

2-15-2016

2-15-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "2-15-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 17.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/17>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
February 15, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
****Russell Union Ballroom****

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Sam Adeyeye, Ashley Colquitt for Moya Alfonso, Olga Amarie, Kelly Berry, Chad Posick for Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Sally Ann Brown, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Tom Pearsall for Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Jim Harris, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Patricia Humphrey, Alina Jacob, Scott Kersey, Barbara King, Shainaz Landge, Li Li, Jim LoBue, Nan LoBue, Ron MacKinnon, Alan Mackelprang, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Marla Morris, Shahnam Navaee, Constantin Ogloblin, Enka Lakuriqi for Marshall Ransom, Joe Ruhland, Lina Soares, Linda L. Thompson, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Lisa Abbott, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, William Amponsah, Steven Elisha, Tim Giles, Mujibur Khan, Lili Li, Lawrence Locker, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Bryan Miller, Jake Simons, Valentin Soloiu, Jim Stephens, Tiffanie Townsend, Jianqiang Zhao

Administrators: Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Steven Burrell, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Alan Amason, Greg Evans, Devon Jensen, Christine Ludowise for Curtis Ricker

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Erroll Spence

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Visitors: Dustin Anderson, Candace Griffith, Maura Copeland, Amber Culpepper, Andrea Hagans, Megan Stewart, Steven Harper, Delena Bell Gatch, Trent Maurer, KeShawn Harris, Yi Hu, Alisa Leckie, Meca Williams-Johnson

SECRETARY'S NOTE: Once again, the recording of the meeting was flawed. Some periods or individual speakers are garbled or inaudible. Also, because I gave up my known-to-be-working microphone to some speakers, and so was standing and therefore not able to take notes, there are some gaps in my notes.

Commented [1]: Ming Fang He (COE): There was one mistake. Li Ma was here, but they listed that she was absent.

Li Ma (COSM): I did not sign, sorry.

Approval of the Agenda for the February 15, 2016 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

Approval of the November 16, 2015 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

Librarian's Reports for February 2016: Jessica Minihan (LIB) Senate Librarian:

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that he had privately asked NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Chris Geyerman some general questions pertaining to our football budget that were prompted by a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article. He asked if Geyerman could comment on the budget numbers re: Georgia Southern that the *Chronicle* published.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) said he'd be happy to pursue answers to any specific questions if Cyr would submit them in an RFI, but that he was not qualified to comment on the Athletic Department budget.

Cyr said he would send in some questions, and noted his concern was that the move to Bowl Division had increased student fees to something like \$5.8 million, a huge increase over the previous year, while revenue had not gone up anywhere near enough to offset those fee increases. He wondered how we are justifying the larger expenditure from what we were paying previously.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee noted that in November she had been handed a letter addressed to the Faculty Senate President, which was totally anonymous, inquiring about the athletic budget and more specifically the football budget. She mentioned or showed it to several other people on the SEC and their sentiment was that we don't address totally anonymous things.

The Librarian's Report was Approved as accurate.

Undergraduate Committee Report — Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair:

On November 10, they approved five new courses; deleted a course; had 56 course revisions, which led to 14 program revisions; had three program deletions due to low enrollment; one program minor became a certificate; and there were ten special topic announcements. These minutes were Approved.

In January they approved 26 new courses; 14 were deleted; three courses were reactivated; four selected topics were announced; and 82 courses were revised, leading to 35 program revisions; one program was deleted in Public Health and two new programs announced, a Public Health minor and a Gerontology Interdisciplinary minor. These minutes were Approved.

Graduate Committee Report — Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair:

Anderson noted that they had vetted over 600 pages of material in their last two meetings. In November, they approved 16 new courses in three colleges; approved revising eight courses in three colleges; approved deleting 12 courses in two colleges; approved two program revisions in two colleges; and approved one new program in Public Health as well. They also discussed a proposal to the Graduate Faculty Status Policy that was tabled during that meeting; the Director of Student Services from COGS introduced an issue surrounding Graduate Credit Hour Requirements during the final phase of a graduate student's candidacy; and they looked at some proposed dissertation design changes on which the Interim Associate Dean of the College of Graduate Studies is seeking feedback. These minutes were Approved.

