor Ellis replied that “tenured and tenure-track” should have been deleted, to read “each full-time faculty member” to be consistent with the Senate composition section.

Professor Lowndes, as a point of information, asked what that meant. Professor Ellis explained that when the Senate voted to give Cooperative Education the right to have one representative on the Senate, it was defined and put into the Senate bylaws as one from either the professoriate, which seems to be dwindling, or the Coop coordinators who are full-time, and established that both categories would have the vote.

Provost Abdelal suggested that the committee address the inconsistency in applying restrictions to non-tenure-track faculty in other colleges. Professor Ellis explained that the Coop representation was part of the reorganization that converted some tenure-track professorial Coop faculty to coordinators.

Professor Lowndes, as a point of information, stressed that the Faculty Senate is primarily concerned with the diverse avenues of academic policy and consequently the Senate membership should be elected and appointed from appropriate bodies. He reported that since the early nineties there had been a gradual change whereby an increasing number of administrators from non-academic areas had been appointed to the Senate. It seemed inappropriate to have these non-academic administrators participating and voting on many issues before the Senate. Two years ago, the SAC took this matter to the President and the President agreed with SAC and has since appointed only academic administrators, that is those who have tenured faculty rank, to serve on the Senate.

Professor Margotta referred to item 2.b on page 1, which stated that one function of the Senate is “To be consulted as either a whole body or in appropriate committees on all policies, proposals, and problems of faculty concern, including such matters as the creation of new colleges, new campuses, new departments, and degree programs”. He noted that the faculty were not consulted before the fact on decisions about issues such as the NU Press elimination, football coaches’ salaries, or advertising at Fenway Park.

Provost Abdelal responded that the Senate is free to take a position on any issue and discuss it with any university administrator. To take stronger action, the Senate is also free to develop and take a vote on a resolution that would then be communicated formally to the President. There is a gradient with regard to issues that are relevant and those that are less relevant, but that is a judgment the Senate can make as a collective body. We have a process for debate.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out that item 2.c perfects item 2.b and provides oversight if item 2.b is not observed. It states that another Senate function is “To initiate consideration and recommendation on any matter of faculty concern”.

Professor Ellis agreed and added that the importance of 2.b and 2.c is to keep the Senate able to deal with any issue regardless of some other's opinion on its importance or relevance. That is what gives the Senate its power; our Senate has been described as one of the strongest systems of university faculty governance.

Professor Blank noted that there is a difference between being consulted and holding a discussion. Professor Herman replied that it is impossible to be comprehensive. He noted that the NU Press issue provided a lesson in the effectiveness of item 2.c because the final outcome had been relatively satisfactory.

Professor Alper asked why, on page 7, the term “Customer Service” was used instead of “Student Service.” Professor Ellis replied that the term in the draft was correct.

Professor Alper pointed out two typos on page 8, which will be corrected.

Professor Alper asked why, on page 7, item g.2), “three” was deleted before “faculty members”. Professor Herman replied that this allows for situations in which a larger committee is requested.

Professor Lowndes expressed very strong concern that a sentence in the original Handbook (item I.A.1 under Definition) had been omitted from the revised version. It states, “The Teaching Faculty . . . is represented by the Faculty Senate which, together with the Administration of the University, has the responsibility of maintaining and improving the academic standards of the University and making the functioning of the University more effective and harmonious.” The language in the draft revision looked like an attempt to water down the Senate’s role.

Professor Ellis responded that the new language had come from the previous Handbook committee and agreed that the language needed further work.

Professor Lowndes urged that the original language be returned to the document to ensure that joint supervising and addressing of issues are not removed from the functions of the Senate.

Motion. Professor McKnight moved to postpone the resolution until the next meeting. There being no objection, the Senate turned to a vote.

Vote on Professor McKnight’s motion to postpone: PASSED, 30-0-3.

Professor Vaughn urged Senators to review the draft and convey any concerns to Professor Ellis or any of the members of the committee.

Professor Ellis moved Resolution #1 – Section VI.B, and the motion was seconded. The resolution read as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate approves Section VI.B (Term Faculty Appointments: Academic and Clinical Specialists, Cooperative Education Coordinators, In-Residence Faculty) presented in the Revised Draft (11/10/04) 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 Herman pointed out that the language regarding non-reappointment (item 10.c on page 13) should include the language that was in the legislation that created the Coop coordinator category.

Professor Wray suggested that, to make the language consistent with legislation passed in 1992, the first bullet on page 13 should read “three months” instead of “one month,” and the second bullet should read, “one year” instead of “six months.” These changes were accepted as a friendly amendment.

Dean Soyster noted that evaluation of academic specialists' research was not mentioned and that in the College of Engineering these people are involved in research. Professor Ellis explained that purely research appointments, such as research scientists or the research professors the Senate approved last year, would fall under section VI.C.

Dean Soyster reported that he has a PI, appointed as an academic specialist, who has a \$1M grant, yet an academic specialist is defined as having teaching duties. He wanted to call attention to the fact that academic specialists in Engineering also participate in the research mission. Professor Ellis replied that the committee was unaware of these appointments.

Provost Abdelal expressed concern at the apparent assumption that all term faculty are performing the same

functions across the University. He said that Coop coordinators, who are term faculty, do not teach. He cautioned against assuming that everybody is teaching or involved in formal coursework, since the evaluation process presupposes the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and thus distorts the framework for the Coop Division.

