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AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
The Wichita State University

Room 126 CH  3:00 p.m.

Meeting Notice: Monday, April 5, 1993

Order of Business:
I. Calling of the Meeting to Order
II. Informal Statements and Proposals
III. President's Report
IV. Old Business
   a. Rules Committee (March 29 Agenda - Attachment A)
   b. Preliminary Charge for Neighborhood Group
      (March 29 Agenda - Attachment B)
   c. Charge for Honors Committee (March 29 Agenda -
      Attachment C)
   d. Ad Hoc Tenure & Promotion Committee
V. New Business
   a. Sexual Harassment (very rough draft) - Buff Attachment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Kathryn Griffith, President  3165  Box 17
Keith Williamson, Vice President  3185  Box 31
Joyce Cavarozzi, Secretary  3541  Box 53
James Clark, President-Elect  3220  Box 78
Albert Gosman, Elected by Senate  3402  Box 35
John Dreifort, Elected by Senate  3150  Box 45
Elmer Hoyer, Apptd by Sen. Pres.  3415  Box 44
A. J. Mandt, Past President  3125  Box 74
DATE: March 31, 1993
TO: Faculty Senate Members
FROM: Executive Committee
SUBJECT: Sexual Harassment Policy

The members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Harassment (Nancy Bereman, James Sheffield and Diane Huntley) submitted a working draft of a sexual harassment policy to Peter Zoller and Barbara Bowman. The committee explained that this is a "working" draft.

The committee would welcome comments of their work on the policy to date.
To: Peter Zoller  
Barbara Bowman  

From: Nancy Bereman  
Jim Sheffield  
Diane Huntley  

Members, Ad Hoc Committee on Sexual Harassment  

Re: Sexual Harassment Policy  

March 22, 1993  

Attached is a working draft of a sexual harassment policy from our committee. Items that are enclosed in square brackets [ ] are either recommended additions or questions that we have. The first two pages deal with definition, retaliation, consensual relations, a description of the informal process, and a working draft of a formal process.

The committee welcomes your comments on our work to date.
It is the policy of Wichita State University that no member of the university community (students, faculty, staff, and administrator) may sexually harass another. Sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and any other behavior of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when one of three criteria is met:

(1) Submission to [or rejection of] such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of the individual’s employment or academic progress or status.

(2) Submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions affecting such individual.

[Are items 1 and 2 redundant? If we have #2 do we need #1? If we need both, how are they different?]

(3) Such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work [or academic] performance or creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment.

[There is some, but not unanimous, sentiment on the committee for eliminating some or all of the statement "creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment". Comments?]

Retaliation:

Any person bringing a good faith complaint should not be subject to retaliation. Any such retaliation shall result in appropriate disciplinary action following University policy.

Consensual Relationships:

Romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and students, or between supervisors and employees, even when voluntary, are very unwise. Codes of ethics for many professional associations forbid professional-client sexual relationships. The professor-student relationship is such a professional-client relationship; therefore, faculty are cautioned that entering into sexual relationships with students is unprofessional conduct. In situations in which the respondent is in a position to influence the employment or academic status of the complainant, charges of sexual harassment will be taken especially seriously.

Procedure:

The sexual harassment complaint procedure will be composed of an informal followed by a formal process. Informal process: Complaints concerning alleged sexual harassment may be discussed with any university employee with supervisory responsibilities. When a complaint is received, the supervisor will consult with one of the following: the Director of Affirmative Action, the Director of Employee Relations, or the Affirmative Action Officer in Student Life and Services. An individual with a complaint may also go directly to one of the above designated individuals.
When a faculty member is involved, the appropriate chair and dean will be informed.

If a faculty member is involved, an informal review of the complaint may be conducted by the faculty member's chair, his/her dean, or the Director of Affirmative Action.

If the informal review process results in a resolution which is agreeable to both parties, no further action will be taken.

If the reviewing officer finds insufficient evidence for the complaint, the complainant will be notified and informed of his/her right to proceed to the formal process.

If the reviewing officer finds sufficient evidence for the complaint but there is no resolution that is mutually agreeable, both parties will be advised that the formal process will begin.
(The following assumes a preceding informal stage of process and assumes that the respondent is a faculty member.)