In January, they approved 21 new courses in six colleges; the reactivation of two courses within our Nursing program; the revision of 29 courses over four colleges; the deletion of one course; eight program revisions in five different colleges; the deletion of three programs or certificates in two colleges; and three new programs or certificates in two colleges. They also introduced upcoming program reviews, which committee members are undertaking now. These minutes were Approved.

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report:

There was no one present to report. However, Jim Harris (CEIT) noted that he is on the committee and is watching faculty struggle with these reviews because they're not really trained in assessment. He wondered why faculty are doing these reviews when we have an Office of Assessment, with experts in assessment.

President Jean Bartels noted that the responsibility for the assessment of any course in the curriculum is the responsibility of faculty, not the office of Institutional Effectiveness. We have had numerous training opportunities on assessment for faculty for many years now.

Harris said his problem is that everything this committee does deals with process, and not product; they are just making sure that faculty are following the correct process, and he didn't think that is stated as something the faculty should be doing. He is evaluating programs he knows nothing about. If you want to evaluate product, you have to have people expert in those specific disciplines. But this committee is not expert in process and that is what they're assessing.

Moderator Humphrey noted that she is comfortable assessing programs in her field. Harris agreed, but when he is thrown into a discipline he knows nothing about, he feels very uncomfortable. Humphrey suggested that we ask Terri Flateby to come to Senate and address this for us. Harris agreed.

Humphrey mentioned the gratitude owed to people who serve on all our committees who show up for meetings and work diligently, this leading to a note that we are coming up on election season and that if faculty can't make the set meeting times for these curriculum committees, they should not run for election to them because meeting attendance is absolutely essential to those committees functioning. Graduate Committee meets the first Thursday of every month at 9:30 and Undergraduate the first Tuesday at 3:30. Undergraduate Chair Aasheim confirmed the importance of this and noted they've had some major problems as the result of people being late or just not coming to meetings.

President's Report (Jean Bartels):

SACSCOC Reaccreditation

We now have the final full approval thru the year 2025, with zero recommendations for alterations on that report. One of the things that is going to be critically important for us is to remember that the SACSCOC Reaffirmation process is not the only thing that is important in terms of what we do re: Assessment. That is not something we just did for SACS, but something that is important to the ongoing development not only of our curriculum for every program, and for every student, but also what happens in terms of expectations for improving our programs and units. So we will be continuing that very important work. Obviously we are going to do some things around core curriculum. There has been confusion with core curriculum for a long time in terms of the mandates we have from the University System, the revisions that got done, and she was not sure exactly what the Gen Ed committee is being asked to review. She wants to look into that, because if it's process, that's one thing, but outcomes are important, and those need to be assessed as well, and by people that are in the discipline.

President's Assessment Advisory Team

In line with that, President Bartels said she has created a President's Assessment Advisory Team, which is representative of every single college and all units in the institution, to continue to explore what's happening with assessment in everybody's units.

Budget

We presented our budget request to the University System. Because we had a student enrollment that was flat, we don't anticipate much additional money to come using the current formula. However, the Governor did recommend full funding of a 3% merit increase for faculty and staff for the institution. That would go to the USG Board of Regents and they are the group that actually distributes that resource. It is fully funded, which it wasn't the last time around, so hopefully we will see an actual 3% coming to the institution. Also, we expressed our need to look at compression, and asked for some additional resources for that. We also talked about some of the emergent programs that need support and development. Overall, ours was a relatively small budget request, as we were encouraged to do because of flat enrollments.

Legislation

Once again, campus carry is being discussed in the legislature, this time with the addition of tasers. The USG continues to support very strongly the current law which bans all of those things from campus. President Bartels noted that faculty members are free to provide their perspectives as private citizens, but they cannot represent their positions as representing Georgia Southern or the USG.

