

**UNIVERSITY ASSEMBLY  
UM-ST. LOUIS  
MINUTES  
September 12, 2000  
4 p.m. 222 J. C. Penney**

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m. by the Chairperson of the University Assembly, Dr. Lawrence Barton, who proceeded with the first item of business by introducing Dr. Raymond Balbes, Chairperson of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.

**Memorial Resolution Honoring Dr. Edward Andalaft**

Following preliminary remarks about the untimely passing of Dr. Edward Andalaft, and the information that a tribute to Dr. Andalaft is being planned for November 16 in the Century Room of the Millennium Center (details to follow), Dr. Balbes offered a Memorial Resolution for the Assembly's consideration:

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft made extensive contributions to Mathematics by his research and by his service to the profession at the local and national level;

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft devoted a great part of his time to helping students and to developing unique and lasting bonds between students, faculty, and alumni;

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft was a pillar of the Department, having established high standards for research and teaching that will remain as a tribute to his efforts;

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft served with distinction for many years on the UM-St. Louis Senate and on many of its committees;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Assembly of the University of Missouri-St. Louis, on behalf of the students, faculty, and the staff of UM-St. Louis and on behalf of the citizens of the State of Missouri, does hereby adopt this Resolution in sincere appreciation of the dedicated and devoted service of Edward Andalaft.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary cause this Resolution to be entered into the minutes of this meeting.

The Memorial Resolution was approved by voice vote of the Assembly.

**Report from the Chairperson -- Dr. Lawrence Barton**

The Chairperson welcomed members to the first meeting of the University Assembly and announced that Susan English, the Senate's very efficient Assistant, has resigned from the University to take a much more attractive position. Replacing Sue will be Joan Arban, who served in this capacity for 15 years, until 1998. The Chair indicated that he was delighted that Joan agreed to take the assignment and asked those assembled to join him in welcoming her. She was given a hearty round of applause.

Assembly members were brought up to date on activities completed or under way by the Faculty Senate and University Assembly Office. The Chair reported that he has contacted all committees and that all have either selected or are about to select their chairperson. (Note: The committee membership roster reflecting newly-designated chairpersons has been posted on the Web.) He is awaiting action by the student members of the Assembly, who must fill student vacancies on certain committees by election. Commenting on the need for patience as the Assembly works through inevitable glitches in the new governance procedures, the Chair said he expects that the Committee on Bylaws and Rules will be quite busy this year.

The Chair reported his concern with the situation of the students and noted that there was no report from the Student Government Association on the meeting's agenda. In an effort to become familiar with what has transpired, he has spoken to Joshua Stegeman, a member of the Student Senate Association; Josh Renaud, Editor of the Current; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs G. Gary Grace; and Rick Blanton, Director Emeritus of Student Activities. In addition, the Chair was called by Rick Eccher, a member of the Student Court. From these conversations, the Chair understands that a provisional Student Government was appointed after the spring Student Government Association elections were canceled, and that the election of an SGA President is planned for September 26 and 27.

Furthermore, the Committee which drafted the new governance document did not address the issue of how the students were to organize. It was deemed the responsibility of students to organize themselves and to hold elections for Assembly membership and for committee slots. The Chair said he is anxious for the new structure to work successfully for the students. He offered to meet with them to try to attain that goal.

Calling this year a new beginning, the Chair expressed hope that students, faculty, staff, and administration can work together better than in the past two or three years. Attributing much of the problem to poor communication and procedures that have not given faculty members reasons to respect the process, the Chair rated this as his most urgent priority and pledged to try to improve the climate and collegiality on the campus. He reported that he has attended meetings of the Cabinet and has met and will meet regularly with the Chancellor, who has pledged to be a partner in the effort to bring all campus constituencies together. He will also meet regularly with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Chair invited input from Assembly members and asked that he be kept informed when problems arise.

In closing, the Chair reported that he and Ms. Arban are scheduled to tour the new Student Center to select an appropriate location for future meetings. Information on this will be forthcoming.

### **Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill**

The Chancellor expressed pleasure at presenting the first-ever Chancellor's Report to the University Assembly and congratulated members for taking part in the new governance structure of the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Chancellor Touhill reported that preliminary on-campus enrollment for Fall 2000 is 12,188 -- an increase of 119 students, or 1 percent over last fall. These students are generating 112,647 credit hours, an increase of about 1 percent over last fall. This is in line with the credit hour production needed to meet our budget obligations for this fiscal year; however, the Chancellor said we still have to find the resources to pay for a marketing plan.

