

**2007/2008 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
January 28, 2008**

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. and attendance was taken. Forty-two Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Van Selst, Sabalius,  
Gorman, Henderson,  
Lessow- Hurley, Kassing

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Sigler, Lee, Najjar, Phillips

**Deans:**

Present: Parrish, Stacks  
Absent: Wei, Merdinger

**Students:**

Present: Reyes, Lazarowich,  
Grabowski, Zeier  
Absent: McDaniel, Prothro-Jones

**Alumni Representative:**

Absent: Thompson

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**Honorary Senators (Non-Voting):**

Present: Norton

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Romo, Sivertsen, Liu

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Fee, Kao, Schultz-Krohn, Canham, Hendrick

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Campsey  
Absent: Roldan, Jiang

**ED Represent:**

Present: Langdon, Maldonado-Colon, Rickford

**ENG Representatives:**

Present: Backer  
Absent: Meldal, Gao

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Mok, Butler, Desalvo, Van Hooff, Vanniarajan  
Absent: Belet

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: McClory, Kaufman, Hilliard, Bros

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Von Till  
Absent: Hebert, Zia

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes – Minutes of December 10, 2007 were approved as is.**

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Lessow-Hurley made the following announcements:

Senators were welcomed back from the winter break.

Senator Belet was welcomed back from sabbatical.

The Chair attended the Greater Expectations Retreat organized by Rona Halualani. The retreat focused on retention of African-American and Latino students.

In mid-January SJSU formally began the presidential search. You will be hearing more about this shortly. The Trustees have said they will not be using a headhunter and have asked for nominees. Names can be sent to Chair Lessow-Hurley.

The Goals Advisory Committee (GAC) is going to reconvene. The Chair has asked for nominees from the campus for a Faculty-at-Large seat. Senators were asked to encourage their colleagues to run. The selection will be made on February 5, 2008.

The Chair encouraged all Senators with terms expiring this spring to run again.

## **B. From the President of the University –**

President Kassing, Larry Carr, and Rona Halualani made the following announcements:

### **Blood Drives:**

Blood drives are going to be suspended on campus because they violate our campus anti-discrimination policy. An email message announcing this will be sent out campus-wide to all faculty, staff, and students. The Chancellor is fine with our position on this issue. A letter will also be sent to the Commissioner of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) outlining our position today. That letter will be copied to our congressional delegation, state Assembly, and state Senate as well as local council members, Mayor Chuck Reed, the Stanford Blood Center, the American Red Cross, the head of the county hospital consortium, the Chancellor's Office, and all of our sister CSU campuses.

### **Questions:**

Senator Peter said, "I am proud to be a member of an institution taking a leadership role in civil rights. How alone are we?" Rona Halualani said, "We are one of only four universities in California to take this position. We are one of the first in California." President Kassing said, "Twenty percent of all donations come from high school and university students. We have to be careful how we come at this. We want to effect a change, but not paralyze the blood supply."

Senator Gorman said, "I appreciate the efforts in this regard." Senator Sivertsen said, "I am proud to work with this President. However, we also need to promote safe sex."

### **Greater Expectations Retreat:**

The President thanked everyone that attended the Greater Expectations Retreat in early January.

**Budget:**

Budget conversations have started. VP Lee is sorting through what it all means. It appears simple, but it is not. One positive thing is that the unions and student organizations are working together. After the budget information gets more precise, we will assemble and present it to the Senate.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**December 10, 2007 –**

Senator Sabalius said, “Item 2b of the minutes state that I will attend CSU Statewide meetings in the Fall 2008, and be on sabbatical in Spring 2008. I have changed that and will be attending meetings in Spring 2008, and be on sabbatical during Fall 2008. The new elected Vice Chair will have to attend meetings during the Fall 2008 for me.”

**B. Consent Calendar –**

Senator McClory announced there were three informational items:

Associate Dean Ping Hsu has agreed to be the Administrative representative on the Student Fairness Committee (SFC).

Blair Whitney will be the Graduate Student representative to the University Library Board (ULB).

