(to be considered for
approval at 2/17/98
Senate meeting)

SENATE MINUTES
UM-ST. LOUIS
December 9, 1997
3 p.m. 222 J. C. Penney

The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m. Minutes from the previous meeting (held November 4, 1997) were approved as submitted.

Report from the Chairperson -- Dr. Lawrence Friedman

(see attached)

Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill

The Chancellor began by extending her thanks to those who were involved in inviting President Manuel Pacheco to St. Louis to attend events sponsored by the Faculty Council and Alumni Alliance.

She reported that more than $400,000 has come to the campus from private donors in November. The year-to-date total is nearing $3 million.

In November, over 200 people attended a reception which was held to bring together scholarship donors and recipients. Chancellor Touhill extended her thanks to the faculty members who attended.

Several events and workshops were held over the past month to recruit students and to help students who already have enrolled. An open house attracted more than 500 students and parents, and workshops on stress management, time management, and career choices were conducted by Counseling Services for current students. Additionally, Career Services coordinated on-campus interviews involving over 500 students and 100 companies.

With the assistance of Acting Vice President Stephen Lehmkuhle, the campus is working to move proposals for the Ph.D. in Education and a master's degree in Social Work through the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. After these proposals are approved, the campus will seek curator approval for a Ph.D. in History and a master's degree in Philosophy.

Under the direction of Vice Chancellor Nelson, academic units will be allowed to offer whatever courses they wish during the spring and summer sessions. Units will retain some income if it exceeds direct expenses. Units also will

be liable for any losses if income is less than direct expenses, the Chancellor stated.

On the subject of grant activity as a criterion for tenure and promotion, Chancellor Touhill said, "I think most faculty recognize that the culture and realities of higher education are now such that it is unrealistic to expect that all the expenses associated with a research-oriented institution can be covered by the revenue provided by state appropriations and student fees. We must, of necessity, increasingly seek to augment those revenue streams through grants, contracts, and gifts. The Office of University Relations has been very successful in obtaining significant gifts, as the result of faculty involvement. Some departments have built and maintained an impressive record of external funding. And in most departments there are faculty who have been active in obtaining, or applying for, internal or external grants. I think it is obvious to everyone that we need to continue and expand these efforts. I am asking that every unit review its tenure and promotion standards to see whether attempts to obtain grants, contracts, and gifts should be included within one or more of the three standard requirements for research, teaching, and service. I am not recommending that such activity become a separate requirement alongside research, teaching, and service. Those units that have already submitted their tenure and promotion standards to Vice Chancellor Nelson are free to revise them should they wish to do so. Those who have not should do so as soon as possible."

At the close of her report, the Chancellor was asked by Student Senator Barbara Collaso if the M.S.W. would be on the agenda for this week's meeting of CBHE. Chancellor Touhill expressed hope that the proposal will be decided on at a forthcoming meeting.

Report from the Faculty Council -- Dr. Herman Smith

(see attached)

Report from the Intercampus Faculty Council -- Dr. Silvia Madeo

(see attached)

Report from the Executive Committee -- Dr. Lawrence Friedman

Dr. Friedman reported that Drs. Richard Wright and Bruce Wilking and Ms. Barbara Collaso will comprise the 1998 Student Election Subcommittee.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Dr. Friedman introduced recommendations from the Educational Policy Task Force and provided the history of the recommendations. He explained that the Task Force met in

spring and summer of 1996 and developed a draft. Subsequent to this, the Executive Committee's charge was interpreted to include issues of educational policy. The Task Force's draft was reviewed by the Executive Committee, and several minor editorial adjustments were made. The document (see copy attached) was approved by the Senate.

Report from the Committee on Student Affairs -- Dr. Bruce Wilking

Dr. Wilking distributed a survey concerning the possibility of instituting an "enrichment hour," during which classes would not be scheduled. The survey was to be completed by Senate members and returned to the Office of Student Activities.

Report from the Budget and Planning Committee -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill

Chancellor Touhill reported that the Committee met two weeks ago to review graduation rates for each degree program and budget information on all administrative units. The Committee will meet again on December 15. The agenda for that meeting will include a review of research activity.

