



# Northeastern University

## Office of the Faculty Senate

**TO:** Faculty Senate  
**FROM:** Robert Hanson, Secretary, Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Minutes, 27 April 2016

---

Present: (Professors) Adams, Barczak, Bickmore, Brooks, Caligiuri, Cokely, Daynard, Devlin, Hajjar, Hanson, Howard, Kanouse, Kruger, Lerner, Leslie, McOwen, Nelson, Ocampo-Guzman, Patterson, Portz, Sceppa, Suci, Vicino, Young

(Administrators) Ambrose, Aubry, Bean, Courtney, Hudson, Loeffelholz, Poiger, Reynolds, Tilly

Absent: (Professors) Andrews, Crittenden, Gouldstone, Hellweger, Kelly, Piret, and Dean Brodley

I. **CONVENED.** Provost Bean convened the Senate at 11:01 AM

II. **MINUTES.** The minutes of 4/20/2016 were approved as written.

### III. SAC REPORT

III.1 Elections for the 2016-2017 Senate Agenda Committee took place earlier this morning. Results are:

- SAC Chair & Senate Vice Chair: Professor Sceppa (BCHS)
- Senate Secretary: Professor Hanson (COS)
- SAC members: Professors Kruger (BCHS), Bickmore (CCIS), Ocampo-Guzman (CAMD), Lerner (CSSH)

Professor Sceppa noted that the 2015-16 SAC has enjoyed a proactive and constructive relationship with administration. There were over 200 faculty involved in various Senate-related committees.

III.2 SAC met once since the last Senate meeting and once with the senior leadership team.

III.3 Professor Sceppa thanked the Senators and the many the Senate committee members, some of whom are still working on their charges/reports and some of whom will convene over the summer, such as the Tenure Appeals Committee. Many other faculty have worked on other committees whereby the SAC has provided faculty members to serve (i.e. the University Classroom Committee, grade appeals committees) or where another entity is convening the committee (i.e. the Ph.D. Task Force and various academic plan committees). "The SAC extends its appreciation and thanks to each of you for your dedication to the academy and to the sharing of its governance."

III.4 Professor Sceppa also expressed personal gratitude to this past year's members of the Senate Agenda Committee who worked so conscientiously to see that the task of governing the academic mission of the University continues to be a shared enterprise.

III.5 And finally, Professor Sceppa thanked Parliamentarian Goodale in absentia and welcomed Professor Peterfreund as today's Parliamentarian.

### IV. PROVOST'S REPORT

IV.1 Provost Bean reported that the academic plan has moved from the generative to the synthesis process with deans and Vice Provosts pulling together reports from faculty

committees. The senior leadership met last week to work on a white paper using committee reports. A new website has been generated for community feedback in next few weeks.

- IV.2 There are two ongoing dean searches. COS had five finalists with two returning for second interviews. BCHS is in the midst of interviewing five finalists.
- IV.3 Senior Vice Provost Loeffelholz is appointed interim dean of CPS starting in the next few weeks.

## V. QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION

- V.1 Professor Portz inquired how the salary process has played out given recent Senate discussions. The Provost responded that it has not proceeded as quickly as he would like. He intends to review the entire process in the fall. Faculty Handbook procedures are presently in place with promotion-related increases moving to the college level and a change in the merit/equity split. Processes have never been submitted by departments. The Provost announced that the process should be fully revamped by this time next year.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

- VI.1 NEW ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT. Professor Cokely read the following and it was seconded by Professor Daynard.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Department of Cultures, Societies, and Global Studies be established in the College of Social Sciences and Humanities, combining the Department of African American Studies and the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, as approved by the CSSH College Council on 15 April 2016.**

Professor Buscaglia was recognized and explained that this is a combination of two departments which requires no funding. There will be a new chair.

**VOTE to approve the new department in CSSH: 30-0-0**

- VI.2 GRADUATE COUNCIL PROPOSAL. Professor Hanson read the following and it was seconded by Professor Cokely

**BE IT RESOLVED That Northeastern University establish the Master of Professional Studies in Analytics in the College of Professional Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on 13 April 2016.**

Dean LaBrie was recognized and explained the complexities of analytics programs. The MPS differentiates this proposal from others passed by the Senate. This is an entry-level graduate degree with experiential components.