There are lavender colored sheets in the back of the room that have a list of the Senators whose terms are expiring this Spring. These Senators are encouraged to run again.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items: None**

**V. Unfinished Business - None**

**VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.**

**A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) – None**

**B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None**

**C. University Library Board (ULB) – None**

#### **D. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

Senator Bros presented *AS 1375, Policy Recommendation, Administration of Online Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Evaluations for Online Courses (Final Reading)*. Senator Bros said, “I’m very excited about bringing the final reading of this policy. The main reason for this policy is that under the current policy, those individuals that teach online courses have to use a mailing system to deliver their SOTES. We clearly have a need for this. The Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) has developed an appropriate online instrument. All we have to do today is act on that.”

#### **Questions:**

Senator Van Selst said, “Under 5.6 it is not clear to me what happens if the course is online only, and if the faculty member has the option of administering it in a classroom if no classroom exists.” Senator Bros said, “They do. We wanted to make sure we didn’t restrict the instructor. We wanted to leave that up to the discretion of the faculty member.”

Senator Peter said, “Just a final clarification on the CFA position, are we going to end up wind up in a grievance over this?” Senator Bros said, “My last communication with Liz Cara assured me that this was not going to happen for this particular issue. Primarily because this is for online courses, and the fact that we added the terminology, *majority of the course online*, should further eliminate that as a possibility.”

Senator Van Hooff said, “I just want to make sure I understand this. The faculty member has the choice of either having their SOTES online or to request a paper copy?” Senator Bros said, “Yes, it is their choice. There are some classes where a large portion of the class is online, but the class does meet occasionally.” Senator Van Hooff said, “Then this is geared toward hybrid classes, what about the classes that are totally online?” Senator Bros said, “It wouldn’t be necessary to do that. I can’t imagine why the instructor would choose to have it in class, but if they did so why not? It is to their advantage to do it online, because they will have a much higher return rate.”

#### **Debate:**

Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to change, “The Office of Institutional Planning and Academic Resources Office,” in the 5<sup>th</sup> line of 3.3 to read, “The Office of Institutional Research,” and to change “Instructional Research” in 5.6.2 to read Institutional Research.” Senator Van Selst made a friendly amendment to add a section 5.6.3 to read, “A course section that never meets in the classroom shall be evaluated online.” Senator Kaufman proposed an amendment to the Van Selst amendment to add at the end of 5.6.3, “should the faculty member choose to have it evaluated.” Senator Van Selst said, “The Kaufman amendment would be friendly if instead of being 5.6.3, it was made 5.7.” Senator Maldonado-Colon made a friendly amendment to the Van Selst amendment to have a section 5.7 that reads, “A course section that meets 100% online shall be evaluated online if it is to be evaluated.” Senator Backer made a friendly amendment to rename the title in section 2 of the policy to read, “2. Faculty Responsibilities for On-Campus Course Sections, and to rename the title in section 3 to read, “3. Proctor Instructions for On-Campus Course Sections.” Senator Langdon proposed an amendment to 5.1 to read, “5.1 SOTES are required for all faculty (including tenured, and non-tenured) who teach.” The

Langdon amendment was not seconded. Senator Van Selst proposed a new section 4 to read, “4. Instructions for Online Evaluations.” followed by a new section 4.1 to replace 3.2 to read, “4.1 The following statements shall be posted: You are being asked to complete a Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness, or SOTE, form. The results of the SOTE serve some important purposes. First, the results provide helpful feedback to the instructor, which can assist in improvement of instruction and course design. In addition, the results are an element of the instructor’s performance evaluation. While the SOTE results are an important part of the instructor’s evaluation process, they are but one element of that process” followed by a new 4.2 to replace 3.3 to read, “4.2 Under no circumstances shall any completed SOTE instruments be returned to the instructor of record.” The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed. **The Senate voted and AS 1375 passed as amended.**

**E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – None**

**VII. Special Committee Reports – None**

**VIII. New Business –**

**Discussion on the Presidential Search:**

Chair Lessow-Hurley announced that the purpose of the discussion was to get advice about the qualities we would like to see in a president and the kinds of questions we should be asking. Senator Peter led the discussion.