Senators were reminded that last spring the campus completed work on a strategic plan that is consistent with the goals and objectives that were outlined earlier in a System-wide Strategic Plan approved by the Curators. Chancellor Touhill said she soon will meet with the Strategic Plan Task Force to review revisions suggested by faculty and academic officers. She will also be working with the Task Force to establish benchmarks. Assembly members were reminded that the System-wide Strategic Plan included a five-year financial or resource plan that, in essence, mandated that each campus reallocate funds to increase faculty and staff salaries. It was projected that UM-St. Louis would need to reallocate about \$4.2 million to meet System goals. A total of \$1.6 million was reallocated at the beginning of this fiscal year, and we will need to reallocate approximately \$1.2 million in rate dollars next fiscal year. The remaining years call for much smaller reallocation amounts. Chancellor Touhill said she soon will be meeting with the Budget and Planning Committee to begin discussions on the rate dollars that need to be reallocated next year.

While we are in the process of reallocation, we are also in the process of distributing new Mission Enhancement money. More than \$1.8 million in new rate dollars has been assigned to Education, the Honors College, Communication, Computer Science, MIS, Social Work, Nursing, and to the Graduate School for student support.

The continuing concern and public debate over the cost of higher education has prompted President Pacheco to appoint a System-wide Student Fee Task Force. System Vice President James Cofer is chairing this effort, the Chancellor reported. The Task Force is charged with examining all aspects of the student fee structure and creating policy recommendations that could be submitted to the Curators in November, 2001. UM-St. Louis is represented on the Task Force by vice chancellors Krueger, Grace, and Durand, who may be contacted with questions or suggestions.

In closing, the Chancellor reminded Assembly members of the forthcoming State of the University Address and Founders Dinner.

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

Chancellor Touhill reported that the Committee met over the summer and discussed enrollment management. Vice chancellors Grace and Krueger reviewed the enrollments during the 1999-2000 academic year and the projections for the 2000-2001 year. The overall credit hour goal was the same for both years.

Meetings of the new Budget and Planning Committee are being scheduled at this time.

In response to the Chancellor's offer to take questions from the floor, Dr. Timothy McBride asked if the \$1.2 million reallocation has been updated since last year. The Chancellor said that she does not have an update on the figure at this time.

Turning to other business, Mr. Joshua Stegeman introduced the student members of the Assembly who were present and indicated that students are trying to get themselves organized, as they did last year. Three students on the Assembly were members of last year's Senate. They will assist the group in acquainting itself with the whole University Assembly idea. Mr. Stegeman reported that the group has met once and is using its listserv to discuss ideas. He assured everyone that student seats on committees will be filled.

Completing the business at hand, the Assembly adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Pierce Secretary, University Assembly

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

**FACULTY SENATE  
UM-ST. LOUIS  
MINUTES  
September 12, 2000  
3 p.m. 222 J. C. Penney**

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m. by the Chairperson of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Lawrence Barton, who proceeded with the first item of business by introducing Dr. Raymond Balbes, Chairperson of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science.

**Memorial Resolution Honoring Dr. Edward Andalaft**

Following preliminary remarks about the untimely passing of Dr. Edward Andalaft, and the information that a tribute to Dr. Andalaft is being planned for November 16 in the Century Room of the Millennium Center (details to follow), Dr. Balbes offered a Memorial Resolution for the Faculty Senate's consideration:

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft made extensive contributions to Mathematics by his research and by his service to the profession at the local and national level;

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft devoted a great part of his time to helping students and to developing unique and lasting bonds between students, faculty, and alumni;

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft was a pillar of the Department, having established high standards for research and teaching that will remain as a tribute to his efforts;

WHEREAS, Ed Andalaft served with distinction for many years on the UM-St. Louis Senate and on many of its committees;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Missouri-St. Louis, on behalf of the students, faculty, and the staff of UM-St. Louis and on behalf of the citizens of the State of Missouri, does hereby adopt this Resolution in sincere appreciation of the dedicated and devoted service of Edward Andalaft.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary cause this Resolution to be entered into the minutes of this meeting.

The Memorial Resolution was approved by voice vote of the Senate.

