

## **FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**

December 1, 2009  
2:30 p.m.

Assembly Room  
McFall Center

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair, Ron Shields called the Faculty Senate meeting to order. Shields made an announcement that the name of Terri Rentner had been called during Senate Roll Call over the past three meetings. He indicated that this was done in error as Terri Rentner was not a member of Senate this academic year. On behalf of Senate, Shields offered his apologies to Terri Rentner for this error. He then asked the secretary to call the roll.

### **ROLL CALL**

**Absent:** Cynthia Baron, Arjun Gupta, Jacqueline Leclair, Monica Longmore, Sridevi Menon (Messer-Kruse sub for Menon), Cynthia Patterson, Robert Clark, Ed Whipple, Nathan Whitman

Secretary Williams announced that there was a quorum

### **COMMUNICATIONS**

#### **Chair**

Chair Shields indicated that he had received a request asking about the posting of minutes from Senate related meetings. He indicated that minutes from Faculty Senate, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Executive Committee/ Vice President for Academic Affairs are posted on the Senate web site. Once Senate minutes are disseminated, there is a two week waiting period to make any corrections in the minutes prior to posting them on the Senate web site. Shields thanked President Cartwright, Provost Borland and Chief Financial Officer Stoll for their presentations at the Faculty Senate Open Forum on November 23, 2009. He stated that this information provided a good comparison of how Bowling Green State University stands in relationship to our sister institutions in the state of Ohio. Shields noted that the Open Forum is available through the Faculty Senate web site.

#### **President**

President Carol Cartwright offered the following report:

Good afternoon. I hope you enjoyed the Thanksgiving holidays. I want to update you today on several items we have discussed before. I also want to alert you to several new topics.

Regarding the on-going story of the state biennial operating budget for FY 2010 and FY 2011, we continue to monitor the challenge that the Ohio Senate is facing in passing compromise legislation to fill the \$851 million gap created by the Ohio Supreme Court's decision about the use of the video lottery terminals (VLTs) at Ohio's seven race tracks.

The House passed the Governor's proposal which was a full delay of the last phase of promised income tax cuts. The Senate did not support that proposal and tried to create a compromise that would have delayed about 1/3 of the income tax cuts and made other cuts in state government funding. That proposal proved equally unpopular. Therefore, we do not have a solution at this time. As I have said in the past, we will keep you posted.

As I arrived at BGSU, decisions had been made about engaging enrollment consultants, Noel-Levitz. As I recall, members of the Faculty Senate raised questions about the value that the consultants might bring to us. Now, as we look forward to welcoming the new freshman in fall of 2010, we can provide more answers. The Noel-Levitz analysis has provided BGSU with data driven modeling to ensure desired enrollment outcomes. For example:

**Merit Scholarship Thresholds** – Noel-Levitz has analyzed our data against historical and national norms and helped us determine that the overall design of our merit-based awarding strategy is working very well.

**Strategic Use of Internal Aid** – We have been able to isolate students who receive no federal or state assistance, and yet do not make enough to afford a BGSU education on their own. Historically these students have not chosen BGSU due to this inability to pay. The analysis confirms that by redirecting existing need-based aid, BGSU stands to increase net revenue in the upcoming academic year.

**Prequalified Prospects** – Noel-Levitz predictive modeling tool has allowed BGSU to purchase the names of prospective students that are pre-qualified based on BGSU's model informed by over 200 variables of historical BGSU data. Currently our Fall 2010 prospects are up 66% over this time last year.

Dr. Borland will provide an additional update enrollment during his remarks.

Centennial celebration planning has been underway for quite some time. As we look forward to the launch of the Centennial year in just a few weeks, I want you to know about three important kick-off events in January. On January 10th we will have a student-oriented kick-off with a concert featuring singer-songwriter Gavin DeGraw. A faculty and staff kick-off is planned for January 29th and the community kick-off for our Centennial will occur on the evening of January 30th during the Bowling Green Chamber of Commerce annual dinner dance. You can find details about these events and many other interesting Centennial items at the website: <<http://www.bgsu.edu/centennial>>

At the recent Faculty Senate Fall Forum, I noted that the university was considering a voluntary separation program. On November 23, I provided a brief message to the university community about this program. This University Employee Separation Program (UESP) is different from an early retirement incentive plan as it is made available to both retiring and non-retiring employees who meet eligibility criteria and it does not include the purchase of any service credit for any employee. Wright State and Kent State implemented a voluntary separation program last year and we have been following their experiences and their success. We are on track to take a recommendation to approve our UESP to the Board of Trustees on December 3rd. We will send a message

about the details of the program following Board action and will communicate individually with all eligible employees very soon thereafter.