New Buildings on Campus

The Military Science Building is beginning construction, and that's located off of 301 right where the roundabout is that gets you onto campus on that road. In January, we had a ribbon cutting for the Student Health Services Building. The multipurpose building is in its design phase, and has now come down to three versions of a draft design for that building.

Presidential Search

Airport interviewing for potential candidates was happening in Atlanta later in the week. On Campus interviews, at this point in time, for the finalists that are identified, are scheduled for the weeks of February 29 and March 7. The committee is supposed to recommend to the Board of Regents its unsequenced and unranked recommendations by March 11, and the Board of Regents in mid-March will interview those final candidates and make the decision for the end of that presidential search.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if it is legal for faculty members who want to speak or write on the campus carry bill to identify themselves as faculty members at Georgia Southern. President Bartels said that "as soon as you do that you identify Georgia Southern, so I would request or I would think that what would be requested would be that you identify yourself as a faculty of a public institution in the System or in a public institution in the state. They will know you come from USG then, but at least you're not identifying necessarily what your affiliation is."

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked how our enrollment numbers compared with those of other schools. President Bartels said a number of institutions lost enrollments, but in general they were pretty level across the System, and a few places went up. VP Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) confirmed this and added that those schools with increases saw them largely due to mini-mesters. President Bartels added that we are "commendable" because our FTE is third only to UGA and Georgia College and State, at 83% FTE; other schools have many part-time students. Also, our student credit hours are up again.

(Ming Fang He of COE posed a question that is inaudible on the tape, but that asked President Bartels for information about pay increases that she had already given in her report.)

President Bartels replied, "Let me repeat what I said for you. In the budget this year, yet unapproved, at the state level, the Governor has recommended full-funding for a 3% merit increase, that would impact everybody in the System. Again it's merit based, as they always are. There is nothing in the budget for compression. We have noted in our budget request that compression continues to be an issue for us, and would request some assistance with that. There is no money that came in the legislative language for compression. I know that's your favorite question."

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if there was somewhere a roster of members on the Assessment Advisory team. President Bartels said she would make that public, and that the members came from every college and from every vice president in the institution.

Mark Edwards (COSM) noted that "Just because the Governor suggests 3%, and even if it's approved by the legislature, it doesn't mean that Georgia Southern will necessarily get 3% because it has to be also apportioned by the Board of Regents. Is that true?" President Bartels confirmed this, but anticipated that this time around it probably will be at that amount.

Moderator Humphrey noted an error in the agenda: Provost Diana Cone could not give her report because, though present, she can hardly speak due to illness.

Senate Executive Committee Report: (Pat Humphrey [COSM], Chair.):

We had no Motion requests, but two RFIs: One from Karl Peace asked about the place of publishing books at Georgia Southern these days. In Dr. Grube's day the Spring Faculty Meeting honored people who had published books in the previous year. According to Dr. Bartels, there are a couple of problems with that: 1) Lack of clarity re: what constitutes a book as opposed to say a manual, as opposed to say a book chapter. 2) People in Performance and Creative Arts tended to be left out of the honors. Currently, though, people who do publish books are honored by the Library and at the Alumni Building, and the Alumni Magazine recently had an article in terms of new books published. The RFI question was unclear, but may also have been asking how books count towards promotion/tenure, but that might be dependent on specific disciplines, so if that's the question it needs to be clarified and resubmitted.

Another RFI from John Dyer was re: attendance verification in online classes, which can sometimes be problematic. Various professors have various methods and deadlines, and so the situation is rather chaotic. Dyer wanted to know if there was a better way.

Barbara King (CLASS) asked if we have a recommendation for the time frame for online attendance verification. Moderator Humphrey noted that it is supposed to be the same as in a regular course. King, though, noted that online classes don't have a particular meeting day, and asked if we are supposed to do it the first day, second day, by the third day, or what. Moderator Humphrey noted her own practice re: deadlines, but Adam Bossler (CLASS) noted that this was what King was talking about – each professor having different practices, which is very confusing especially since students might be taking multiple online courses in any given semester. He thought a more straightforward policy as to when students are expected to do attendance verification would help students probably even more than the faculty. Humphrey noted that this was something to pursue with the Registrar.