Dr. Lawrence Barton inquired as to the purpose of these various reviews. The Chancellor said that, eventually, the Committee will draft a workload policy and will assist with various recruitment problems. Dr. Joseph Martinich suggested that copies of these reports be distributed to the Senate.

Report from the Committee on Bylaws and Rules -- Dr. William Long

Before presenting his report, Dr. Long questioned if a quorum was present. Senate members were counted, and it was determined that a quorum was not present. At this point, it was decided to continue meeting but to limit the agenda to informational items only.

* * * * * *

Report from the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction -- Professor David Ganz

Professor Ganz reported that the academic calendar will be considered by the Board of Curators in January. He noted several issues under discussion by the Committee, including the need for a grade change policy, the possibility of publishing the Bulletin every two years, a proposal to renumber our courses to correspond to the numbering system in place at the community colleges and at other institutions, and concern that graduation requirements are

being waived for courses that are unavailable at the St. Charles and Jefferson County sites.

In response to a question from Dr. Mark Burkholder, Professor Ganz confirmed that incoming students receive the Bulletin gratis, while continuing students must pay for the book. The price, he said, is well below the cost of printing it. Dr. Burkholder suggested putting changes to the book on the Web, and Dr. Martinich commented that that was supposed to have been done several years ago. Professor Ganz clarified that we moved to a new system several years ago but that change did not include posting updates on the Web.

Dr. Yard asked if the Bulletin is the final rule or law of the University. Professor Ganz stated that it is not to be construed as a contract. However, he noted that under the CBHE articulation agreement, the rules in place when a student starts and maintains continuous enrollment in college are binding.

In closing, Professor Ganz called the Senate's attention to course actions which were effected by the Committee.

Report from the Committee on Physical Facilities and General Services -- Dr. Lawrence Barton

(see attached)

Dr. Joyce Mushaben reminded Dr. Barton of the concern she expressed at the last Senate meeting about the issue of being unable to see around "mega-vans" when pulling out of spaces in lot N. Dr. Barton said he would bring the issue up at the Committee's next meeting. When the West Drive is straightened, he observed, there will be no parking along it.

Dr. Mushaben complained about "goose fecal material," which is not being cleaned up from the sidewalk in front of buildings.

Ms. Collaso inquired about parking for resident students. Dr. Barton deferred to Vice Chancellor Schuster, who reported that his office is working on parking problems now. Additional spaces have been made available at the Honors College, he reported.

Dr. Williamson inquired why the upper levels in Lot N have been closed. Vice Chancellor Schuster said there was a temporary problem but that barricades should be coming down when the snow is over.

Completing the informational reports, the Senate adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Larson
Senate Secretary

Attachments:

Report from the Senate Chairperson
Report from the Faculty Council
Report from the Intercampus Faculty Council
Recommendations of the Educational Policy Task Force
Report of the Senate Committee on Physical Facilities and General Services

(minutes written by Ms. Joan M. Arban,
Senate Executive Assistant)

Senate Report from the Chair, Dec. 9, 1997

We have a long agenda this afternoon, so I won't take long with my opening statement.

I want to thank the Faculty Council for taking the initiative and inviting President Pacheco to the campus--and for opening up their monthly meeting to the campus community so that everyone had a chance to see and hear the President of the University.

I'm not sure we heard anything that we hadn't already known but it was insightful to hear what the president had to say and how he related what he said to our campus. It would have been enlightening to hear his perspective on the relationships between campuses and their individual roles within the System. Maybe next time.

Some of the questions asked of him are truly Systems questions, where policy and decisions have been made affecting the four campuses and which can only be rectified, if need be, through the System.

Other questions were, for the most part, about campus issues and these can only be addressed and managed through local actions, for which the president is not in a position to wave a magic wand and wish away the problems that face us.

Although part of the predicament we find ourselves in has been due to System decisions, it is only on a local level that we can pull ourselves up and out of the mess we find ourselves in.

The primary problem, of course, is a financial one, but others contributing to the dilemma, and naturally related to budget are planning and developmental.

The System allocation to this campus is not going to change in the near future and it is the near future that is in the most trouble at this time

When institutions reach this point in their history, when very tough decisions have to be made regarding budget, they usually opt for one of two directions to follow:

One, they begin fighting among themselves, attacking one another, looking for ways to bring down those they blame for the situation they are in, looking for means to gain the edge so that their ideas will prevail, looking to bring down the very structure that has helped them not only to survive, but to grow and prosper through the years.