Now to three new topics: a proposed new Third Frontier program, a meeting of the Ohio Board of Regents on the BG campus, and several new initiatives to increase (and improve) our internal communications.

Earlier this month, Chancellor Fingerhut talked with the IUC presidents about a renewal of the Third Frontier program to support the continuation of Ohio's transition to compete in a high-tech global economy. The existing Third Frontier program would be expanded at a proposed level of \$1 billion over five years with a vote on renewing the Third Frontier in May 2010. Yesterday, two members of the Ohio House announced that they plan to co-sponsor a joint resolution to seek voter approval for \$1 billion in Third Frontier bonds over a five-year period. They noted that the funding would be principally bond funding and that a mix of additional funding, as yet undetermined, would be included. The Stanford Research Institute (SRI) evaluated the first round of Third Frontier funding and determined that the Third Frontier is positively impacting Ohio's economy. Several examples are: 41,300 jobs created between 2003 and 2008; 3000 Ohio students awarded internships with nearly 700 companies; 4% growth in Ohio's technology industries between 2004 and 2008; new technology clusters in biomedical imaging, fuel cells, photovoltaic's and liquid crystals/flexible displays have been created; and venture capital investment increased from \$243 million in 2004 to \$446 million in 2008, to name just a few examples. We will actively support a Third Frontier renewal and will be urging you, as Ohio citizens, to support the renewal if it is placed on the May 2010 ballot.

The Ohio Board of Regents has asked that we host one of their regularly scheduled meetings on the Bowling Green campus in 2010. While details are still being worked out, it looks as if we will host in the spring of 2010. This will be a wonderful opportunity to showcase our strengths and engage OBR in our Centennial celebration.

Finally, I want to note that in an effort to make our internal communications more timely and better aligned with our strategic plan, the Office of marketing and communications will be rolling out some new initiatives in the coming days and weeks. This afternoon you will be receiving the first edition of Zoom News – a new daily e-newsletter. Zoom will provide a quick look at University news along with updates on enrollment and other strategic initiatives. And later this week, we'll launch a weekly podcast – Take 5. The format will be 5 questions for key administrators, faculty and staff members on topics of interest. I'm told that the first guest will be Rebecca Ferguson answering questions about the University Employee Separation Benefit. Campus Update and The Monitor will continue but with a new look and focus. I'm sure the Office of Marketing and Communications would appreciate your feedback on these new communication vehicles.

President Cartwright entertained questions from the Senate. Carothers asked how large the window of opportunity would be open for the proposed Early Separation Incentive Program. Cartwright indicated that it would be a very short window of opportunity and

that the majority of those who opted to take advantage of the program would be leaving at the end of June 2010. It is not like an ERIP with a long window of opportunity. Zhong asked how the target number is determined for separation. Cartwright indicated that the company running this Early Separation Incentive Program uses a mathematical formula to predict the number of employees who are eligible and the number who will take advantage of it. They have been fairly close in their predictions for previous customers such as Wright State University. Dixon voiced concern about losing some of the brightest and best faculty who lend stability to programs/departments and the university. She further questioned what plan was in place to replace faculty who might leave as a result of this Early Separation Incentive Program. Cartwright indicated that the Deans and Provost will be working with Chairs/Directors to replace faculty appropriately and with expediency. She also indicated that the goal of the program is not to replace every position that is vacated. The majority of positions vacated are likely to be on the staff side, if other institutions' experiences are to serve as a guide for us.

### **Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Provost Ken Borland shared the following report with Senate:

#### **Enrollment**

There is a slight challenge regarding our registration goals for spring 2010. A strategy to encourage our students to "finish what you started" has been implemented. Academic Advising, Call Center, Bursar, and Financial Aid staff are working to assist returning students in removing registration barriers. If you are aware of students in good academic standing who have not yet registered, please join us in offering them your encouragement to register.