### **Minutes**

The minutes of May 16, 2000, were approved as presented.

### **Report from the Chairperson -- Dr. Lawrence Barton**

The Chairperson welcomed members to the first regular meeting of the 2000-2001 Faculty Senate and announced that Susan English, the Senate's very efficient Assistant, has resigned from the University to take a much more attractive position. Replacing Sue will be Joan Arban, who served in this capacity for 15 years, until 1998. The Chair asked those assembled to join him in welcoming Joan, and she received hearty applause.

Senators were brought up to date on activities completed or under way by the Faculty Senate and University Assembly Office. The Chair reported that he has contacted all committees and that all have either selected or are about to select their chairperson. (Note: The committee membership roster reflecting newly-designated chairpersons has been posted on the Web.) Commenting on the need for patience as the Senate works through inevitable glitches in the new governance procedures, the Chair said he expects that the Committee on Bylaws and Rules will be quite busy this year.

The Chair reported that he has attended an Intercampus Faculty Council retreat and a regular meeting of the IFC. One issue that has been addressed is the Faculty Shares Program. There were only two responses to the UMSL Selection Criteria that were posted on the Web several weeks ago. A hot topic in the coming months will be post tenure review. The Chair noted that we have moved past the point of deciding whether we will have post tenure review; rather, we will be deciding who establishes the procedures. If it is to be faculty, we will need to hammer out the details. More information is provided in the Intercampus Faculty Council report. Post tenure review will be on the agenda for the October 17 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

One of the Chair's pet peeves over the years, and a matter he has chided our IFC representatives about, has been whether or not they regularly remind the President that the formula for distributing the budget among the four campuses is unfair to UM-St. Louis. Furthermore, the repeated reallocations we have undergone in recent years have affected our campus the most because we lack flexibility. The Chair said he raised these issues at the IFC meeting and was told by Academic Affairs Vice President Stephen Lehmkuhle that we have as many programs as UMKC and UMR. The Chair was unconvinced but said he would have to count up the individual programs to be certain. He pointed out that our newer programs don't have the infrastructure built in that exists in the 30-40 year old programs on the other campuses. When President Pacheco joined IFC, the Chair repeated these points. The President didn't agree but admitted that UM-St. Louis is different in that we are still a developing campus. The Chair vowed to make this case at every meeting he attends.

The Chair commented that we often compare ourselves to the other campuses and expect to be treated in the same way, but we don't always look the same and, in a number of respects, we don't compare well with them on performance measures. Chancellor Marguerite Barnett used to muse, in public, about our building a world-class urban research university. That is what many of those who were hired in the 1960s thought they were hired to do, the Chair said. On the other hand, the research culture has not really developed on this campus to the extent that many faculty would prefer.

An examination of the listing of Research Board grants suggests that we are nowhere near as active in research as our colleagues on the other campuses. Dean Wartzok shared data with the Chair about comparisons with our peer group. This is not the Urban 13, but a group selected by the campus. It is far from a distinguished group of institutions, but UM-St. Louis ranks at the bottom of all research comparators. Clearly, much of the data relates to the sciences, education, and--to a lesser extent--the social sciences. We all recognize that there is much more scholarly activity on campuses than represented by that cohort. Nevertheless, the Chair believes that if we are really going to compete, then the research culture on this campus should be strengthened. How do we do this? We need leadership by the deans and vice chancellors. Departmental chairs need back up for their words when they exhort their colleagues to be more research active. More recognition for research should be developed, a larger share of the reward system should be designated for research accomplishments as well as excellent teaching, and there should be more support for research on the campus. The Chair noted that the campus has done well recently in using enhancement money to fund graduate programs, but he urged that we go much further.

Calling this year a new beginning, the Chair expressed hope that students, faculty, staff, and administration can work together better than in the past two or three years. Attributing much of the problem to poor communication and procedures that have not given faculty members reasons to respect the process, the Chair rated this as his most urgent priority and pledged to try to improve the climate and collegiality on the campus. He reported that he has attended meetings of the Cabinet and will meet regularly with the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Chancellor Touhill has pledged to be a partner in the effort to bring all campus constituencies together. The Chair invited input from Senate members and asked that he be kept informed when problems arise.

In closing, the Chair reported that he and Ms. Arban are scheduled to tour the new Student Center to select an appropriate location for future meetings. Information on this will be forthcoming.