**VOTE to approve the new degree in CPS: 29-0-1**

- VI.3 SENATE COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH POLICY OVERSIGHT. Professor Young read the following and it was seconded by Professor Cokely.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the report of the 2015-2016 Senate Committee for Research Policy Oversight.**

Professor Rappaport, chair of the RPOC, was recognized and provided a brief overview of the report, including the need for communication between current research process committees, faculty frustration with procedures at ORAF, and the need for a comprehensive grants management software (as Banner is generally disliked and difficult to use).

Questions were raised regarding a process for input into decisions-making with ORAF, where communication between similar committees might occur, and the need for more personnel in IRB where a proposal can stall for as many as 60 days. Professor Young responded to the latter explaining that full-time employee counts were similar to other universities but it is a subject that should be explored given the influx of student proposals.

Bouvé Assistant Dean of Research Charles Storey was recognized and reported that Priority software has been explored and demonstrated to CSSH, COE, finance and ORAF. The Assistant Dean averred that it is a good product and has sent a memo strongly recommending it for use.

**VOTE to accept the report of the 2015-2016 RPOC: 30-0-0**

Provost Bean noted that research administration has improved during the past year but that research funding has not kept up because of a limited ability to grow research. Administration is interested in getting this right. The new Senior Vice Provost for Research, Art Kramer, rebuilt research administration at his last institution and is very positive about the future.

VI.4 SENATE COMMITTEE FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICIES

Professor Kirda was recognized and provided an overview of the report and recommendations. He reported that meetings and a faculty survey (with 174 respondents) for research and teaching support were undertaken. The main findings were that the majority of faculty were satisfied with IT research and teaching support; 1/3 were dissatisfied.

**VOTE to accept the report: 30-0-0**

ITPC Resolution #1 was read by Professor Bickmore and seconded by Professor Cokely.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Senate Agenda Committee be urged to work with the Provost's Office to establish a University-wide grant management working group, with membership drawn from principal investigators from each College, along with representatives from Information Technology Services (ITS) and the Office of Research Administration and Finance (ORAF), to be charged with evaluating and selecting a Principal Investigator(PI)-facing, real-time, post-award grant management system and other**

software tools to facilitate grant post-award management and compliance for faculty investigators; and

**BE IT ALSO RESOLVED** That resources be provided to purchase and integrate these tools with Northeastern's current grant management systems and to distribute these tools to and train all grant PIs and unit grant administrative personnel.

Dean Tilly inquired whether pre-award management was included and Professor Kirda explained that there was less concern amongst faculty for this and that post grant management is more painful. Issues regarding pre-award management will be considered in the future.

**VOTE to approve: 30-0-0**

ITPC resolution #2 was read by Professor Bickmore and seconded by Professor Cokely.

**BE IT RESOLVED** That Northeastern ITS visit each college at least once per year to ascertain faculty concerns; to apprise faculty of the range of ITS software, services and activities related to faculty research; to solicit suggestions for both software and services; and to identify unmet faculty IT needs; and

**BE IT ALSO RESOLVED** That a web directory of all available software tools be developed by Northeastern ITS, communicated to all faculty and staff, and maintained on at least a semi-annual basis.

Professor Kruger questioned the rationale and Professor Kirda explained that much software exists of which faculty is not aware. ITS was consulted, viewed the report and agreed that communication can be improved. Professor Brooks noted, too, that they were given the opportunity to respond to the report.

**VOTE to approve: 31-0-0**

ITPC resolution #3 was read by Professor Bickmore and seconded by Professor Cokely.

**BE IT RESOLVED** That the Office of the Provost establish a committee consisting of the cyber security research faculty at Northeastern University; and

**BE IT ALSO RESOLVED** That the director and staff of the NU Office of Information Security regularly meet with that committee in order to better secure Northeastern's information infrastructure and to better support cyber security research; and

**BE IT ALSO RESOLVED** That security policy decisions be made in consultation with this committee.

Professor Hajjar asked if this might include taking laptops overseas and related security matters to which Professor Kirda replied that such a committee should do so. He explained that no-one working on security is coordinating or talking. Dean Poiger suggested broad thinking as data security arises in many colleges. Professor Bickmore confirmed that this is related to the LPOC proposal re data management at the library.