The second direction they can follow is to "circle the wagons", so to speak, and in doing so to restore the respect and trust each previously had for the other.

I believe the only way out of our present dilemma and to prevent things from getting any worse is to cooperate, to share information and on a timely basis, to agree on priorities after sound and honest discussion, and to openly arrive at decisions jointly and fairly agreed upon.

The governance structure as it is presently set up is responsive to this kind of cooperation. It reaches into all aspects of the academic mission as well as into the units supplemental to and supportive of the academic mission.

It reaches into curricular and programming issues, into admission and recruiting issues, into budgetary and future planning issues, into appointment and tenure issues, into research and teaching support issues, into educational policy issues and into adequate resource issues among others.

None of these issues should be debated in a vacuum or behind closed doors. The apparatus is already here and by using it the way it should be used and the way it was originally planned to be used, we can accomplish what really is important to our mission,-- that is, to provide a quality education, maintain a quality research program and to provide access to students residing in the greater metropolitan area of St. Louis and its surrounding environs and to do so within a reasonable and sensible budget.

We have a collective responsibility to accomplish this mission and the only way it can be done is by a willingness to work amiably together and to share the time and efforts it will take to do so.

Senate Remarks from the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Council
December 9, 1997

I hope that all of you were able to Attend President Pacheco's visit to the Council last Wednesday, December 3. The President told me afterward that he would very much like to be invited back again next year. Due to the extraordinary nature of the occasion, the Council deferred the ordinary business of the December meeting until the February meeting unless called into special session, so I thought it well to keep the Senate abreast of other ongoing business of the Council.

The Steering Committee met with Vice Chancellor Grace on November 20 to discuss revisions of current written UM-SL documents: student grievance, grade appeal, plagarism, and cheating policies. All parties agreed that current university rules and procedures are too vague and need clarification so that any reasonable party would interpret them in the same way. The Council's Faculty Grievance Assistance Committee will be meeting this month with Vice Chancellor Grace to work on proposed modifications to current UM-SL documents, including the Faculty Handbook which appears to be out of step with UM System policies and procedures. I have also asked Vice Chancellor Nelson to bring Vice Chancellor Grace to an upcoming meeting of the Senate's new Academic Advisory Committee to discuss these same issues because there is widespread dissatisfaction with current policy and its implimentation from the standpoint of the faculty. For example, the Council strongly believes that student appeals beyond the College or School level should only involve questions of alleged violations of standard procedures and rules. I am happy to say that I believe there is strong administrative support for virtually every point of dissatisfaction brought up by the Steering Committee.

The list of administrators to be evaluated this year by the Administrator Evaluation Committee are Chancellor Touhill, Vice Chancellor Nelson, Deputy to the Chancellor Dreimeier, Interim Assoc. Vice Chancellor Mc Phail, Vice Chancellor Schuster, Vice Chancellor Osborn, Coordinator of Campus Computing Siegel, Assoc. Vice Chancellor and Dean Smith, Vice Chancellor of Managerial and Technological Services Krueger, Assoc. Vice Chancellor aknd Dean Wartzok, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity Seay, and Assoc. Vice Chancellor Beeler. Some discussion was raised concerning the short term for Vice Chancellor Nelson. The consensus of the Faculty Council at the October 30 meeting was to keep Nelson in the list if for no other reason than for him to receive early feedback on his reception by the faculty. The list was approved unanimously.

Also at that meeting I gave a summary of the survey results of University Senators regarding changes to certain Senate Bylaws. One of the main questions addressed the qualifications for chair of the Senate Budget and Planning Committee. Currently the Bylaws name the Chancellor, an administrator, as chair with voting rights. This is the only Senate committee that is not chaired by a regular full-time faculty member and the only committee that does not name the administrators on the committee as ex-officio. Based on a seventy-five percent return from surveyed Senators there is overwhelming support for changing the Senate Budget and Planning Committee to a faculty-chaired committee. Since it appears that such a vote would pass in a mail ballot of the Senate, I drafted a recommendation to the Senate Rules & Bylaws Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Council, that they consider this proposed change in Senate Bylaws to better reflect the wishes of the Faculty Council, the overwhelming majority of Faculty Senators, and the General Faculty. Immediately after COuncil meeting with President Pacheco last week, the Steering Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Council, voted unanimously to support the recommendation for a Bylaws change. The Steering Committee also voted unanimously to call a special session of the Faculty Council before the next Senate meeting to confirm the action of the committee and show widespread representative support for this Bylaws change, if such proved necessary.