Presidential Search Update (Pat Humphrey):

Moderator Humphrey reiterated, with a few extra details, what President Bartels had already said, but then emphasized the confidential nature of the process until the names of those candidates coming to campus are announced. She and other search committee members have been doing a lot of background searching on the candidates.

Ming Fang He (COE): *(After identifying herself, her question is inaudible on the tape.)*

Moderator Humphrey replied, “No, Ming Fang, it was not because, for one thing, it was not celebrating just work. It was only celebrating books. If you published 20 articles you were not celebrated at that particular event. So that again is part of why I think why Dr. Bartels, at least, believes the thing was discontinued in its prior form.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if there was a possibility of resurrecting such an event in a more inclusive form because, for one thing, he thought it might bring people to the Spring faculty meeting.

President Bartels said she'd like to have a more inclusive way to celebrate the great scholarly and creative work that's done. One thing we're already trying to do is make that more public in other publications, such as the President's Newsletter and in the University Newsletters and things like that.

Moderator Humphrey then noted that the next item, an update from our Student Opinions of Instruction Ad Hoc Committee, was intended as an information only item, “. . . so if people start wanting to get into nitpicking and editing on the fly . . . I’m planning on shutting you down very quickly.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if the instrument had been released so that people could look at it, and if not, would we get a look at it before the start the pilot. Moderator Humphrey suggested that question be left pending the update.

Student Opinions of Instruction Ad-Hoc Committee Update — Trent Maurer, CHHS:

Trent Maurer (CHHS) said no, nobody would get to look at them because the committee was appointed to use their expertise and if they opened it up for everyone else to look at it, it would derail them. The initial plan was for a pilot testing in December of ‘15. It took so long to hear back from the companies that sell these things, and ultimately to eliminate them, that they’re now a semester behind.

In 2013-14 a different committee formed to examine the then ten-year-old SRI, nearly all the faculty and administrators who commented said we want a new form. This current committee was formed in Spring 2015 and charged to explore different options, whether it be for purchase or creation of a new measure; to pilot a new SRI and, if successful, recommend that to the Senate for approval. In addition, they were charged to develop new guidelines for the use of the SRI form.

This semester they completely eliminated purchase because there are only two options, and neither looked good. So they have developed our own form from a combination of best practices in the literature of over 1,500 peer reviewed studies on SRI’s, and two measures they were given explicit permission to use. We think we are going to have a really good measure when it gets pilot tested. They are near to having the information they require to draw a stratified random sample, and now need information re: our transition to new ScanTron machines because they want any new SRI to work with those. He commended Pam Deal, Sonya Chance and Sarah McNure for their help.

They should soon begin notifying department chairs and faculty that they have been randomly selected to participate in the pilot testing. From that point, they will rely on

the good faith of faculty and department chairs to comply. He invited the Provost to issue a directive to faculty to comply because he can't compel cooperation.

Moderator Humphrey asked Maurer to give us some idea of how what they have come up with is more formative, which is what the BOR policy calls for, than summative, which is what our current SRI looks like.

Maurer said we are lucky that the BOR has required that SRI's focus on the improvement of teaching, even though it's under the evaluation aegis, so the form really needs to focus more on student learning. Like the existing SRI, there will be a section on the teacher on the pilot form, a section on the course, and a section for open ended comments, though the way these look and the way they work may be a little bit different. But there will be a new section on the student in which the student will report their own behavior as connected to learning, such as to what extent they actually come to class. They also are trying to add in the student learning objectives for the course. They want students to actively reflect on their learning, on what a professor did (or did not) do that helped their learning, rather on whether or not they like a particular professor.