**VOTE to approve: 31-0-1**

ITPC resolution #4 was read by Professor Bickmore and Professor Cokely seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That Northeastern ITS provide a list of all software being considered for procurement related to infrastructure, teaching or research, to ITPC on at least a semi-annual basis, and that ITPC be charged with reviewing these lists and providing recommendations to ITS.**

Professor Kirda explained that the reasoning is to provide time for faculty input and not to slow down processes. Professor Brooks affirmed that there is no provision to prevent ITS from purchasing software but rather, a recommendation that the Senate ITPC be involved in order to bring a faculty point of view into the conversation. Discussion ensued concerning college-specific software and timeliness. Provost Bean agreed that faculty users should be involved in testing a product but agreed that timeliness is a concern.

**VOTE to approve: 31-0-1**

- VI.5 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE FOR FULL-TIME NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY. The following resolution was read by Professor Cokely and seconded by Prof Hanson.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the report of the 2015-2016 Senate Committee for Full-time non-tenure-track Faculty.**

Associate Teaching Professor Gardinier, Committee chair, was recognized to explain that issues of compensation were not charged to the Committee at this time. Compensation differs across colleges, as do titles. Regarding research dollars, the Committee discussed this with the Provost and efforts are being made to provide for all full-time non-tenure-track faculty (ft nttf) to apply for funds. Professor Barczak inquired whether deliberations were inclusive of Coop faculty and Professor Gardinier responded that this was not in the original charge.

Provost Bean indicated that discussions had taken place concerning whether these proposals represent the final language. They represent a big move forward and need involvement of the deans in vetting the details. He recommended that the proposals be considered drafts for review rather than be submitted for the vote. Professor Gardinier noted that the Committee had worked closely with SAC to establish wording and, while the language could undergo revision in the future, there is interest in resolving matters as soon as possible. Professor Kruger noted, too, that amendments may be proposed

although they seem relatively straight-forward. He noted that the proposed grievance policy has not changed in any way except to include ft nttf. He added that the ft nttf have been waiting a long time for these matters to move forward and noted the importance of having these protections in place before addressing participation in University governance. Professor Sceppa added that the proposals represent approval of certain principles.

**VOTE to accept the report: 33-0-0**

FT NTTFC resolution #1 was read by Professor Cokely and Professor Daynard seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That it is the sense of the Senate that Northeastern University move toward "one faculty" by minimizing the differences (with the obvious exception of tenure) between the various classifications of full-time faculty.**

A friendly amendment by substitution of the wording following the parentheses was proposed as follows "**in the rights and responsibilities between the various classifications of full-time faculty in the Faculty Handbook**". This was accepted by the movers.

Professor Portz suggested that the resolution is too broad and questioned whether all differences should be minimized. Questions were raised concerning possible implications. Professor Gardinier explained that recommendations concern issues of protection as a precursor to participation in the Faculty Senate. Vice Provost Loeffelholz warned against excessive "word-smithing" of a proposal that is aspirational. Professor Kruger noted that a 'sense of the Senate' has value in that it is not binding in its specifics or interpretation but sends a signal that the Senate embraces the inclusion of the ft nttf. Professor Lerner added that it is important to continue minimizing differences but the language does not say to eliminate differences. The resolution as amended is:

***BE IT RESOLVED That it is the sense of the Senate that Northeastern University move toward "one faculty" by minimizing the differences (with the obvious exception of tenure) in the rights and responsibilities between the various classifications of full-time faculty in the Faculty Handbook.***

**VOTE to approve the sense of the Senate as amended: 31-0-2**

FT NTTFC resolution #2 was read by Professor Cokely and Professor Ocampo-Guzman seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the proposed modified *Grievance Module* of the Faculty Handbook be accepted in order that all full-time faculty are included in and covered by the Grievance process currently reserved for Tenured and Tenure Track faculty.**

Professor Daynard spoke in favor of one grievance policy rather than the two very different policies currently in use. Vice Provost Loeffelholz suggested several edits by way of a friendly amendment to the Grievance Module.