There is great news to report in regard to Fall 2010 admissions. As compared with this same time last year, we are up...

- 66% in prospects
- 17% in fiscal year campus visitors
- 74% in off-campus recruitment activities
- 31% in applications
- ~50% in applications from students of color
- 27% in admits

We are recapturing some lost ground in large counties, as we are at four year highs for fall freshmen applications in Cuyahoga (Cleveland), Hamilton (Cincinnati), Summit (Akron), and Stark (Canton) counties. We are well ahead of last year in other key counties: Franklin (Columbus) up 30.42%; Montgomery (Dayton) up 8.3%; and 16 other counties are at four year highs.

Thank you for your personal and professional support for these vitally important recruitment and retention efforts. The results even at this early stage should encourage us all.

## **Dean Searches**

To follow on last month's report on two dean searches now underway, I wish to share that the College of Education and Human Development search, chaired by Dr. Linda Petrosino, Dean of the College of Health & Human Services will be supported by Witt Kieffer search firm. The Library dean search, chaired by Dr. Simon Morgan-Russell, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, will be supported by the Parker search firm.

A conference call of the search committee chair, Barbara Waddell, and I with the respective consultant is being established. Also, drafts of the position descriptions have been prepared for the consultants to expedite and refine their work with myself and the search committees.

There are numerous other interim positions that are also being considered for searches and I will keep you posted on that progress.

## **Centers of Excellence**

The deans and I are crafting a communication for University and external communities in order to express BGSU's perspective on and the implementation of our five Board of Trustee-approved Centers of Excellence. The communication, ready in the coming weeks, will highlight that...

1. Centers, which are interdisciplinary, a nexus of programs, have academic cores.
2. Academic excellence and faculty expertise are the hallmark of each center.
3. Collaborators from outside the academic programs may enhance a center's work.
4. Center research, creativity, and economic development are on behalf of the State.
5. Centers must maintain external validation of excellence.
6. BGSU centers of excellence will be centrally governed.

## **Collegiality & Shared Governance**

### ***Faculty Welfare Committee***

This afternoon, General Counsel Sean FitzGerald and I followed up with the FWC in regard to an outstanding Charter related proposal from the ad hoc Flexible Leave and Tenure Committee. We look forward to FWC's follow-up on our conversation about the proposed "Stopping the Tenure Clock" policy.

### ***Heard at BGSU***

Last month, I noted for you that assumptions, interpretations, and even some facts floating about at the University need to be placed in context, addressed by University leaders, and then further considered by the University community with the scholar's rigor. This week a new link from my web page was developed and, when live, will be a vehicle for doing so. Initial installments are now being prepared. "*Heard at BGSU and Responses from BGSU Leadership*" will capture, as questions, some of those "assumptions, interpretations, facts, etc." With University leaders responding to them, you will be better able to exercise consideration and discernment of what you encounter in a more transparent University. I also hope that by doing so, we can all more fully engage in collegial shared governance to improve BGSU for our students, our colleagues,

and our future...on and beyond our two campuses. I welcome Faculty Senate's engagement with "*Heard at BGSU and Responses from BGSU Leadership.*"

### ***Engaging the Faculty Senate***

This body, our Faculty Senate, is a cornerstone intentionally laid for the purpose of building transparent, collegial and shared governance across and between BGSU's several constituencies. No matter what it has been, today Faculty Senate's agenda is very significant to our future, and Faculty Senate is worthy of our fullest engagement, as Senate members and as member of the BGSU community in Bowling Green and Firelands. I hope that you will strengthen your commitment to the Faculty Senate so that, by working together, we can accentuate the value of and strengthen the Faculty Senate in such a way as to increase the engagement of those we represent and serve. I hope you will share that message with those you represent so they may actively engage in this important governance work with us. For, of what value is transparency, collegiality, or shared governance if we are not committed to it and if the people of our University do not engage it? For that very reason, I am pleased that our deans will be strengthening our commitment to Academic Affairs' engagement with the Faculty Senate. I am happy to acknowledge their presence here in the Faculty Senate today and their leadership to improve transparency, collegiality, and share governance.

### ***Academic Reconfiguration***

Having sent an update to the University yesterday (11-30-09), I will provide elaboration under "New Business" later in today's Faculty Senate agenda.