Senator Peter said, “As you know the process has begun. The advisory committee has met for the first time. The first meeting was open, but the rest of our meetings are closed. During this first part of the process, the search is conducted completely confidentially. That means that individuals are contacted to see if they are interested in being candidates. We have asked that all of you send us names of likely people that will be confidentially contacted and asked if they would like to apply. If they do apply, they may be selected to come before the committee in a confidential meeting where they are interviewed. The top several are then selected to become open candidates and appear on campus. At that point in time they need to decide whether they are willing to allow their candidacy to become public and open. The dilemma that the advisory committee is in is that during the confidential interview we must come up with searching and thoughtful questions on our own. We cannot ask our friends what they think, because this is a confidential process. During the lead up to the presidential search, I think all of us have heard about qualities we would like to see in a president. I would like to hear more about that. We would like to hear your ideas about what we should look for in a president. One way to structure this conversation is to ask you if you were on the committee what question would you ask a potential candidate to determine in your own mind whether that candidate has the quality or qualities that you think is important to hold as a President of the university. That makes it a more practical conversation. Don’t just tell us in an abstract way. How would you search for those things? What question would you ask to determine that the candidate has the quality or qualities that you think are

important. Remember that virtually all the candidates we will see are professionals at being interviewed. Nearly all of them will have given press conferences. They all are going to be very good at giving rehearsed answers to questions. What question or questions would you recommend we ask, and why should we ask those questions. That is how I would like to structure this conversation.

**Discussion:**

Senator Sabalius stated, “I think it is important to ask any candidate how they would balance the campus autonomy vs. system conformity.”

Senator Norton said, “I would ask, what is the last book you read, and why did you read it?”

Senator Buzanski said, “The question I would like to ask is for the candidate to explain his/her philosophy regarding the relationship between the President and the Academic Senate, and to explain why he/she takes that position. I think we can learn a great deal about whether the candidate is a leader, compromiser, dictator, etc.”

Senator Kaufman said, “In the advertisement position description, the role of faculty research is given fewer lines than the Mineta airport. I would like to ask the candidates what role they think faculty research plays, and how they would plan to support that?”

Senator Gorman said, “I would echo Senator Kaufman’s comments. I would also ask the individual what their vision of the university is with respect to balancing scholarship, teaching, and service, and how he/she would address the workload issue?”

Senator Van Hooff said, “A very important question would be what would make the candidate feel that he/she was qualified for the position, and how much do they know about the campus as well?”

Senator Reyes said, “I would ask what type of relationship this president would like to have with students, and how often would this president like to interact with students and student organizations?”

Senator Fee said, “I’m interested in introducing a different type of question by introducing a scenario of national campus situations. An excellent example for me would allow us to see the candidate’s problem-solving ability and their personal values when they describe how they would handle a certain problem or scenario.”

Senator Grabowski said, “I would like to know what the candidate’s philosophy and experience is in dealing with shared governance. I would also like to know what the candidate’s views are on support of student leaders and creating new student leadership roles on campus.”

Senator Parrish said, “One of the things that concerns me about this is that most searches start in the Fall, and I would caution people not to just settle for someone. My question would be the extent of which the person views themselves as an internal or external campus President?”

Senator Lazarowich said, “Some of the faculty have a negative view of student leaders, I was wondering how the candidate could foster an environment that is a little bit more supportive between the faculty and student leadership.” Senator Peter said, “Is there a specific question that would elicit the warmth of the candidate? It is important to have a President that likes people, and can talk to everyone equally well.”

Senator Rickford said, “Given that a large percentage of our students are ethnically diverse, and a large percentage of our faculty are drawn from the mainstream, how would you balance traditional approaches to governance with an innovative approach one might need to engage both constituencies effectively.”

Senator Von Till said, “I am a little concerned because it has taken us so long to get where we are at and I don’t think we will take too kindly to someone messing with us. I’m not sure how to put that into a question. I think we want to find out if someone is coming here with their own vision that we really don’t want. I would want to ask them who they think we are, and what they see as our vision of ourselves, and what do they have to bring to us?”

Senator Van Selst said, “I would ask what their goals are for the first couple of years they are here. I think you should then listen for the shared governance in that question.”

Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “I would ask how they have managed diversity issues throughout their career?”

Senator Van Hooff said, “I would ask what experience and record they have in fundraising?”

Senator Bros said, “As we move towards a research dominated institution, more of our resources would be moving out of teaching and into research. I am concerned, or want to know, how would the president deal with a potential two caste system in the university and how he/she would develop equity?”

Senator Gorman said, “My question would be what his/her experience is with an unionized university. Over half of our faculty are union members.”

Senator Campsey said, “I am concerned about Long Beach’s decision of not sending this out to a headhunter. It almost seems like an insider deal. I hope the antenna is out so we can see if this is going to happen. I hope the committee shares my concern.” Senator Peter said, “All I can say is that members of the committee have discussed the issue and we have been reassured.”

Senator Van Selst said, “The CSU Executive Committee in Long Beach discussed this and what Chancellor Reed has said is that he will very often approach people and encourage them to run, but that is the end of it. It is up to the candidate to survive the interview process.”

Senator Sivertsen said, “I would ask how he/she would think creatively to accomplish a diverse faculty. My second question would be what kind of experiences they have had as President on other campuses working with a Student Affairs Division, and what their views are on the role of Student Affairs on a campus?”

Senator Butler said, “I would like to know what the candidate knows about the history of diversity on our campus, and the campus climate that exists here. I would like to know how much research the candidates have done on this university.”

Senator Langdon said, “I have a very simple question, why are they interested in this job?”

Senator Parrish said, “I just wanted to remind you that you will only have about 1 hour to ask questions. Typically you will only be able to ask one question each.” Senator Peter said, “We’ve been told one or two questions.” Senator Parrish said, “I think one question that hasn’t been asked is about retention. How do we retain a diverse faculty?”

Senator Hilliard said, “I would like to approach this as a writing instructor/coordinator. Fifty-five percent of our freshman class is remedial. We also have an incredible problem with the WST. Many of these students are ESL and they are given 45 minutes to write an essay. It is never considered that maybe they need more time to write an essay in a second language.”

Senator Stacks said, “I would like to ask what is their view of our master plan and does it need modification? Also, how do they perceive working in a region with other CSUs or other institutions, and what do they see as the role of special sessions including the issues of graduate differential fees for certain disciplines? In terms of research, I would ask what do they see the role of undergraduate and graduate students being in terms of research activities to determine whether they see that as an important method of student learning.”

Senator Gorman said, “We have the largest number of graduate students in the CSU. I think we need to ask the candidates what their vision is for the graduate programs on campus, including the role of graduate students in student governance. I also think we are starting to have a problem with retention. I think this concern is going to grow. How would the candidates address this?”

Senator Sabalius said, “I take for granted that candidates that apply for president here will inform themselves about our campus, our constituents, etc. However, asking them about their opinion of the Access to Excellence plan that will be out by then will show how deep and well they have informed themselves, and will show how they understand

campus autonomy vs. their limited role vs. having to answer to a system and marching in step with 23 campuses. Also, this gives them an opportunity to outline their vision for our campus, maybe in contrast or opposition to what the Access to Excellence plan proclaims. The candidates may be able to offer ideas that weren't covered in the Access to Excellence plan."

Senator Campsey said, "Being here 26 years I've seen a lot of Presidents and weak Presidents choose weak subordinates. I would ask how will the candidates choose their management team and the deans as well? What qualities will they be looking for?"

Senator Van Hooff said, "One problem we are going to face sooner or later is the retirement of the baby boomers. How will he/she envision dealing with this problem?"

Senator Buzanski said, "I was impressed with a question that came up earlier about creating a given problem and having the candidate respond to that. One problem that has been consistent as long as I've been here is budget cuts. I would certainly think a question phrased with how would you deal with budget cuts would be a rather revealing question."

Senator Schultz-Krohn said, "One question that might be interesting is to ask what was the biggest dilemma the candidates have had to deal with, and what was the resolution."

Senator Grabowski said, "I would like to ask the candidates what they do for fun."

Senator Hilliard said, "I would like to know what kind of staff the candidate's would choose?"