**VOTE to accept updated Grievance Module for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook: 33-0-0**

FT NTTFC resolution #3 was read by Professor Cokely; Professor Kruger seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the proposed language on *Retaliation* be added to the Faculty Handbook as a new module.**

There is currently no language in the Faculty Handbook for either tenure-track or ft ntt faculty. Professor Cokely explained that the intent is that the opportunity to participate in the Senate requires anti-retaliation language. Such retaliation may include a variety of actions such as changing a teaching schedule, changing teaching obligations and any number of others. Professor Kruger noted that there is a definition in the wording of the module, Appendix II. Vice Provost Loeffelholz noted that the proposal is based on the University of PA whistleblower policy but could overlap with existing University policy and the additional wording does not have parallel at other institutions. Professor Kruger agreed that the proposal exceeds the UPA policy to address governance which is a concern for participation in governance matters. Retaliation does happen here. This is an important document as a precondition to serving on the Senate. Brief discussion ensued on the footnote whereby Professor Daynard indicated that it does not the limit scope of this policy. By way of legislative history he noted that there was particular concern among SAC members' years ago concerning retaliation. Today's environment has changed but, in the interest of the future, such assurance is reassuring regardless of the level of faculty/administration relationships. This is an important piece of the proposal which will give comfort toward the next step.

Discussion was had concerning the University whistle-blower policy and whether this proposal conflicts or duplicates it with the result being that duplication, in this case, is warranted given the importance of moving toward ft nttf participation on the Senate.

**VOTE that the proposed Retaliation Module be added to the Faculty Handbook: 33-0-0**

FT NTTFC resolution #4 was read by Professor Cokely read and was seconded by Professor Kruger.

**BE IT RESOLVED That all FT non-T/TT Faculty are eligible for the same lengths of contract, based on rank. Those ranks and corresponding contract lengths are:**

- **At first level/rank, such as assistant teaching professor: 1-year renewable terms**
- **At second level/rank, such as associate clinical professor: 3-year renewable terms**
- **At third level/rank, such as principal lecturer: 5-year renewable terms.**

**BE IT ALSO RESOLVED That, under extraordinary circumstances, contract length could be shortened from the aforementioned terms on a case by case basis.**

Vice Provost Loeffelholz expressed concern about using the word "all" as visiting faculty terms cannot be longer. Professor Kruger offered a friendly amendment to identify the same groups of faculty identified in the grievance policy and this was accepted.

As amended, the resolution is:

***BE IT RESOLVED That BE IT RESOLVED That all FT non-T/TT Faculty identified in the Grievance Policy are eligible for the same lengths of contract, based on rank. Those ranks and corresponding contract lengths are:***

- ***At first level/rank, such as assistant teaching professor: 1-year renewable terms***
- ***At second level/rank, such as associate clinical professor: 3-year renewable terms***
- ***At third level/rank, such as principal lecturer: 5-year renewable terms.***

***BE IT ALSO RESOLVED That, under extraordinary circumstances, contract length could be shortened from the aforementioned terms on a case by case basis.***

**VOTE for FT NTTFC resolution #4 regarding length of contract, as amended: 32-0-0**

FT NTTFC resolution #5 was read by Professor Cokely; Professor Kruger seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the proposed language on *Appointments, Terms and Reappointments* be added to the Faculty Handbook as a new module.**

Vice Provost Loeffelholz suggested ranks be specified and wondered if the proposal needed more work. Professor Gardinier noted that the essence of the proposal is around issues of non-reappointment where there is much misunderstanding about how contracts are issued.