### **Graduate Student Senate**

President of GSS, Carl Walling, reported that GSS recently passed a resolution naming the first annual Graduate Student Colloquium after Charles Shanklin in memory of his dedication to BGSU. This Colloquium will be held on April 22, 2010. If any Senators would like additional information on the Shanklin Colloquium, they can contact the GSS Office or President.

### **Undergraduate Student Government**

Sundeep Mutgi, President of USG, reported that the straw poll taken by USG on the proposed Shuttle Fee for students resulted that 60% of those who responded were in favor of the fee and 40% were against the fee. The actual student government vote came out in a like manner with 60% in favor and 40% opposed. Consequently, USG will be supporting the proposed Shuttle fee when it comes to the Board of Trustees. USG would also like to have input relative to proposed increases in student tuition and student fees, especially in how the added monies will be used.

### **Retiree Representative**

No Report

### **Ohio Faculty Council**

OFC Representative, Keith Bernhard, reported that the meeting of OFC for November was transformed into a "Focus Group Response Meeting" held at the Board of Regents in

Columbus. The focus group consisted of representation from four year and two year institutions of higher education in Ohio. The group was charged with identifying issues related to three themes: Making institutions of higher education in Ohio run more efficiently; Focusing on Student Preparation and Transition to Higher Education; and Efforts to Coordinate Statewide and Regional Systems. OFC will use the data gathered from these Focus Groups to develop a White Paper on Issues Facing Ohio's Institutions of Higher Education.

## **REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES**

### **Committee on Academic Affairs (CAA)**

No Report

### **Amendments and Bylaws Committee (ABC)**

Erin Labbie, Chair of ABC, reported that the Amendments and Bylaws Committee was investigating several issues related to Charter interpretations including the following: "Recording Procedures for Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee hearings" [B-I/E/ 10 9d)] [B-I.E. 4 9h)] ; and a GSS request regarding "Charter language addressing Student Rights and Excused Absences Due to Religious Holidays." ABC will also be reviewing the Flexible Tenure Policy that Faculty Welfare Committee will be bringing forward to Senate, following discussions with the Provost.

### **Committee on Committees (ComCom)**

Daniel Williams, Chair of ComCom submitted the following report. Appointments have been made to the Leave Bank Committee and the Infectious Diseases Work Group. The Director of the Ice Arena has informed the Faculty Senate office that he will convene a meeting of the Ice Arena Advisory Committee. In addition, the Committee expects a proposal from the Health Service Advisory Committee recommending the appointment of an additional graduate student to serve on the committee. Once this is received, ComCom will review the request.

### **Faculty Senate Budget Committee (FSBC)**

No Report

### **Faculty Personnel and Conciliation Committee (FPCC)**

No Report

### **Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC)**

Dan Madigan, member of FWC, indicated that FWC had been meeting with the Provost and General Counsel to discuss "Stopping the Tenure Clock Policy." While the Provost and General Counsel support the policy in concept, they do have some concerns over the language used in the policy including the criteria used for "stopping the tenure clock." FWC will be reviewing language from similar policies from other universities to determine how to improve upon the language and criteria used in the BGSU policy.

### **Committee on Professional Affairs (CPA)**

The Chair of CPA, Geoff Howes, reported that the committee was continuing to work on two issues...copyright and intellectual property issues... and the University System of Ohio. Howes encouraged Senators to attend a presentation on December 2<sup>nd</sup> (7:00 pm in the BTSU Theater) by Harvard Law Professor, Lawrence Lessig entitled "From copyright to corruption and back again."

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Reconfiguration Update**

VPAA Borland provided the following information about "Reconfiguration."