In response to the Chair's invitation to entertain questions from the floor, Dr. Jeanne Morgan Zarucchi inquired if there is a conflict of interest for deans and departmental chairs to serve as unit representatives on the Senate, an issue that has received some attention recently on the Faculty Forum. The Chair reported that the matter was discussed by the Steering Committee. He pointed out that the election of Dean Durham was in accordance with the rules. The issue will be addressed by the Committee on Bylaws and Rules, the Chair said. He suggested that the odds of a dean being elected to the Senate are quite small and noted that Dean Durham was elected to chair Committee on Committees primarily because he had at his disposal secretarial assistance.

Dr. William Long commented that the Faculty Forum is a nice informal means of communication but urged the use of the Faculty Listserv to make faculty aware of issues as they arise. To this, Dr. Arshadi expressed the desire that the Faculty Forum be kept separate from the Faculty Senate. Associate Vice Chancellor Jerrold Siegel agreed to alert faculty members about the availability of the Faculty Forum via the listserv operated by the Office of Academic Affairs.

#### **Report from the Chancellor -- Chancellor Blanche Touhill**

The Chancellor prefaced her remarks by asking Ms. Arban to work with Ms. Agnew to include with these minutes a list of the academic programs on each UM campus. Chancellor Touhill noted that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education has a different list of programs and that the UM System lists emphasis areas and sometimes majors. It depends on how you count, she said. (Note: The UM program inventory is listed by degrees. UM-St. Louis has 87; UMC has 232; UMKC has 113; and UMR has 68 degree programs.)

The Chancellor reported that there will be a big decision made in the next several years as to whether UMR will remain focused on engineering or if it will have a broadened mission. They already have engineering management, but there is some talk that they might add a school of business and additional arts and science programs.

Chancellor Touhill began her regular report by congratulating Faculty Senators for the fine manner in which they have brought about meaningful change in the governance structure of the campus. She remarked that an organization has been created that provides faculty, staff, and students with a forum for debate and power in areas that are appropriate to each group. She pledged her support and cooperation to the members of the Faculty Senate and to the University Assembly as a whole.

The Chancellor said that the Steering Committee has suggested that she provide separate reports to the Faculty Senate and to the University Assembly; therefore, when she reports to the Faculty Senate, she will concentrate on issues that are in the purview primarily of faculty. She said she will report to the University Assembly on broader issues that will interest the entire campus, such as budgets, enrollment, strategic planning, events, and construction. In order that the Chancellor has a sense of what issues interest Faculty Senators, she invited them to communicate with her in

writing at least one week in advance of each meeting, asking her to address specific matters. At this meeting, she has been asked to address possible reductions in the serials supported by our library and Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion guidelines.

### **Possible Cut in Serials**

Campus librarians have informed the Chancellor that they are projecting a \$600,000 deficit in the library's budget by Fiscal 2003 due to the escalating costs of serials. Ms. Amy Arnott, Interim Director of the Libraries, has said that the rise in serial costs, due solely to the high inflation rate of professional journals, has become the most troublesome aspect of library budgeting. The Chancellor stressed that this projection is not due to a budget cut or reallocation. Unlike other campus units, the libraries have not experienced cuts or reallocations. In fact, the libraries were recipients of funds reallocated from other units under former President Russell's five-year plan (Fiscal 1993 to Fiscal 1997). During the current fiscal year the librarians will be gathering use statistics and other relevant data. During Fiscal 2002 librarians will work with faculty and library liaisons to identify which journals, if dropped, would have the least impact on their respective departments.

### **ATP Guidelines**

The Chancellor reported that Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Douglas Durand has recommended that we continue through this academic year to use the Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion guidelines that were implemented two years ago by former Academic Affairs Vice Chancellor Jack Nelson. Dr. Durand has further recommended the formation of a task force to reconcile ATP guideline modifications suggested separately late last year by the ATP Committee and by the deans. The task force would include three members of last year's ATP Committee, three members of this year's ATP Committee, and three members of the Council of Deans. Chancellor Touhill said she is inclined to accept these recommendations unless someone makes a compelling argument to the contrary. She said she will ask Dr. Durand to move forward quickly.

### **Nanotechnology and Bioinformatics**

The Chancellor reported that the UM System, in fulfillment of Strategic Plan Action Step 1.6 under the Critical Success Factor of Research and Scholarship, has identified two areas for System-wide collaboration: Nanotechnology and Bioinformatics.