**VOTE for FT NTTFC resolution #5 to add a new module entitled *Appointments, Terms and Reappointments* to the Faculty Handbook: 31-0-0**

FT NTTFC resolution #5 was read by Professor Cokely; Professor Ocampo-Guzman seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That Faculty members in the ranks of Assistant or Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant or Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant or Associate Academic Specialist, Lecturer or**



**Senior Lecturer may request consideration for promotion to the next faculty rank after completing a minimum of three full years of service at the faculty member's current rank. Units employing faculty members in these ranks shall have procedures for promotion consideration consistent with the Faculty Handbook, and approved by the Provost.**

Professor Sceppa offered a friendly amendment to include Coop Coordinator which was accepted by the movers. Professor Gardinier, in response to several questions, noted that promotion guidelines have been three years in most colleges which is admittedly different from tenured/tenure-track faculty. The distinction is around the sense of job security and whether to commit to stay is derivative of commitment from the organization. Dean Hudson argued that promotion is not the way to resolve length of contract and, if NU is moving toward the idea of one faculty, then the legacy of three years is odd. She suggested three one-year contracts and a three-year contract with promotion the same as tenure-track faculty. Several Senate members argued that expectations and rewards are different; therefore timeframes need not be the same.

As amended, resolution #6 is:

***BE IT RESOLVED That Faculty members in the ranks of Assistant or Associate Teaching Professor, Assistant or Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant or Associate Academic Specialist, Coop Coordinator, and Lecturer or Senior Lecturer may request consideration for promotion to the next faculty rank after completing a minimum of three full years of service at the faculty member's current rank. Units employing faculty members in these ranks shall have procedures for promotion consideration consistent with the Faculty Handbook, and approved by the Provost.***

**VOTE for FT NTTFC resolution #6 regarding procedures for promotion, as amended:  
30-0-2**

- VI.6 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE FOR ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS POLICY . The following resolution was read by Professor Barczak and seconded by Prof Cokely.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate accept the report of the 2015-2016 Senate Committee for Enrollment and Admissions Policy.**

**VOTE to accept the EAPC report: 32-0-0**

EAPC resolution #1 was read by Professor Barczak; Professor Kruger seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That Northeastern University ensure transparency regarding how the goals of the University are used to shape the composition of the in-coming undergraduate class, including the role that Deans and Associate Deans play in**

**establishing and meeting target enrollment goals for their respective colleges.**

Professor Ruberti, chair of EAPC was recognized and presented a summary, noting that results of the analysis are striking in terms of SAT changes since 2006. It would appear that SAT scores are driving the process. There is general decline in total enrollments in non-STEM and Bouvé but causes are difficult to pinpoint. The Committee met with Ronne Patrick Turner of EMSA to discuss selection policy but could not determine how they establish their rankings. The entire process is very opaque in many ways.

Discussion was undertaken concerning inclusion of NUin and transfer students, implementation, how transparency might be had, the University's strong emphasis on rankings and numbers, and marketing among the Colleges. Professor Barczak explained that transparency is being requested as it has not been clear that deans have had much to say about goals for their colleges. Provost Bean reiterated that EMSA is not creating limits. Professor Sceppa emphasized that there are targets for each College/School which are determined in some manner that is unclear. Non-STEM & Bouvé see a high number of applicants yet admits are still at the predetermined number. How is that determination done? Provost Bean responded that an obvious answer is that the quality of students is lower. Perhaps there is too narrow a definition of quality and the University could 1) improve sophistication in looking at broader standards, and 2) up our game in those colleges. Professor Daynard noted that a holistic evaluation of applicants seems to go against the traditional admissions procedures. Professor Kruger asked the question "Do we want to be a technical institution or find more students in every college?" He noted too that Colleges are held accountable but have little control over their revenue stream. These issues have implications for the University of the future and are both important and urgent.

Professor Howard reported that the School of Nursing has experienced steady admissions until recently with last year's incoming students at 17 compared to the norm of 75-100 students. Including external and internal transfers, the sophomore class is 82 students. These numbers wreak havoc for the budget and teaching assignments. Has the quality of students declined that much? In terms of clinical placement these dramatic fluctuations cause lost placement providers which are impossible to get back. Lastly, as a parent looking at colleges, NU sends a mixed message: You will not get in as a freshman but you can try as a sophomore. The Provost noted that his own understanding is that an invitation to apply as a sophomore is a rejection letter.

