

Baylor University Faculty Senate Minutes

16 April 2019

Draper 147♦ 3:30-5:00 p.m.

Members Present: Senators Kathryn Steely for Bolen, Bradley; Cordon, Matt; Dodson, Derek; Elkins, Nathan; Farwell, Beth; Garner, Brian; Hansen, Christopher; Horace Jr., Maxile; Hultquist, Beth; Hurtt, Kathy; Daniel Shafer for Korpi, Michael; LeCompte, Karon; Leutholtz, Brian; Long, Mark; Long, Michael; MacGregor, Jason; McGlashan, Ann; Neilson, Bill; Nichols, Curt; Parrish, Maxey; Pittman, Coretta; Potts, Tom; Michael Sullivan for Pounders, Steven; Raines, Brian; Robinson, Eric; Rodgers, Denyse; Schubert, Keith; Sielaff, Steven; Souza-Fuertes, Lizbeth; Stone, Sara; Strakos, Josh; Stroope, Mike; Supplee, Joan; Taylor, Mark; Umstead, Randall; Walden, Dan; Wilcox, Walter; and Wilfong Jr., Stanley.

Members absent: Senator Flippo, Renee; Ellor, James; Leidner, Dorothy; Nuner, Joyce; and Staff Council Representative Heather Guenat.

I. Call to Order

Senate Chair Randall Umstead called the meeting to order at 3:31pm. He explained that since the last meeting went overtime, he would make every effort to keep to the times allotted on the agenda.

II. Invocation—3:30pm

Senator Dan Walden offered an invocation.

III. Guest Presentation: President Linda Livingstone—3:35pm

President Livingstone mentioned how she appreciated the opportunity to give an update on what is happening at the university. Chair Umstead had provided a summary of some questions from senators and she would answer them as well.

Dr. Livingstone recognized that as we move into the implementation of the strategic plan, the changes that occur can cause anxiety and stress as well as fear. Sometimes the fear is not so much regarding change, but loss of what people were used to or how things were done before, and not knowing what lies ahead. She understands that and realizes that we have great aspirations. We are trying to do something significant at the university, and it can be not only a daunting task, but difficult to realize where we each fit in to where the institution is going. It is important to think about the role that each of us can play because we all will have an important role that we can contribute to—supporting our students, moving forward with the university and implementing the strategic plan. She stated that we really do need everybody on board to make it a success and to find a way to help everybody feel like they are contributing in a significant way.

As the university talks about these issues, first and foremost in all we do, we will keep our mission at the center and core of what we are doing: we are here to educate men and women for worldwide leadership and service by integrating academic excellence and Christian commitment

within a caring community. At the end of the day, we always try to go back to that, our foundation.

In the academic strategic plan, there are Four Pillars:

1. Strengthening and ensuring the integrity of our Christian mission;
2. Continuing to strengthen transformational undergraduate education;
3. Growing our research and scholarly impact breadth and depth; and,
4. Ensuring that our student activities are really performing at the highest level.

Lastly, she mentioned that it is important to be good stewards of the resources, assets and gifts that God has given us as a university to carry out the work that we do.

President Livingstone then went on to talk about the pillars and their relative value:

- The pillars are all critical to Baylor's success. We count them as pillars because we need to hold true to all four of them; otherwise, we will not be able to fulfill our goals. If we carry out the four pillars well, we will be doing something unique to Baylor and no other university in the country. Fulfilling the four pillars is difficult and part of the stress we feel is due to this.
- Historically, Pillars Two (Christian mission) and Three (undergraduate education) have clearly been the driving forces behind the university. In fact, that is why they are so strong because they have been the strategy of the institution and also why we have been as successful as we are today and why they need to stay strong as we go forward.
- Pillar Three, on research and scholarly activity, has been given far less strategic attention, so the infrastructure and support around that, while it has been developed, has not been developed as fully or broadly across the institution, certainly not as much as the first two pillars. It does need some strategic attention and some feel it has received more or perhaps unbalanced attention in relation to the first two, but possibly because they have been developed more over time.
- The four pillars do not exist independently from one another; they are intricately related to each other. She believes that great research leads to great teaching, and bringing our research interests into our teaching will enrich the experience our students have. In fact, we know from Admissions that the best undergraduate students across the country want to be engaged in research. If we can have the capacity to support it at the undergraduate level and at the master's and doctoral level, we really need to build our research capacity across campus, in large part to support Pillar Two and certainly, Pillar One.
- Since all four pillars work together, if we do Pillars One, Two, and Three well, we will be well-positioned to help our students perform exceptionally outside the walls of the university.