The Bioinformatics Group will be linked to the Internet2 project. A draft white paper has been prepared for discussion regarding the establishment of a University of Missouri Bioinformatics Center. The Bioinformatics Group will be discussing this draft at the Fall Internet2 Application Fair on September 18. Senators were invited to request a copy of the draft from their dean. UM-St. Louis members of the Bioinformatics Working Group are Professors William Welsh and Timothy McBride.

The Nanotechnology Group will also hold its first meeting next week in conjunction with the Internet2 Fair. UM-St. Louis members of the Nanotechnology Working Group are Professors Lawrence Barton and Philip Fraundorf.



Chancellor Touhill explained that Nanotechnology and Bioinformatics were chosen because of potential for enhanced external funding and strengths in each area on all four campuses. It is anticipated that by the winter semester a small number of intercampus research projects will be identified. The System plans to invest strategically in research in these areas with the expectation of making each campus more competitive for external funding.

### **New Program**

The Chancellor conveyed the good news that CBHE has approved our proposal for a master's degree in Allied Health. We will plan to begin the program next September. The program has a management component as well as an informatics component.

In response to a question from Dr. Gail Ratcliff, Faculty Senators were updated on the status of searches for a number of vacant positions.

### **Report from the Intercampus Faculty Council -- Dr. Mark Burkholder**

As an introduction to the IFC report, the Chairperson noted that the three campus representatives are Dr. Joseph Martinich (who is serving as IFC President this year), Dr. Mark Burkholder, and himself.

(see attached)

Dr. Burkholder singled out three topics from his more detailed written report: eligibility for the Presidential Research and Teaching Awards, criteria for the Thomas Jefferson Award, and resource planning in the System's Strategic Plan.

The Presidential Research and Teaching Awards (\$10,000 each) are made annually. The IFC has recommended to Vice President Stephen Lehmkuhle that Curators Professors be declared ineligible for the Presidential Award for Research and that Distinguished Teaching Professors be declared ineligible for the Presidential Award for Teaching. All other named professors could be nominated for these awards.

Regarding the Thomas Jefferson Award, the committee that handled the Award last year determined not to make a recommendation. They met and drew up some new guidelines, which will be discussed by the IFC at their next meeting.

President Pacheco met with the IFC and spoke about resource planning in the Strategic Plan for the System. There was a 4 percent salary figure included in the document, which is anticipated to continue for the next four years. There is also a 3 percent E&E. IFC members asked if the E&E increase is to be enjoyed at the department level. President Pacheco said he would have to check into this. He indicated that the plan has both revenue and expenditure assumptions which do not affect the campuses equally (a matter which the Chair addressed earlier in the meeting).

### **Post Tenure Review**

Faculty Senators were directed to the draft policy statement which appears on the Web under the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. (Copies will be appended to the agenda for the October 17 Senate meeting.)

Dr. Burkholder pointed out that the University already has a Post Tenure Review policy in place (see attached document titled "Annual Review of Faculty Performance"). This policy allows a dean to initiate procedures for dismissal of a tenured faculty member. It does not require any peer review; it is an administrator-initiated policy.

Last year, President Pacheco formed a System committee chaired by Dr. Teresa Thiel of UM-St. Louis. Dr. Thiel was present at the Senate meeting to assist Dr. Burkholder in answering questions.

Dr. Burkholder stressed the futility of arguing that we should not have post tenure review and urged that faculty channel their energies into shaping the policy that is finally implemented. Meetings on the campus level are just getting under way, he said, and the big sticking point in the discussions that have been held thus far has to do with the definition of "satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" performance. Dr. Burkholder noted the difficulty in defining these terms in a way that will satisfy everyone. For its part, the Committee has not tried to define them in some qualitative or quantitative way; rather, it has recommended a process that includes both administrators and faculty to ensure that if performance is deemed unsatisfactory initially, there will be a review by the department tenure committee. Faculty would get involved in the process as soon as the department chair or area coordinator designates a faculty member's performance as unsatisfactory.