Reconfiguration has been a topic of conversation at the university for the past several months. This is a process that the Deans have been engaged in since February of 2009 and it is a process that will continue for some length of time. My intent today is to provide you with some highlights of where we are at this point in time. What Academic Reconfiguration has to be about is "Academic Quality." If you remember nothing more from this report, please remember that reconfiguration has to be about academic quality. Our own Charter's seven criteria guiding reconfiguration calls for a focus on academic quality. Obviously, economics will also play a role in reconfiguration. There are clearly economic issues facing our nation, our state, and our university. We are anticipating a shortfall in state support next year, perhaps as much as \$10 million. If \$10 million dollars is missing from our financial support, something has to be done to balance out that equation. Perhaps we could look at these economic issues as a catalyst to motivate us to look at what we need to do organizationally and academically to build a brighter future with a higher level of academic quality and greater opportunities. The process we have been looking at since February has been using a macro level approach. This macro level approach to reconfiguration has given us some ideas and some possible ways to organize ourselves at the college level. We can keep this approach in mind, but in order to address any reconfiguration at the macro level, it is necessary to first explore reconfiguration at a micro level. In meeting with Senate Executive Committee, leadership of Faculty Senate, and Committee on Academic Affairs, it is apparent to me that faculty are calling the question for a micro level exploration of reconfiguration. The essence of the question is "For ideal macro-level reconfiguration to make sense for academic quality, and for purposes of good and immediate economic stewardship in this economic downturn...program, department, and school reconfigurations must first be addressed...now." I agree that this is where we need to begin. If we don't know what the various components are (programs/schools/departments), how do we align ourselves at the college level? I am asking that colleges begin the dialogue for a micro approach for reconfiguration. These dialogues should take place within each college and should utilize data. I recommend that colleges use the Compacts supplemented with data from the state and from our own Institutional Research Office. These dialogues need to include contextual information such as Academic Affairs' reports, Interdisciplinary aspects of programs, Interdependency of programs, and context of programs within the Strategic Plan initiatives. Colleges should look at programs which are sustainable, which programs



should be supported, and which programs/coursework might be duplicative. Any reconfiguration that might occur will follow the guidelines established by the Charter and will be done in a strategic manner. In terms of academic excellence, the foci we want to deal with will address Academic Programs, Academic Initiatives and Academic Units (Departments, Schools, Centers, Offices, etc.). There are basically 5 criteria that we need to be looking at during our dialogues, explorations and deliberations on reconfiguration:

1. *Centrality of our Mission* - BGSU Vision/Mission/Values; Strategic Plan; Centers for Excellence; Academic Themes identified by BGSU Deans; USO Accountability Metrics
2. *Generation/ Productivity* - Degrees per year/Graduates per year/Market Demand; Credit hours generated/Credit hours per faculty/FTE counts; Number of Sections; Distance and Extended Delivery; External sponsorship/ Research/ Service; Gifts/ Alumni/ Foundations; Emerging opportunities between BGSU disciplines, through regional development
3. *Cost* - Dollars generated/ Fees /SSI; Personnel/administrative, classified, management, faculty, non-faculty-GA's; Overhead/equipment/utility/ space; Allocation and budget history; Competitive market position relative to peer programs; Dollars needed to improve/sustain; Total cost and plus/minus net costs
4. *Demand* - Enrollment trends for undergraduates, graduates, transfers/ majors; External mandates; Internal Academic Interdependency; Internal Interdisciplinarity; Non-duplication/redundancy
5. *Credibility/Quality* - Selectivity of students into program; Accreditation & ranking/distinctions; Contribution to community, region, state, beyond; Faculty; Curriculum; Signature or Leading Edge program

This list has been drafted by me in collaboration with the Deans and many others including Senate leadership.

At this point, Provost Borland entertained questions from the Senate floor.

Ruben Viramontez-Anguiano asked how it would be determined if a program is economically sustainable. Borland responded that there are a number of factors to look at. Is there a contemporary student demand for that program? Are we spending more money on it than we are generating from it? If we continue to allocate money as we have been, will we be offering a quality program and are we being good economic stewards? These are just some of the factors to consider in determining economic sustainability.

Senator Jim Evans cautioned that we are not sure of the amount of money that might be involved in any shortfall of SSI money, so he advised against using figures such as \$10 million. Evans posed two questions to the Provost. Will there be a time in this process whatever this dollar amount of a shortfall may be, when the administration will indicate that a certain percentage of reductions will come from academic programs and a certain percentage will come from nonacademic areas? Why aren't tuition raises on the table?

Borland pointed out that any shortfall would be the responsibility of the entire university, not just academic affairs. President Cartwright commented that we don't have all the data we need from the State to determine the actual dollar amount of the projected shortfall in SSI money from the state. Two unresolved issues deal with funding of at-risk students and with funding for doctoral students. Tuition increases are on the table and are being considered.