Senator Desalvo said, "With the teaching paradigm going more and more towards online courses, how would the candidates meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century classroom?"

Senator Van Selst said, "I have two questions, first who is actually in the room during the interview? The second question is what is the feedback mechanism to the Board of Trustees from the advisory committee? Is it written? What is the format?" Senator Peter said, "The advisory committee that also includes the members of the Trustees and the Chancellor are in the room. The interview is closed. The advisory committee recommends a number of names to the Trustees and then the Trustees decide from there. I'm told the Chancellor speaks to each committee member one-on-one."

Senator Najjar said, "One of the things they mentioned during the first meeting was that after the candidates come to campus, the campus community can provide any written feedback they have to any members of the advisory committee to forward." Senator Peter said, "Once the candidates come to campus then their names are public. At that point in time a great deal of research can be done. That is a role everyone on campus can be a part of."

Senator Gorman said, "I would ask what is the role of Global International Studies?"

Senator Liu said, “I would like to know how much the candidates know about information technology, e.g. Wiki?”

Senator Maldonado-Colon said, “Is it possible to share the questions that the committee doesn’t choose to use, so that when the candidates come to the campus we can ask some of those questions? Also, I’m sure you remember there is breakfast, lunch, and dinner and walking around campus, so those are times to ask questions also.” Senator Peter said, “I think it might be a good idea to compile a list of questions and circulate them.” Chair Lessow-Hurley said, “And, of course, this will all be available in the minutes.”

Senator Parrish said, “I think we need to know how well the candidates know this area. I think that when you are looking at the interacting with venture capitalists in the area there is an informality here.”

Senator Bros said, “One of the things I would like to know is to what extent do the candidates think the faculty should be involved in strategic planning?”

Senator Campsey said, “It seems to me that sometimes our story gets downplayed because of Stanford. How would the candidates raise the consciousness about SJSU compared to Stanford?”

Senator Romo said, “I would like to know what the candidates experience and success with and first-year experience programs has been?”

Senator Liu said, “I think we should try and find out what we did wrong in the first presidential search that the president did not stay longer than one month.” Senator Peter said, “That was a health-related issue, we didn’t do anything wrong.”

Senator McClory said, “I would ask a candidate to list the top one or two qualities of this university and state what he/she would do to foster and promote those qualities. I think it would be very telling to see what one or two qualities rose to the top.”

Senator Buzanski said, “I was going to say, have them explain the two or three worst things about SJSU.”

## **IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

### **A. Vice President for Administration and Finance –**

VP Lee announced that they were in the process of installing speakerphones in all classrooms for emergency purposes. They are also working on an outside broadcast system possibly using the bluelight phones. They are also investigating getting text messages out to everyone with a cell phone listed in the database. Lastly, we are also working on getting key cards for entry into campus buildings versus having actual keys. Senator Buzanski asked, “Is there any danger that the speakerphones can be misused?” VP Lee said, “It is not two-way, you have to actually dial a

number from the speakerphone.” Senator Hendrick said, “The Spartan Daily is going mobile next week, and we will be able to push that information within 3 minutes to cell phones.”

Senator Kaufman asked, “Who will decide when a message gets sent out?” VP Lee said, “The emergency center will be operated out of the third floor of the UPD building. As you know, you can’t get onto the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor without a special card.”

**B. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

VP Phillips announced, “Enrollment for Fall 07 and Spring 08 is full. Our headcount for Spring 2008 will be just under 32,000 again. The number of FTES (Full-Time-Equivalent-Students) will be just under 24,500. The college-year enrollment is about 25,744 FTES, that’s a projected number for the census date. That is about 8% above what we achieved last year, and 8.6% above the Chancellor’s target. Most years that would sound good, but in a difficult budget year it presents challenges. The Chancellor’s Office has returned the California Resident 08/09 target to the 07/08 level. We will stop accepting applications for first-time freshmen on February 1, 2008. We already had in hand 6.7% more applications from first-time freshman than we had from all of Fall 2007, so the impact will be negligible. Transfer applications are due April 1, 2008. Graduate application deadlines are under review. Deadlines will be strictly enforced this year.