Dr. Burkholder noted that for some time, our campus has had annual reviews in which the faculty member and the chair both sign off. Some units in the System seem to have no written reviews, a fact that astounded UM-St. Louis IFC representatives. As currently proposed, the procedures require of us only that we bind together five annual reviews with a brief statement from the faculty member summarizing his/her accomplishments and a statement from the department chair or area coordinator indicating the performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Dr. Burkholder pointed out that many public institutions now are engaged in post tenure review. If the University of Missouri follows the customary practice of other institutions, we expect that over a five-year period there may be 3-5 faculty members who would be identified by their chairs as having had unsatisfactory performance. In those cases, the tenure committee of the unit would review the record of the candidate. If the tenure committee disagrees with the chair, that is the end of the review. In other words, the chair can be reversed by his/her colleagues in the department. If, however, the committee in the department agrees with the chair or area coordinator that the performance is unsatisfactory, the next step is to create a small committee to work out a development plan with the faculty member. The emphasis of this program is on faculty development. There are then annual progress reports which are reviewed by the committee that draws up the plan. Two out of the next three years need to be indicated as having satisfactory performance or, in the absence of this, procedures could get under way for dismissal.

Senators were reminded that the policy that now exists allows for the dismissal of a tenured faculty member with virtually no due process. The proposed draft is, in Dr. Burkholder's view, much superior to what is in place today. He noted that the reason we have post tenure review is because the succeeding Presidents of the System have appreciated the political realities in the State of Missouri. They recognize that at some point in the future, a policy could come down on us from those who are unaware of its ramifications. It appears preferable to have campus-elected representatives to write a proposal that offers considerable protection to faculty members throughout the process.

Dr. Burkholder reported that both Dr. Thiel and Vice President Lehmkuhle have offered to meet with faculty groups on all of the campuses prior to the next meeting of the System committee to discuss the suggestions that have been made. (Note: A meeting on post tenure review has been scheduled for Thursday, October 5, at 2 p.m. in the Summit Lounge.)

In response to a question from Dr. Gail Ratcliff, Dr. Burkholder said he is unconcerned about the provision of resources for faculty development. He commented that the deans on this campus have already committed to providing resources. The amount involved is very modest. Based on national figures, only 1-2 percent of the faculty over a five-year period will be judged to need a development program. Dr. Ratcliff then expressed concern about the high turnover rate of administrators. Dr. Burkholder said he believed the language of the draft could be altered to make a stronger statement in this regard. Dr. Thiel commented that there is no reward system built into this and that the draft was designed to be flexible. She added that there was a feeling among some committee members that resources should not be made available to unsatisfactory faculty, since such resources would not be available to all faculty.

There was a brief further discussion, during which it was confirmed that five consecutive satisfactory annual reviews would not be consistent with an unsatisfactory five-year review, that no one could think of a dismissal case on this campus since 1993, and that the document does not address issues such as sexual harassment. Dr. Burkholder explained for Dr. Timothy McBride that the process for reviewing the document will be different on the four campuses. Feedback at various stages will filter through the System committee, which will produce a final recommendation to President Pacheco. The President will not read preliminary responses; he will only read the final report.

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

It was decided to forgo the report due to time constraints. The Chancellor said she would make her presentation at the meeting of the University Assembly, which immediately followed the Senate meeting.

#### **Report from the Committee on Committees -- Dean Jerry Durham**

Elections were held to fill vacancies on Senate committees and on the Faculty Grievance Panel. (The following individuals were elected by acclamation to the Committee indicated.)

Dr. Gary Burger to replace Dr. Edward Andalaft on Bylaws and Rules through 2002

Dr. Kathleen Brown to replace Dr. S. Simon Kim on Assessment through 2001

Dr. Peter Stevens to replace Dr. Edward Andalaft on C&I through 2001

Dr. Margaret Phillips to replace Dr. Frances Hoffmann on C&I through 2002

Dr. Jerry Christensen to replace Dr. Vengu Lakshminarayanan on Research--Fall Panel through 2001

Dr. Patricia Jamerson to replace Dr. Margaret Ulione on Research--Winter Panel through 2002

Faculty Grievance Panel

Dr. Arthur Shaffer to replace Dr. Norman Flax through 2001

Dr. Patricia Resick to replace Dr. Wayne McDaniel through 2002

Regular three-year terms:

Dr. F. Chal Benson, Dr. Ricardo Flores, Dr. Gwendolyn Turner,

Dr. Peter Wolfe, Dr. Roosevelt Wright

**Report from the Committee on Research -- Dr. Gordon Anderson**

(see attached)

Completing the business at hand, the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lois Pierce  
Secretary, Faculty Senate

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