Finally, may the holiday spirit be with you during the coming festive days. I look forward, as I'm sure all you do, to 1998. I'll gladly entertain any questions or comments you might have at this point. Otherwise, peace to all.

Report to the Senate
Intercampus Faculty Council
December 9, 1997

At its November 19 meeting, the IFC passed a resolution recommending campus guidelines for the use of student computing fees. This resolution, which was reported to the Senate in an earlier version last spring, is consistent with existing written policies on the Columbia and Kansas City campuses. Copies have been shared with the chair of the Senate Committee on Computing and with Jerry Siegel. A copy of the resolution with final changes is attached to this report.

The IFC also discussed with Ralph Caruso the individual campus costs associated with ongoing upgrades to e-mail systems across all four campuses. These upgrades appear to have been driven by severe problems on the Columbia campus. Mr. Caruso noted that costs incurred now are laying the groundwork long-range improvements across the UM system. The IFC requested that he make an effort to inform users of the potential benefits of such changes before costs are imposed on the four campuses. Mr. Caruso is scheduled to visit the UM-St. Louis campus on Thursday December 11 from 11:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. in Case Room 3 of the Computer Center Building. He will discuss the migration to Microsoft Exchange as the standard UM e-mail system. Representative of Microsoft will be present to demonstrate the system.

Curator John Mathes joined the IFC for about an hour. He began the session by sharing information about his background and commitment to the University. One of the Columbia representatives asked Curator Mathes to comment on data from Columbia showing a decline in tenure-track faculty as a percent of total employees in combination with an increase in executive, administrative, and managerial posts. Curator Mathes affirmed his belief in the importance of the role of tenured faculty in maintaining quality programs at the University. He said he had been reading about the issue of post-tenure review. He noted that he senses no negative attitudes on the Board toward tenure as an institution nor does he sense a groundswell for imposing post-tenure review beyond what is already in place. He stated his belief that the most important thing faculty can do to protect tenure is to make good decisions when recommending tenure for their colleagues.

When President Pacheco joined the meeting, he also was asked to comment on the statistics from the Columbia campus. He stated that he was not surprised by the decline the tenure-track faculty, but he was surprised by the increase in almost all other categories. Vice-President McGill agreed to examine the report.

Topics to be discussed at future meetings include grievance procedures, the academic calendar, and faculty compensation.

10/1/97

IFC DRAFT RESOLUTION: INSTRUCTIONAL COMPUTING FEES

The IFC recognizes the central importance of the Instructional Computing Fee as a source of financial support for faculty integration of computing into the curriculum. As such, it reaffirms that such fees should be directed towards the support of

-- equipment, software and staffing of General Access Labs which are accessible to all students;

-- equipment, software and staffing of limited access labs that directly service course needs;

-- such non-lab facilities as dial-in access, computer classrooms, e-mail, print and file services, and maintenance of virtual reality classrooms;

-- specialized personnel support (including teaching and lab assistants) required to integrate computing into courses;

-- ~~instructional seminars on computer educational uses~~;

-- course-specific hardware, software and databases.

Such fees should not be used to

-- replace services and maintenance currently funded through the regular budget;

-- support faculty research;

-- provide computers or software for faculty, advising or other administrative use.

In order to promote these ends, the IFC recommends that each campus develop an explicit mechanism by which a portion of the instructional computing fees be distributed to meet specific instructional needs. Such mechanisms may include

-- allocation of a portion of the ICF to the specialized needs of students in each academic unit in proportion to the amount of fees generated by students in that unit;

-- allocation of a portion of the ICF based on a competitive proposal process, wherein submissions will be accepted from unit heads, individual faculty, and other designated parties involved in the integration of computing into the curriculum.