Professor Young opined that there appears to be disagreement rather than lack of clarity. Provost Bean noted that, fundamentally, some of the businesses are functioning better than others. Several Senators agreed that there is a lack of clarity about how decisions are being reached and are unconvinced that it is in a holistic manner. Dean Hudson noted that quality is so narrowly defined that students are admitted [to CAMD] who cannot do the work. Provost Bean countered that, in NU's current situation, the argument that we must admit lower quality students will not work. It is clear that some areas are not competing well and it must be someone else's fault. We need to be more mature.

Professor Kanouse found this demeaning: how can admissions parameters be revised so that projections can be made? Dean Hudson concurred that [CAMD] is being forced to admit a lower quality of student rather than a higher one.

Dean Reynolds expressed initial concerns about the holistic reviews of undergraduate student applications and was re-assured by the EMSA team that such reviews are conducted before SAT scores are considered. He also noted that during his interaction with the EMSA team to discuss enrollments for the coming year, the team was receptive to information from the college, but there was only limited dialogue.

Professor Portz reiterated that information is needed in the form of a report to the Senate. Professor Sceppa noted that the intent of the resolution is to identify the process by which numbers are arrived at and communication of the outcomes. How do deans and colleges fit into the process? What are the enrollment goals and how they are set? What kind of university do we want to be in 5-10 years, since, given the current enrollments, it will be very different? Professor Peterfreund was recognized and noted that non-STEM colleges are experiencing a significantly lower tuition discount than STEM colleges. The Provost averred that financial aid is awarded according to the quality of the students. Dean Courtney agreed that now is the time to talk about long-term matters. The current process is a bit too opportunistic as opposed to strategic. Provost Bean rebutted that, while everyone does not agree on the strategy, the process is strategic.

Professor Sceppa proposed amendment by substitution to target the NU process by which target enrollment goals are determined via discussion and information-gathering for purposes of planning in the short and long term. This was seconded. Several senators spoke in favor. The proposed substitution is:

***BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate discuss at the earliest date in the fall of 2016 the University's strategies and processes for shaping the undergraduate student cohort in light of the university we want to be and to seek out the information it needs to have these discussions.***

***VOTE to amend by substitution: 32-0-0***

**VOTE on EAPC resolution #1, as amended: 31-0-0**

Professor Barczak read EAPC resolution #2; Professor Hanson seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) provide more transparency into the process of determining admitted undergraduates, including information to the faculty as to how particular elements of an application are weighted.**

Professor Daynard proposed that this be postponed to after the discussion; this was seconded. Several Senators spoke in favor. Professor Sceppa spoke against as decisions are being made now for the coming year.

**VOTE to postpone: 19-10-1**

Professor Barczak read EAPC resolution #3; Professor Kruger seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) collaborate with each of the colleges, which have experienced substantial declines in fall freshman enrollments during the last several years, for the purpose of devising a mutually satisfactory plan for increasing the fall freshman enrollments in these colleges; and**

**BE IT ALSO RESOLVED That EMSA report annually to the Faculty Senate on the design, implementation and outcomes of these enrollment improvement plans.**

Professor Daynard offered the same motion to postpone until fall as the resolution seeks a mutually satisfactory plan with EMSA and is part of larger strategic discussion to move the University forward. Professor Kruger disagreed as a strategic discussion will take time and it would be negligent to postpone with no interim plan in place to shore up enrollments. A friendly amendment by deletion of the word "mutually" was accepted by the movers.

As amended:

***BE IT RESOLVED THAT Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) collaborate with each of the colleges, which have experienced substantial declines in fall freshman enrollments during the last several years, for the purpose of devising a satisfactory plan for increasing the fall freshman enrollments in these colleges; and***

***BE IT ALSO RESOLVED That EMSA report annually to the Faculty Senate on the design, implementation and outcomes of these enrollment improvement plans.***

**VOTE in favor of EAPC resolution #3: 20-9-2**

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

VII.1 The 2015-2016 Faculty Senate concluded its business at 2:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Hanson, Secretary  
Faculty Senate