I. Formally lodging a complaint

The complainant should be instructed to file a written charge which details the nature and circumstances of the alleged harassment and the names of persons who can contribute information about the allegation from their personal knowledge. The complaint should be filed in timely fashion with the AAO. Students should be encouraged in advance of the filing to consult with the appropriate Student Affairs officer. Classified employees their AAO in the Human Resources office, and others__? The complainant should retain a copy of the complaint, the AAO will immediately provide the respondent with a copy and generic information as to the process for complaint disposition.

II. Investigation

The AAO will initiate an investigation of the complaint. The complainant, respondent, and such individuals as appear to the AAO to have direct knowledge relevant to the charges shall be interviewed. Note: the AAO does not have subpoena power. Complainants may be advised by the individuals listed in (I) above. The respondent may utilize such counsel as he/she chooses in answering any questions or requests for assistance or evidence by the AAO. Refusal by the respondent to provide substantive assistance shall not be a consideration in evaluating the evidence; however, the relative weight of the evidence shall certainly be fundamental to any decision in the case.

III. Mediation

Having completed the investigation, the AAO should attempt to mediate a settlement of the case. The AAO should not attempt to arrive at a decision and impose it, but should communicate his/her impression of the evidence to the parties in an effort to move them toward resolution. Should agreement be achieved, details of the agreement shall be recorded and a copy provided both parties. If no outcome agreeable to both parties is achieved in timely fashion, the complaint shall be forwarded for formal hearing.

IV. Formal Hearing

(At this point my idea is to parallel the grievance procedure as closely as possible; the fewer unique procedures for disciplinary procedures we have, the better they will be understood and the more legitimacy will be accorded them. The grievance procedure provides for a standing panel of 6 conveners and a pool of 30 faculty from which to draw review committee members; there is provision for mandatory inclusion of protected classes if respondent is a member of such a class. The convener in a specific case is assigned by the Faculty Senate Rules Committee chair; a review committee of 5
persons is also selected by the Rules chair from the pool, but each side has 4 challenges. Conveners and pool members are supposed to be "trained" in grievance proceedings; I suggest their training be enlarged to prepare them for sexual harassment cases.)

The AAO notifies the Rules chair of a formal complaint, and the chair should then appoint a convener and select (subject to challenges) a review committee. The convener will see that review committee members are given a copy of the complaint and schedule the hearing. The convener will chair committee meetings, ensure fair procedure, file final reports, and serve as secretary for any subsequent appeals, but will not participate in substantive deliberations nor vote on the disposition.

While complaints may be filed during the period May 18 through August 18, no action beyond the AAO's effort to mediate will be undertaken. Formal hearing for complaints filed within that period should begin promptly after August 18. Within ten working days of notice the convener shall be appointed; within one week of the convener's appointment the committee members shall have been selected (any challenges shall have been exercised by that time; appointment of committee members may begin simultaneously with the selection of the convener.) Hearings will begin as soon as practicable after selection of the convener and review committee, but no later than two weeks after that selection process is complete.

Meeting procedure: The convener shall chair meetings, and the AAO shall be present to provide technical advice to the committee. If the respondent waives a hearing, the committee shall proceed in closed session to evaluate the evidence that has been submitted, reach a finding, and make such recommendations as it deems warranted. A written copy of its findings shall be provided the parties to the case, the AAO, and such other individuals as the contingencies below spell out.

If no waiver is received, the committee will conduct a closed hearing (unless both parties and a majority of the review committee agree otherwise) to gather evidence. The complainant and respondent shall be present, both accompanied by counsel of choice. Also present will be members of the review committee, the convener, and the AAO; witnesses will be present only so long as is necessary to develop their evidence. The committee will not possess the power of subpoena, so attendance of witnesses and the submission of evidence will be voluntary. Once the evidence is received, the committee shall retire to evaluate it; the convener shall preside, and the AAO shall be included to the extent of the committee's preference.