Lynda Dixon questioned if Chairs and Directors and faculty had been consulted regarding suggestions/information that was included in the Deans' White Paper on Reconfiguration. Shields noted that Chairs/Directors/Faculty had not been consulted in developing the Deans' White Paper on Reconfiguration. Dixon voiced concern on why we would even use information from this White Paper if Faculty/Chairs/Directors had no input for it. Shields indicated that he really didn't have an answer for this question.

Katherine Bradshaw asked how large amounts of money (like \$10 million) might be saved if the university followed any of the models (a three college model, a four college model, or a five college model) delineated in the Deans' White Paper on Reconfiguration. President Cartwright responded that the college models identified in the White Paper came out of Deans' earlier discussions when reconfiguration was being viewed using a macro approach at the university level without any dollar amounts of savings identified. She noted that Provost Borland was now moving the discussions to a micro level.

Bob Debard applauded the current efforts of the Enrollment Management team for their work and he gave credit to the "Blue Sky" work done on the Reconfiguration efforts, he questioned if parents of millennial students would be pleased if BGSU provided inadequate housing or large numbers of students in Freshmen level classes.

Keith Bernhard cautioned that it is essential that these reconfiguration discussions provide transparency and openness and provide opportunities for faculty to feel some ownership of any reconfiguration plans.

Don McQuarie asked if there was a timetable for considering reconfiguration discussions and reconfiguration plans. Shields responded that other than timetables that might impact Charter regulations concerning contracts and employment, that the timetables for reconfiguration discussions would be arranged by each individual college. Any reconfiguration proposals would follow the procedures outlined in the Charter.

Senator Evans voiced a concern that the recent Separation Incentive Plan introduced to BGSU personnel could muddy the waters in making any possible decisions about reconfiguration. Even though the current Separation Incentive Plan is not a "buy out" program like the previous ERIP (Early Retirement Incentive Plan), Evans cautioned that the results of the recent plan may have a negative impact on the future of faculty and programs at BGSU. Evans reported that he and Bill Knight from Institutional Research had done some research on the impact of the previous ERIP and that the ultimate outcome was that BGSU lost 121 Tenure Track Faculty and gained 173 Non Tenure Track Faculty. He cautioned that this kind of outcome could make it very difficult to plan

for reconfiguration and he also feared that reconfiguration decisions might be based on the number of faculty remaining in some programs due to faculty loss through the Separation Incentive Plan. He questioned why we are doing this? President Cartwright suggested that it would be better to wait to have this discussion after seeing the data resulting from the Separation Incentive Plan. She indicated that we need to see the data before passing any judgment on its merits.

Allison Terry asked if the movement involving reconfiguration will be fostering/ supporting interdisciplinary programs at the university. Borland responded that many universities have done away with the disciplinary boundaries that framed university programs 50 years ago. The value of interdisciplinarity needs to be accentuated and faculty will have to work collaboratively to break down the disciplinary boundaries that inhibit interdisciplinary efforts. He indicated that he would be supportive of interdisciplinary programs.

Amy Robinson voiced concern that the public perception could be that BGSU may be placing higher priorities on non academic programs rather than academic programs. She restated the question raised earlier about whether non academic programs at BGSU will be asked to share the financial burden if there is a budget deficit. For example, is the hockey team on the table? Borland replied that the scope of his responsibilities is academic affairs. Other areas such as non academic areas have been having similar discussions regarding economic stewardship.

Opportune Zhong asked if the purpose of the reconfiguration discussions was really for the purpose of academics or for the purpose of finances. Borland indicated that the primary emphasis for reconfiguration should focus on academic quality. However, there will be some indicator of economic impact when discussing reconfiguration. He noted that the academic components of reconfiguration really can't be separated from the economic components of reconfiguration.

## **ISSUES AND CONCERNS**

### **Firelands Student Representative**

Lovey Leavell requested that she, the Undergraduate Student Government representative from Firelands, be placed on the next Senate agenda and be given the opportunity to deliver a report from the USG at Firelands. Shields indicated that the Senate Executive Committee was in the process of reviewing her request.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Shields adjourned the meeting at 4:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Ursula Williams  
Faculty Senate Secretary