The IFC recognizes the need for strict accountability on how funds allocated via the above mechanisms are spent as well as documentation of their direct benefit to UM students. ICF recipients should be required to give a full accounting of their ICF expenditures in order to receive subsequent allocations.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

October, 1997

The committee proposes the following guidelines for off-campus and electronically offered courses. It should be noted that these guidelines include not only courses offered through interactive video to other campuses, but any course that involves electronic media and/or is offered at a location other than the main campus.

1. **We endorse the attached "Principles of Good Practice for Electronically Offered Academic Degree and Certificate Programs."** These general principles will be used to guide committee decisions on electronically offered courses, but committee recommendations focus on the needs of the University of Missouri-St. Louis campus and on its collaboration with other institutions.

2. **As courses are developed, the faculty of the unit, with information provided by distance learning specialists, will determine the accommodations necessary to teach electronically offered courses. Each unit's faculty will thus retain control of its courses.** Many courses can be offered through interactive video with the appropriate accommodations and resources. It also acknowledged the fact that the accommodations may cost too much to make the course economically feasible. The faculty of each unit should determine which courses may be offered electronically, the accommodations and resources needed and whether a course should be taught through that platform. Recommendations from the unit will be noted on the Senate course approval form.

3. **Individual course assignments will be made to individual faculty after discussions with the chair or unit administrator, as is the present practice with on-campus courses.** In the future, electronically offered and off-campus courses will become more common. In making teaching assignments, unit administrators, directors and chairs should consider faculty skills, interests and overall workload. They should also help faculty obtain from the campus administration the resources needed to teach such courses.

4. **At a minimum, faculty will receive the same credit for distance courses as for on-campus courses. This will be considered on an individual basis with consideration given for the faculty member's time and effort in light of the faculty member's schedule, workload, and amount of student interaction in teaching the course.** Consideration should be given to the number of students enrolled in combined on-and off-campus sections; the number of students enrolled should determine the amount of credit the faculty member receives for the course. Thus, courses with high enrollments should count the same as high

enrollment on-campus courses. Electronically offered courses require additional time to address the technological component of such courses.

5. **Faculty development will be available for faculty interested in teaching electronically offered courses. This will include appropriate replacement accommodation to the department or extra compensation and resources for course development.** Orientation should be required of all faculty who are planning to offer courses employing electronic media. This orientation would help faculty determine which media would be most useful for each course and how best to use it. The orientation should be made available at least one semester prior to the one in which the faculty member plans to offer the course.

The committee also strongly recommends that faculty who have been successful in teaching electronically offered courses be accorded extra compensation to mentor faculty beginning to teach such courses.

6. **Off-campus students should, to the extent practicable, have access to the same appropriate combination of resources necessary for a complete educational experience as on-campus students.** The campus must ensure that resources are available and are in good working order. For example, students now are unable to access the Internet because there are too many users for too few lines. Other times equipment doesn't work. Because many problems occur at the beginning of the semester, additional staff should be allocated during that time to assure that equipment is in good working order. If access is not available or equipment doesn't work, students and faculty become frustrated and the potential of the learning environment has not been realized. Such a condition would reflect negatively not only on the program but on the University as a whole.

7. **Evaluation should be ongoing and should include not only an evaluation of the course content but also of the appropriateness of the medium of course delivery.** Courses offered through electronic media should retain the same high level of quality that other courses on- or off-campus offer. In fact, the courses might be richer because of the increased access to a variety of learning tools. On the other hand, the need to coordinate a great deal of information from a range of sources may also make the course more confusing. The Senate Committee on Assessment should work with ITC and other appropriate campus groups or committees to develop a recommended evaluation format.

8. **Student credit hours should be assigned to the instructor's academic unit. Budgetary credit should be allocated in an equitable manner to participating institutions.** If the University is to foster the development of high-quality courses delivered electronically and/or off-campus, it needs the enthusiastic support of individual faculty and academic

units. This will be best achieved if the units view the development of such programs as integral parts of their mission, rather than as activities which detract from their programmatic goals by using up scarce resources.