Mark Edwards (COSM) said he hadn't anything from Maurer about soliciting the opinion of the faculty.

Maurer figures to hear complaints from faculty involved in the pilot even before he solicits comments. After the pilot, they plan to solicit comment from faculty and chairs involved in the pilot. He said they "also realize that change is everyone's favorite word, so we expect to get a lot of negative feedback no matter what we do, and the challenges of course [will be in] interpreting that in light of what the literature says, in light of what the best practices are." The form as it's designed now will be more complicated to use, because you will not be able to summarize a faculty member's teaching with a single number, which he calls a good thing.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked about the ultimate process for approval or disapproval of this instrument, wanting to know when it will come to a vote in the Senate.

Maurer said that after gathering and analyzing the pilot data, ideally they will come back for the first Senate meeting Fall semester and recommend the form for adoption at that time. He did not think it realistic to recommend it in the summer because of the amount of data they'll have to go through.

Moderator Humphrey asked how many classes/courses they envision using for this pilot testing. Maurer couldn't be exact because of the remaining logistical question of who will and who will not have the new ScanTron machines. Humphrey asked for an approximation – 20 classes? 100? Maurer said the University has approximately 2350 classes in which SRI's would be used this semester, and using standard statistical power tests they need about 330 for a representative sample, but that they would be unable to get anywhere near that, that is just too unwieldy, they can't make it work. He figured they'd get in the neighborhood of about half of that, if they get a good answer to that logistical question. If they don't, it may become a moot point and they may have a much smaller population from which to draw.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked whether they will ensure disciplinary diversity for the pilot because he was worried about who won't get represented in the pilot.

Maurer said the very reason they are waiting for that logistical information is so they can take a stratified random sample that will come from every single college, both graduate and undergraduate, both face-to-face and online, and classes of a wide variety of sizes. They want to ensure no one is left out. That doesn't mean every department is going to be selected; that's not the way stratified random works.

Flynn remained worried, though, because Maurer had said they won't have a statistically significant sample.

(Secretary's Note: I apologize for the lengthy direct quotations that now follow, but your humble Secretary doesn't know what a lot of this means, though it seems others on the Senate do.)

Maurer replied, "The fun thing about that is the issue when you are asking is the power sufficient to be reasonably certain. The question is, are the means that you find representative of the means from the population. The old form was very much focused on SRI means. The last committee made it very clear that that's an inappropriate way to evaluate faculty. The new forms, although means are possible to calculate, are not what everything is going to be about. The new forms are going to be about distributions, which is much less of an issue; we are much more interested in the frequency distribution of responses than the mean." Moderator Humphrey agreed with that.

Alan Mackelprang (COBA) asked what sort of criteria would indicate a successful pilot test.

Maurer replied, “Several of the questions will ask things like how much time do students on average report studying for a class? We already have data from NSSE on that, so we will be able to compare the distribution of responses to what we have from NSSE. If they are at least somewhat similar, that’s a pretty good representation. If this pilot test comes back such that, you know, 90% of our students say they are putting in 12 hours a week for each class, well, we know that’s not true. So we have questions like that in there where we can triangulate with other data sources to know whether or not this is representative. Similarly we will want to expect a certain degree of variability on the responses, so no matter what question we are looking at, we don’t have answer responses that are all at one end of the spectrum or the other, but there is some diversity. We would expect some frequency distribution so it’s not all lined up on one, but honestly a significant part of what will determine the effectiveness is does this blow up and create any problems? Because there is no way to know that until we pilot test it because it is so different from some of the things we’ve done before. We are looking at also to identify kinks in administration of it because we don’t want to have that happen during a wide scale implementation.”

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked how, assuming that this new form is implemented, would an average faculty member represent his/her performance because almost all departments use SRI as some component of evaluation.