- We are partially through the first year of implementing a five-year plan that is tied to a 10-year vision, so what we see now is not what we will see in the next three, five, or seven years down the road. We cannot do everything at once, but we continue to talk about what kind of structure and support mechanisms we need to fully implement *Illuminate* along with the four pillars around the five academic theme areas over the coming years. Certainly it is important for us to receive feedback as we go forward. We do understand that this is a work in progress and it will continue to grow and develop in the years ahead around all four pillars and leading into the five academic theme areas.

Teaching, research, and workload

- These are issues that all universities across the country struggle with, talk about, and try to understand how they can all work together in a way that helps the institution move forward. Therefore, the conversations we are having are not unique to Baylor, but they are important and we need to have everybody's voice in this process.
- Regarding one of the points made earlier, of being good stewards of the resources we have as an institution: our most critical resources are our people on campus—faculty, staff, students, alumni, and others. Other resources include financial and physical facilities, for example. We are working in all of these areas to ensure that we use those resources to the highest investment purposes, to support the academic enterprise. We are rethinking our financial model, to examine and verify if it is designed in the best way to give the support our schools and units need to do the best job they can in teaching and research. We are looking at facility resources, and we created for the first time a facilities task force that is looking at being strategic as we get requests on how to use facilities best. They are a very expensive and valuable resource and the more we can do with the resources we have before building a new building, the better off we are.
- This same conversation is taking place as it relates to our human resources, our faculty and staff resources, and how we are using them on campus. One element of this conversation is faculty workload. There is a workload policy that was approved in 2005 and the question now is if the policy is being applied consistently and, if not, how we can apply it more effectively across campus, while ensuring that faculty's time is being directed in the highest and best way it can be in supporting the institution. For example, if we hire a faculty member with a 2/2 teaching load, there would be an expectation that he/she would be doing a certain level of research. Typically, if it is a tenure-track faculty member, the research expectation would be at a level that would qualify him/her to be tenured at the tenure point in their career. In following that faculty member's career over a period of time, the question is if that person's research is still at the level that was expected of them at that 2/2 load and, if not, why is that? There could be a number of reasons, such as a high level of service or taking on administrative duties, but maybe their research is not moving forward for some other reason. What do we do in working with that faculty member? How do we ensure that what you are doing is contributing fully to the life of the university? That faculty member can sit down with their chair and dean, and talk about what the workload should look like going forward. Maybe the faculty truly wants to reinvigorate their research agenda and wants to find a path back to being more

productive as they were at a certain point in their career. They can work out a plan over a two-year period or so to help the faculty member reinvigorate their production from a scholarly perspective. On the other hand, the faculty member might think that a better pathway would be to do additional teaching and that could be another option. In order to accomplish what we are doing, we need some faculty who are doing more teaching; we need some faculty who are doing more research; and we need some faculty who have a balance of both.

- On the other hand, there is sometimes the perception that doing more teaching is punishment. That is not the intent of the plan, and President Livingstone truly hopes we do not have that kind of mindset; she also hopes students do not interpret it in that manner either. Teaching is one of the primary privileges of being on a college campus, and she considers it a perfectly appropriate way to contribute to Baylor's mission. We do need to acknowledge teaching excellence and, while we already do that, we can do better. She is aware that merit decisions were made recently and her understanding is that faculty were rewarded from a high-merit increase perspective both for excellence in teaching and in research. We need to continue to refine this process to appropriately reward excellence in what faculty are doing across campus.
- President Livingstone also cautioned against anecdotal conclusions regarding the broad decisions being made on merit and the value being placed on teaching and research.

A few other updates and questions to think about include:

- How can each of us do our part to help Baylor progress as a university? That role will be different for each of us.
- What is in the best interest of our students as we move forward?
- How can we creatively work together to help each other work through the change and some of the anxiety that goes with different pathways forward?
- Can we embrace a model where some people are primarily teaching, some are primarily doing research, and others are doing a balance of both?
- How can we work together to continue to talk and work through these difficult issues in ways that help the institution and move *Illuminate* forward?