Professor Peterfreund pointed out that the positions are classified differently; the terms distinguish the job descriptions. He did not see a conflict with Coop faculty and the faculty described therein. A simple sentence or two under Professional Development would answer Dean Soyster's concern. A PI with a large grant who is obviously current in a research field could be evaluated by taking professional development to mean research. A statement might be added such as, "In the event that an academic or clinical specialist is actively engaged in research, evaluation of the research output shall take the place of professional development."

Professor Herman explained that some slippage has occurred over the years in hiring term faculty over tenure-track faculty. If a person is teaching, doing service, maintaining currency in the profession and doing research, that person ought to be a tenure-track faculty member. The Senate and the Handbook should not run afoul of AAUP regulations, and this language is dangerously close to the line. He recommended considering a title change as the most appropriate way to handle it without eroding faculty rights and responsibilities.

Professor Vaughn noted that item b was for academic specialists and item c for Coop coordinators, and it is difficult to cover all possible cases explicitly. There is a distinction between those who do all that a tenure-track faculty member does and those whose positions will terminate. When one gets to the point of doing all that a tenure-track faculty member does, the classification should reflect that.

Provost Abdelal saw a lack of correspondence between the primary function of Coop coordinators and performance expectations for term faculty. In his opinion, Coop coordinators' primary expectations are securing coop opportunities for our students with the corporate world, and advising and mentoring students in relation to what they have done during and after the coops. He said that only a minority of coordinators teach, but the performance expectations section for term faculty emphasizes teaching. He recommended that the body reflect on this inconsistency.

Professor Marshall noted that research is not normally a requirement for academic specialists.

Professor Ellis pointed out that Coop coordinators, in helping students to integrate the coop and academic experiences, carry out a form of teaching, and that in some colleges they do this in the classroom. The committee had to define how to evaluate teaching, not that teaching necessarily carries more weight than obligations, but the weight that is applied should go with the appointment and expectations of the person hired. He suggested that perhaps the definition of a clinical or academic specialist should be clarified.

Professor Onan suggested that sometimes less is more. She explained that academic and clinical specialists are relatively new to Northeastern. Each college developed its own document defining their rights and privileges. While it makes sense to have some uniformity, the colleges have specialized and differentiated needs, and the specialists therefore have different roles and should be evaluated accordingly.

Professor Ellis read the following from the current Handbook (item C, page 86), which defines the clinical or academic specialist classification in an attempt to make it consistent with rights, responsibilities, and various personnel rules:

Clinical or Academic Specialist (2.7) is a title conferred on individuals who have special skills, education and/or work experience which qualify them to fulfill highly specialized teaching and/or supervisory roles in a particular academic unit. Neither Clinical nor Academic Specialists are eligible for tenure. They are given term appointments which may be renewed depending upon the quality of job performance, University need and available funding. Clinical and Academic Specialists are employed in and may seek promotion to one of the following ranks: Assistant Clinical or Academic Specialist;

Associate Clinical or Academic Specialist; or Senior Clinical or Academic Specialist. The specialist's maintenance of professional qualification (where applicable) and quality of performance are the major factors in annual evaluation and retention decisions. The Specialist's quality and level of performance and length of service are the major factors in promotion considerations.

Professor Wray pointed out that Coop coordinators do teach, although what they do educationally appears different from traditional teaching, and for fifteen years the coordinators have been engaged in an ongoing struggle to justify their existence, as faculty, to those who don't understand this.

Professor Peterfreund asked whether anyone currently filling these ranks were in violation of anything stated in the section. He thought not. He then asked whether faculty members fitting these descriptions can be evaluated on a fair and effective basis annually. He predicted that the answer would be affirmative. Referring to the performance expectations in item 3, he noted that the items listed for teaching effectiveness apply to Coop coordinators. He cautioned against making this document into a laundry list of exceptions that would render it more confusing and less helpful than it is.

Dean Soyster appealed for the flexibility to accommodate the academic specialists in his college who often come from industry and have special talents.

Professor Herman felt that research can be accommodated within professional development predicated on the objectives stated in the individual appointment letter. These objectives may change from time to time. The criteria exist to provide standards for evaluation, but we must not become unable to distinguish between non-tenure-track and tenure-track faculty. The line must be clear not only to those at the University but also to those outside who might judge us.

Professor Powers-Lee, as a friendly amendment, suggested eliminating the list under Teaching and substituting the following for the last sentence in the first paragraph: "Good teaching includes, as applicable, the indications of teaching effectiveness listed in section . . . [on the last page]."

Professor Ellis did not consider the amendment friendly. He explained that the committee had considered Professor Powers-Lee's concept, but the difficulty with the design of the three sections as they are now is that section VI.B must stand alone for the group and people should not have to refer back to the section on tenured and tenure-track faculty to see what their list is. Even though teaching appears typographically to have greater weight than the other two categories, it is only because of its longer list of possible components. The three categories are to be weighed with regard to the weighting of duties in the individual's appointment.

Professor Blank asked why the term "when deemed appropriate by the unit" in the sixth item in the list on page 3 did not apply to the other items. Professor Ellis said he did not know.

Professor Blank suggested that the term be struck or the end of the sentence removed to apply to all the items on the list.

Professor Ellis accepted as a friendly amendment Professor Blank's suggestion to delete "when deemed appropriate by the unit."

Adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Ellis, Jr.
Secretary