Maurer said it would be “not terribly dissimilar to the way it is now, but instead of the tyranny of the mean which we know is problematic on our current form, they would simply report the frequency distribution instead. The idea here is that rather than saying I have a mean of x out of a score of y, you instead say on these questions this is the distribution of my student responses. It gives a somewhat more holistic picture of what’s going on. It also is really interesting because you have faculty members, most of whom teach more than one course. And so they can say in course x, here is the distribution, but in course y this is the distribution, and here’s what I think is going on pedagogically with that, and here’s what I’ve chosen to do to try to address those differences.”

Edwards asked, “So you mean it’s something like giving the mean of standard deviation of a normal distribution or something like that?”

Maurer replied, “No, that’s not what would happen at all. They would avoid the mean and the standard deviation; they would say of this six point scale, for example, x% had one, y% had two, z% had 3, and this was the distribution, and you’d look at that

distribution. I actually think this will be much more helpful to faculty members especially those going up for promotion/tenure. Because the mean may not change over a five-year period, but the distribution of responses could. You could have a faculty member who has a lot of scores on the one/five range with a mean of three at year one, but by year five their means are three. Statistically those means could turn out the same, but that tells us something qualitatively different about that faculty member. Similarly, there might be a small mean change which right now we could detect as a small mean change, but if what's happening is that in years one and two we had a certain population of students who rated the faculty member very low on a few items, but then by years three, four, and five those ones turn into threes or fours, that tells us more than there's a mean change of .2 on a five point scale."

Edwards noted that we already have these statistics on the current form.

Maurer agreed, but they are not typically reported that way. There seems to be a focus on the mean and many of the questions on the existing form are not appropriate, and so we need to change the questions themselves. It is not just what the data says; it's that the questions are problematic.

Moderator Humphrey noted "that we are dealing with ordinal data, and calculating means and standard deviations in small classes with ordinal data as totally inappropriate."

Flynn noted that Maurer was saying that it's the questions that are the problem, yet he and the committee were not letting us know what any of the questions are, which Flynn found disturbing. He also noted that Maurer had said the committee was going to make recommendations for the way these evaluations should be used, and he wanted more information about that part of the committee's work.

Maurer replied that much of this comes from the 2013-14 committee, which recommended some changes, and the work of the Faculty Welfare Committee, which instituted some but not all of those changes, so when the current ad-hoc committee was charged, they were sure that making those changes was part of their official charge. He offered as an example getting rid of the practice of administrators using means to compare individual faculty members. He also referred to what Moderator Humphrey had said about best practices in basic math. He reiterated, though, that the committee was "not going to show you the questions. The committee was deliberately composed of

experts on SRI's, people who are familiar with the existing literature, because the issues are exceptionally complex. In addition to good pedagogy and issues in evaluation, there are many logistical issues we have to deal with, too, like we don't want more than a two-page form because then you need a staple, and if you have a staple then you can't use the existing software and hardware machines we are trying to make it work with. All these different things are going on and at this point it would completely derail our work to reopen it up."

Flynn asked at-large whether an open records request would be the proper way to see these questions. Moderator Humphrey suggested he talk with Maurer one-on-one. Maurer said that would be fine.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) understood Flynn's concern about not having seen the questions, but noted Maurer had said that once they have run the pilot, we will have the opportunity to see the information, and so a pilot is just that, a pilot to see what roadblocks we meet and where we need to change our direction. She suggested that the Senate wait to see what the pilot results are and move forward from there.

Jim LoBue (COSM) noted that Maurer said this was a more complicated instrument, and asked if Maurer had a sense of how much longer it's going to take to administer.

Maurer said they don't want a form that's going to take 30 minutes, so "no matter what" they want to keep it to front and back of a single piece of paper. They kept most of the questions quantitatively oriented, so there still are only two open-ended questions. He anticipated no increase in time, and maybe less time because there are fewer questions.

Moderator Humphrey noted that because Dr. Bartels has to go to a meeting in Atlanta next month, the Senate meeting that was scheduled for March 8, has been moved to March 7 and over to the Nessmith-Lane building.

Unfinished Business

None.

New Business

None.

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

Announcements from the Floor

None

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.