Other issues:

- We have had great success with the campaign this year. We anticipate that by the end of the academic year, we will be over \$200 million in receiving the largest amount ever before. That would put us over \$700 million toward our goal of \$1.1 billion. This is very exciting. From an academic perspective it is what some of the funding is for—we already announced the Welcome Center; it will be a wonderful Center for our prospective students and their parents; there will be an Alumni Center embedded in that facility. The Tidwell building will also be remodeled; the project goal was to raise \$20 million and we have raised \$17 million so far. The plans have been out there for about ten years and it will probably be the first project that will get done. A formal announcement will be out in the near future.

- We will be announcing a transformational gift that will be a matching program for endowed chairs on campus. It will be significant, probably the largest gift to academics outside the capital gift or building we have ever had. It will allow us to create approximately 17 endowed chairs at the \$3 million level and it will be accessible to all the schools across campus. Currently we have five endowed chairs at the \$3 million-level or higher and this has allowed us to have a dramatic impact. We are very excited to see these early gifts, which show how much support we have among our community for what we are trying to do.
- Enrollment is very strong for Fall 2019. We hope to see a class similar to last year's—around 3,300-3,400 accepted students. Currently the class is as academically qualified or more than last year's class and that class was the most academically qualified we have had. It is also among the most diverse classes we have ever had. We did change the model for deposits this year. We used to have refundable deposits.
- We have also done some research with a group called Simpson Scarborough. It started three years ago, trying to understand how those issues were affecting the perceptions of Baylor by prospective students and their parents. We just received the results of the third round, and Simpson Scarborough said that they had never seen as dramatic a change in a positive direction about the perceptions of an institution as they saw about Baylor in a full two-year period of time. They found there were no lingering impacts of sexual assault issues among prospective students and their parents. We have not had enrollment concerns over that period because of those issues; it has been important for us to be positioned where we are now from a financial perspective.
- We have received reaffirmation of our A+ bond rating by Fitch and S&P Global rating, which is very positive.
- Our new provost, Dr. Nancy Brickhouse, will start on May 1st and there will be a reception in her honor on May 6th at Armstrong Browning Library. We are excited to have her on board.
- It is a really good time to be at Baylor. There are tremendous opportunities for us as we try to work through some of the difficult issues and move forward together. As I said at my inauguration address, the world needs a Baylor because we are a unique place, that cares about our Christian mission, cares about teaching, and we are trying to grow and move forward on research and want our students to perform at exceptional levels.

When President Livingstone finished, Chair Umstead asked for a motion to extend this item agenda for ten minutes. Senator Chris Hansen made the motion; Senator Joan Supplee seconded and the motion passed.

A time for Q&A with President Livingstone followed.

IV. Guest Presentation: Student Course Evaluation Task Force – 4:13pm

Chair Umstead explained that there was a senate task force in 2015-2016 that studied Student Course Evaluations (SCEs). The task force was appointed by then Chair Ron Beal, and they made a series of recommendations, including that there be another task force created to study implementation. The first step was to deal with the instrument itself.

He then introduced Dr. Lisa Shaver, chair of the Student Course Evaluation task force. The members include Dr. Jim Ellor, Dr. Blaine McCormick, Dr. Kathleen Morley, Dr. Christopher Richman, Dr. Lane Scales, Dr. Lisa Shaver (chair), Dr. Jo-Ann Tsang, and Dr. Lenore Wright.

Dr. Shaver thanked the task force for their work. They worked well together and are very proud of the results. Their goal was to make people dislike Student Course Evaluations (SCE) less.

The charge was to develop an instrument or prompts for a new course evaluation. Our course evaluation has not been updated in 30 years. The senate task force was particularly interested in increasing response rates, which they viewed as reducing the length of the SCE, decreasing bias, and improving the information that is gathered.

Additional research that this task force did was to review course evaluations from other institutions; they reached out to faculty of Color Alliance, the Women in Science and Engineering, and the BU Women's Colloquium. They developed a Qualtrics survey that was sent out to faculty requesting feedback about the current course evaluation. They also reviewed current scholarship on course evaluations.

The results of the faculty survey showed they thought the main benefits of the SCE are to provide the instructor feedback for course revisions, and to give students the opportunity to give feedback on the course anonymously, and providing input from students for future course planning. The limitations are that it is used as the primary measure for teaching effectiveness; that it is biased; and there is a low response rate. The most helpful questions for faculty are the free responses, because they provide detailed information and often give constructive ideas. They thought that questions that point to specific areas where they can make improvements were helpful as well. The questions they found least helpful are the first questions that refer to expected grade, absences, required course, a total of five questions which seem not to be used much.