The Student Center Facilities Project is moving forward. Interviews have been setup with construction managers and architects.”

**Questions:**

Chair Lessow-Hurley asked, “To what extent are the facilities going to be green?” VP Phillips said, “We are going to ask the architect to propose the mechanism of being green.” Senator Buzanski commented, “If you are trying to accomplish this green goal please do not be stingy with the result of it being poorly executed.” VP Phillips said, “As I understand it, it is the devoting of funds to the actual construction of measures that will produce a green building rather than seeking the lead designation that acknowledges you did that, which is in itself a very expensive process.” Senator Romo asked about the Presidents and Superintendents Latino Summit. VP Phillips said, “On Saturday, February 9, 2008, we will have around 2,500 Latino and Hispanic Students in 5<sup>th</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup> grades along with their parents and siblings in the Event Center. Events will be held across campus.” Senator Henderson asked, “Where will students go while the student center facilities are being built?” VP Phillips said, “Much of the renovation of the existing Student Union can either take place with the union open, or we may construct some of the new facilities and then do some of the retrofitting. We haven’t exactly decided yet.”

**C. Associated Students President –**

AS President Henderson said, “AS is working on a faculty enrollment survey, a smoke-free resolution, voter registration, EOP, time, place and manner, bylaw

revisions, and spring AS elections. We recently had a retreat in January and we went over our strategic plan. I am also leading the March to Sacramento on April 21, 2008, involving all the CSU campuses. We will be marching in an effort to freeze student fees. In addition, we will be having AS 55 on April 24, 2008, so please send in your nominations.”

**D. Vice President for University Advancement –**

VP Najjar said, “First, I’d like to acknowledge Larry Carr and Sylvia Light for the hard work they did for SJSU’s 150<sup>th</sup> Anniversary year. I’d like to thank everyone that participated across the campus. We will probably leave the banners up until May. We just came back from the Chancellor’s Office with another naming opportunity. The College of Business Honors Program has been named after Gary Sbono. He contributed \$5.2 million to the program. There is a press release about this on the website. Also, SJSU is number one in fundraising for the first time in CSU history for 2006/2007. There is also a press release out on this. I would like to mention that we have a staff very committed to fundraising, but this is a very difficult time. The economy is tough right now. If you know of anyone that might be interested in contributing to SJSU, please let us know. Think of us in your wills, and tell other faculty and staff to think of us too. You may see an announcement shortly that there are presidential candidates that want to visit the campus. There will be a short turnaround on this.”

**E. Statewide Academic Senators –**

Senator Van Selst reported, “First of all the CSSA, which is the statewide student organization, has been playing very nicely with the Chancellor’s Office and the CFA in terms of budget issues in Sacramento. Also, in their last meeting they came out against Proposition 92. The graduate fee for graduate programs was discussed at the Board of Trustees meeting, but it was still an agenda item. At the plenary meeting for the ASCSU there were two actions taken on that. The CSU Statewide Senate in a universal statement of concerns, but a very conflicted disposition to the resolution, voted against the imposition of the graduate fee differential as proposed by the Board of Trustees. There is a first reading item, subsequent to this, that I encourage you to look at. It says if the CSU is going to engage in systemwide program fees what are the priorities and principles under which you should charge these fees for. The CSU Statewide Senate spoke strongly against the drop/withdrawal/incompletes proposals that came out of the taskforce mainly based on workload, etc. The Board of Trustee expressed strong support for our presidential search. Other issues coming before the Senate include a strong push for support of a Troops to College program, which encourages California residents and troops living here to go to college. A consequence of that has been that there is a strong push by the Chancellor’s Office to take money that may or may not be available and push it into Academic Technology online programs. Finally, regarding the Senate budget, the Chancellor’s Office has threatened to cut \$125,000. The CSU Statewide Senate is having serious discussions about what work to do and not to do if that should occur. Some of the areas being considered include GE, the Lower Division Transfer Project (LDTP), and

Professional Doctorate Programs. There is an enormous amount of support that goes into these statewide initiatives, and we just can't afford to do it.”

**F. Provost – No report**

**X. Adjournment** – The meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.