Principles of Good Practice for Electronically Offered Academic Degree and Certificate Programs

Preamble

These Principles are the product of a Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications project, "Balancing Quality and Access: Reducing State Policy Barriers to Electronically Delivered Higher Education Programs." The three-year project, supported by the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, is designed to foster an interstate environment that encourages the electronic provision of quality higher education programs across state lines. The Principles have been developed by a group representing the Western states' higher education regulating agencies, higher education institutions, and the regional accrediting community.

Recognizing that the context for learning in our society is undergoing profound changes, those charged with developing the Principles have tried not to tie them to, or compare them to, traditional campus structures. The Principles are also designed to be sufficiently flexible that institutions offering a range of programs—from graduate degrees to certificates—will find them useful.

Several assumptions form the basis for these Principles:

• The electronically offered program is provided by or through an institution that is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting body.

• The institution's programs holding specialized accreditation meet the same requirements when offered electronically.

• The "institution" may be a traditional higher education institution, a consortium of such institutions, or another type of organization or entity.

• These Principles address programs rather than individual courses.

• It is the institution's responsibility to review educational programs it provides via technology in terms of its own internally applied definitions of these Principles.

Principles

Curriculum and Instruction

• Each program of study results in learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor and breadth of the degree or certificate awarded.

• An electronically offered degree or certificate program is coherent and complete.

• The program provides for appropriate real-time or delayed interaction between faculty and students and among students.

• Qualified faculty provide appropriate oversight of the program electronically offered.

Institutional Context and Commitment to Role and Mission

• The program is consistent with the institution's role and mission.

• Review and approval processes ensure the appropriateness of the technology being used to meet the program's objectives.

Faculty Support

• The program provides faculty support services specifically related to teaching via an electronic system.

• The program provides training for faculty who teach via the use of technology.

Resources for Learning

• The program ensures that appropriate learning resources are available to students.

Students and Student Services

• The program provides students with clear, complete, and timely information on the curriculum, course and degree requirements, nature of faculty/student interaction, assumptions about technological competence and skills, technical equipment requirements, availability of academic support services and financial aid resources, and costs and payment policies.

• Enrolled students have reasonable and adequate access to the range of student services appropriate to support their learning. Accepted students have the background, knowledge, and technical skills needed to undertake the program.

• Advertising, recruiting, and admissions materials clearly and accurately represent the program and the services available.

Commitment to Support

• Policies for faculty evaluation include appropriate consideration of teaching and scholarly activities related to electronically offered programs.

• The institution demonstrates a commitment to ongoing support, both financial and technical, and to continuation of the program for a period sufficient to enable students to complete a degree/certificate.

Evaluation and Assessment

• The institution evaluates the program's educational effectiveness, including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student and faculty satisfaction.

• Students have access to such program evaluation data.

• The institution provides for assessment and documentation of student achievement in each course and at completion of the program.

Facilities and General Services Committee - Senate Meeting, Dec. 9, 1997

This report will be brief but it continues my response to the committee's suggestion that I report at each Senate meeting. Since the last Senate meeting, I appeared before the SGA and the students had lots of comments, complaints and suggestions. One question, which continues to be raised, is the issue of parking on the top of Garage C. A formal response has been requested from Vice Chancellor Wendell Smith.

At the November meeting we received a report from the subcommittee on recycling. A report will be made by Robert Roeseler at the Senate Meeting on January 20. However it is important that the campus community knows that the recycling program is active and successful. The revenue from recycling has not been high but it has been used to support tree plantings and other memorials. Apparently there is no market for plastic recycling and student groups do the aluminum can recycling. The blue containers should be used and it is important that publicity be provided for the fact that most paper products can be recycled under the Smurfit contract. The subcommittee membership consists of Paul Travers, Alice Canavan, Margaret O'Connor, Robert Roeseler, Yvette Sweeney, Bruce Wilking and Emil Wooley.

We raised issues about lighting near the Nursing Administration Building and received a report on the bridge being constructed between SSB and the Computer Center Building. This project was initiated at the suggestion of the committee. We received a report on various facilities projects underway on the campus and we briefly discussed issues relating the campus' relations with the City of Normandy. The latter will be discussed at the December meeting. I can give details of the vice chancellor's report if there are any questions but they will not be included in the written report.

Please don't forget to contact committee members if you have any issues that are within the purview of the committee.