Drawing from the research, SCEs are the most common method used to evaluate teaching primarily because they are fast, inexpensive, easy to administer, and they give the appearance of objectivity with the numbers. They do not provide an accurate measure of teaching effectiveness or student learning. Most of the research shows they are primarily an indicator of the grade the student expects to receive and contain bias. They reflect biases that students bring to them, such as gender, race, and age; particularly gender studies have shown that the bias is large enough that it is statistically significant and there is nothing you can do with the questions to adjust for that—it is something students bring to the evaluations. On the other hand, what SCEs are very effective at is providing a measure of students' perceptions; their views and experiences of the course. It provides a good position for students to observe some aspects of teaching, clarity, interaction,

assignments, and student comments contain valuable information about their experiences in the course.

Based on the research, the task force proposes reducing the current SCE from its 23 questions to 9. Dr. Shaver mentioned that if students have five courses, which is typically the standard, they answer 115 questions every term. With the task force's recommendation, they will take it down to 45. The 9 questions are intended to amass student perceptions and additional explanations around the aspects of the course that faculty can actually use. Therefore, the task force has really narrowed it down to specific areas that can be addressed.

The first six questions would include the typical "strongly agree" through "strongly disagree" as well as the option for comments. The last three questions would be open response. They narrowed down the questions, such as "what would you do if a student said 'strongly agree' or 'strongly disagree;'" what would you learn from this? If the faculty member would not be able to receive any valuable constructive feedback, the question was deleted. They used questions faculty can actually act upon.

The proposed six questions are:

1. The instructor engaged with students (e.g., greeted students before or after class, initiated conversations, invited and responded questions, was willing to meet with students).

Comments:

2. The instructor clearly explained the subject matter.

Comments:

3. The feedback and evaluation I received on my work contributed to my learning.

Comments:

4. The assignments (readings, papers, problems, projects, etc.) contributed to my understanding of course content.

Comments:

5. The course frequently encouraged students to engage with material (through discussion, discussion boards, group work, class exercises).

Comments:

6. This class helped me achieve a better understanding of the subject.

Comments:

The three open-ended questions are:

7. Describe what you found to be the most valuable aspects of this course?
8. Describe what you found to be the least valuable aspects of this course?
9. Is there additional information or feedback you would like to share?

The task force tried to take “the instructor” out of the questions whenever possible. There were a few questions where that did not make sense. You could not have “the course explained the subject clearly,” but they did try to remove “the instructor” because a lot of the feedback was hurtful comments that are biased. They really wanted students to reflect on the course itself. The old open-ended questions contained mostly instructor-related questions, so they changed it to “course-related”.

Not all concerns raised by the faculty senate and faculty members could be addressed by survey questions alone, so they made additional recommendations:

- Colleges, departments establish multiple means of assessing teaching effectiveness (eg. periodic peer review, teaching portfolios, course design materials, instructor reflection, mid-term evaluations with instructor adjustments).
- The university recognizes the limitation of SCEs. Numerous studies have shown that SCEs do not accurately reflect teaching effectiveness or student learning. SCEs also replicate gender, racial, age, and other biases that students bring to them. Consequently, SCEs have become the subject of lawsuits at institutions that use them as the primary gauge of teaching effectiveness for raises and promotions.
- To better utilize SCEs for instructor improvement, departments ask faculty to provide narratives that accompany SCE results similar to the narratives required in tenure/promotion notebooks.
- The university add explicit instructions up front that explain the purpose of SCEs and discourage inappropriate comments.
- The university provide faculty with the option to administer SCEs for each of their classes during class periods within an established window of time. After this window, SCEs will be open for students to complete any time. We believe the faculty’s frustration around the new electronic SCEs is the loss of control over conditions and circumstances in which they are administered, which also contributes to low response rates. Members of our taskforce would be happy to pilot this new option.
- The university adopt this new SCE instrument beginning spring 2020.
- The university institute a periodic 5-year review of SCEs by faculty.

A period of Q & A followed the presentation.

V. Approval of Minutes: March 2019 – 4:34pm

Chair Umstead placed the March 2019 minutes on the screen. One senator had distributed suggestions for changes in the minutes. Chair Umstead asked if there was a motion to approve all the changes, but another senator asked to have a discussion on each change.

- 1) Senator Nichols made a motion to replace the words:

“BUPP-706: Faculty is supposed to have a 100% workload every semester under existing policy.”

With

“BUPP-706 states that: “A twelve-hour teaching assignment is generally considered to constitute a 100% workload each semester. Teaching load reductions from this level are determined on an individual basis by the faculty member and the chair.”

The motion was seconded by Senator Supplee. Discussion followed, with objection made against adding words to the minutes that were only shown to the Senate on the overhead for viewing. The senate voted and the motion failed.

- 2) Senator Nichols made a motion to add the vote count results to the minutes and made a motion to add the red text to the blue:

“The senate voted on the amendment and the motion carried by a count of 22 yeas to 5 nays with 1 abstention.”

The motion was seconded by Senator Supplee. Discussion followed, and a friendly amendment was made to alter this wording to read:

“The senate voted on the amended motion and it carried by a count of 22 yeas to 5 nays with 1 abstention.”

The senate voted and the amended motion passed with one abstention.

- 3) Senator Nichols made a motion to correct the minutes to read:

A discussion followed. Wherein Senator Nichols articulated that the intent of his motion was to create a Task Force that was to focus on “whether” A&S should move forward with changes, rather than “how” to move forward. This followed Chair-Elect Raines’ statement that the intent of the proposed change in practice was to help foster accountability. Senator Jason MacGregor suggested that we simplify and make an amendment to the motion:

The motion was seconded by Senator Supplee. Discussion followed and the senate voted; the motion did not carry. There was one abstention.

- 4) Senator Nichols made a motion to update the time on p. 7, changing the start time of the New Business section at 4:55pm. There was no second and the motion could not continue.

Chair Umstead then asked for a vote in favor of adopting the minutes as presented and amended. The motion carried.

VI. Reports – 4:44pm

a) Provost's Office Meeting (Randy Umstead)

Chair Umstead reported that:

- Incoming Provost Nancy Brickhouse was on campus for two days last week and was able to meet with a variety of people, including all the deans. She also spent time with Chair-Elect Raines and Chair Umstead and they were able to discuss a variety of issues, made suggestions, talked about the ongoing workload conversations. They made two very specific suggestions, not coming from the senate, but were based upon their hearing of what has been a part of senate conversations. One of those related to the faculty merit evaluation process:
 - One thing that Chair Umstead has been hearing is that faculty annual salary evaluations have been determined largely upon research and, if that is the case, it would fall outside the scope of BUPP 706, because what it states is that your evaluation should be based on your workload. For example, if your workload is 50% teaching and 50% research, then your annual evaluation should be 45% teaching, 45% research, and 10% service. If a faculty member received an Outstanding on teaching and an Effective on research and an Effective on service, and their overall evaluation was an Effective, that would misapply the policy, and faculty could grieve that. Our recommendation was that the provost start off by making sure that that policy is enforced by deans and chairs, particularly if there is a move to a 3/3 from a 2/2.
 - The second recommendation was that the administration consider the 12-hour workload be moved down to a 9-hour workload.
- Dr. Brickhouse took the recommendations under advisement.
- Chair Umstead also reported on the Provost's Office meeting and he shared some of the concerns faculty have related to the workload changes in A&S. There was also a presentation by Interim Vice Provost for Research Kevin Chambliss about the changes that will occur in the Office for Vice Provost Research as a result of their work with a consulting group and how the processes will be streamlined.

b) Academic Freedom and Responsibility (no report)

c) Admissions Committee (no report)

d) Faculty Athletic Council (Jason MacGregor)

There was an email discussion regarding the addition of a basketball game in the Fall during one of the Study Days for the men's team. There was a discussion whether that was appropriate. There was a loophole in the current policy that states they are not supposed to have games on Study Days unless the Big XII asks, but it was supposed to be only against Big XII teams and, in this case, it is against the Big East. Since it is a home game, they will allow it to take place.

e) Council on Global Engagement (no report)

f) Faculty Dismissal (no report)

g) Human Resources Advisory Committee (Kathy Hurtt)

Chair Umstead mentioned that the complete report is posted in Box. Senator Hurtt noted that she was pleased that they talked and listened to the people on the committee. They were very open to faculty mentioning, for example, that certain policies only relate to staff and if there would be any inclusion related to faculty.

h) Faculty-in-Residence Committee (Kathy Hurtt)

Senator Hurtt mentioned the report is also in Box. She was pleased to inform that admission for next year looks great.

i) Libraries/ITS Advisory Committee (no report)

j) Student Life and Services Committee (no report)

k) Staff Council (no report)

l) Enrollment Management Committee (no report)

VII. New Business – 4:50pm

Chair Umstead explained that the senate bylaws say that on or before the April meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Chair is to appoint a faculty senate Nominating Committee to come up with a slate of officers and the senate will vote on it at the May meeting.

The nominating committee members are:

Brad Bolen, Joan Supplee, Bill Neilson, Jim Ellor, Ann McGlashan, Kathy Hurtt, Mike Stroope, and Randy Umstead (ex officio).

VIII. Old Business – 4:51pm

a) Proposal of Draft Charter

As a result of the senate's work regarding the changes to the retirement plan last Fall, one of the things the senate wanted the Executive Committee (EC) to advocate for was for more faculty involvement in the decision-making process and more transparency from the committees that make those decisions. The EC has been working with Human Resources (HR) and the Office of General Counsel (OGC) to develop new draft charters that have been brought to us for approval. The high points are: for the Retirement and Health Insurance committees, once populated, each year there will be three members rotating off and three members rotating on, out of a total composition of nine members. Under the federal law that governs these things, the president, as

an extension of the Board of Regents, has to retain final authority over all the appointments. Of the three people rotating on each year, one would be recommended by Staff Council, one by Faculty Senate, and the third, by the President's Council/Deans. Out of the group of nine members, faculty senate would have a hand in one-third of that committee, as opposed to now, where we have no say.

Another item was that for the Chair and Vice Chair of committee, one would normally be faculty, the other staff.

The second issue is that in the first year where we need to populate the committees and make changes, we need to develop some sort of abnormal process for it, such as put forward two names, or maybe three names, at they might be for terms that are different from this, and OGC said it is fine because of the language used in the chartering documents (such as "shall"). The EC brought forth a motion for the senate to approve this proposal.

Secondarily, we could consider the EC continuing to apply the previous motion to continue the conversation in order to clarify the details of the one-year appointment process.

The motion does not require a second because it comes from the EC. There was no discussion and Chair Umstead called the vote to approve these proposed policies. The motion carried.

b) BUPP on University Committees

There are two changes that the Committee on Committees (CoC), the provost's office and Chair Umstead have talked about:

1. The CoC would like the faculty senate to bless their report, even if it is incomplete or even if it needs a process for continuing to change throughout the year; and,

2. They do not want to be responsible for summarizing the report from every standing university committee every year. They wanted the committees to do that and would be happy to provide guidelines.

If we approve these changes, Chair Umstead would take them to the provost's office, who would circulate them amongst the deans and eventually it would go to the president because it is a university policy.

Senator Hurtt made a motion to approve the changes put forward by the Committee on Committees. Senator Supplee seconded.

There was a short discussion.

Senator Cordon explained that the CoC is not requiring formalities such as minutes from meetings, because it would be impractical, but they are collecting how often committees meet and any recommended changes.

The senate voted and the motion carried.

c) Student Course Evaluation Task Force Proposal

Chair Umstead asked if there were any thoughts on what was presented and discussed today, and there was a very short discussion. Senator LeCompte asked to postpone the discussion to the next senate meeting so we have time to read and prepare remarks in a timely and thoughtful manner. Chair Umstead had already set aside time at the May meeting for this.

d) Faculty Workload Task Force

Senator Nichols asked this item to be put on the agenda and mentioned that if anybody wonders if he wanted to be on the task force, he indeed did. Senator Nichols continued to explain that Chair Umstead used his prerogative, which the Constitution and Bylaws allow the senate chair to staff the committee as he desires. Senator Nichols stated he continues not to be happy and feels hurt. He also believes it is unconstitutional for any senate task force to try to have closed meetings. He does not see anywhere that anyone is empowered to prevent him or anyone else to attend and be a non-speaking observer. He has been denied being able to attend the task force meetings.

IX. Announcements

Chair Umstead reminded the senate that the meeting time for our May meeting is different from our normal schedule. It will be on May 7 at 2:00-5:00pm.

IX. Adjournment—5:01pm

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Senator Joan Supplee. The motion was seconded by Chair-Elect Brian Raines and approved by the senate. The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lizbeth Souza-Fuertes
Recording Secretary