The committee shall judge, first, whether the evidence validates the complaint; if they hold it does not, the committee shall so report, including an explanation of that conclusion. If the committee finds the complaint validated, the committee shall make recommendations for relief. The committee shall in both instances report in writing to the President, and copies will be
If the complaint is not validated, an appeal may be filed with the President through the AAO, who will provide copies to the committee and the respondent. The appeal should specify precisely why the committee's finding should be set aside; no new evidence may be submitted without demonstrating that it was previously unknown to or unavailable to the complainant. The President shall decide in timely fashion the disposition of the appeal and notify both parties, the committee and the AAO of the outcome. If the appeal is sustained, the committee shall reconvene to make recommendations for relief, which are then forwarded to the President, as above. If the appeal is not sustained, the matter is closed.

If the committee initiates a dismissal for cause complaint as a result of its evaluation of the complaint, it will be taken immediately to the point of consideration by an informal review committee, which shall give preponderant weight to the judgment of the committee lodging the charge, unless the respondent clearly and convincingly refutes their finding or their standing to bring such a recommendation. Otherwise, the dismissal process continues according to terms established for that specific purpose.
The Wichita State University
Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Wichita State University invites nominations and applications for the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs. WSU is a comprehensive, state-supported, urban university with an enrollment of 16,000 students and 600 faculty offering undergraduate and graduate degrees through the doctoral level. Located in Wichita, Kansas, the largest city in the state with a metropolitan area of more than 400,000, Wichita State is a vital and integral part of a dynamic community.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs reports to the President and serves as the principal academic officer of the university; prepares the academic budget; supervises faculty and academic program development; promotes scholarly and creative activities; and supervises institutional accreditation.

The following units report through their deans or directors to the Vice President for Academic Affairs: the colleges of business, education, engineering, fine arts, health professions, and liberal arts and sciences; graduate studies; research; library and media resources; continuing education; Ulrich art museum; computing and telecommunications; the National Institute for Aviation Research; and admissions/records and financial aids.

Applicants or nominees must have an earned doctorate, have a record of distinguished academic accomplishments including success as a scholar and teacher, have significant college or university administrative experience, and be eligible for appointment at the rank of professor with tenure.

Review of applications begins immediately, with interviews occurring when a pool of qualified candidates is identified, and continuing until the position is filled. The appointment is to be effective September 1, 1993.

Applications should include a letter, résumé, and the names of three references. Please direct nominations and applications to:

Office of the President
The Wichita State University
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, Kansas 67260

WSU is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer
**Vice President of Student Affairs**

Our client, a two-year residential college in Northern New England with approx. 1000 students, 400+ of whom live on campus, is seeking candidates for the position of VP of Student Affairs.

Responsible for the leadership, planning, development, implementation, supervision and evaluation of all student activities and student services programs. Will advise student organizations, manage budgets, prepare handbooks, review policies and procedures, and supervise committees.

Requires three to five years' experience working with college students or adolescents in an advisory capacity. Salary commensurate with education and experience. This is a 12-month position.

Send resume and names, addresses and phone numbers of three references to: JWG Confidential Reply Service, Dept. 445, 888 Worcester Road, Wellesley, MA 02181. Our client is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

---

**100 BLACK MEN OF ATLANTA, INC.**

The 100 Black Men of Atlanta (100 BMA) is a non-profit organization committed to the support of inner-city youth in their efforts to obtain a high school or college education. This support includes mentoring and other forms of incentive to support their educational aspirations. The organization is seeking applicants for the following positions:

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

The 100 Black Men of Atlanta, Inc., is seeking an Executive Director. The successful candidate will have overall responsibility for programs and internal management systems. The Executive Director must provide effective leadership of the organization and have a record in strategic and financial planning. The Director must have excellent communication skills, a baccalaureate degree in public administration, business administration or a related discipline and excellent interpersonal skills.

**DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT**

The Development Director must have an excellent record of fund raising from public and private sources and experience in financial and strategic planning. Candidates must possess a baccalaureate degree in public administration, business administration or a related discipline.

The positions offer competitive salaries and generous benefits commensurate with experiences and credentials of successful candidates. Please send resume, letter of interest, and three (3) letters of recommendation, no later than May 26, 1993, to:

Dr. Walter W. Sullivan
100 Black Men of Atlanta, Inc.
127 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 703
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

---

**The Wichita State University**

**Vice President for Academic Affairs**

**REVISED ANNOUNCEMENT**

The Wichita State University invites nominations and applications for the position of Vice President for Academic Affairs. WSU is a comprehensive, state-supported, urban university with an enrollment of 16,000 students and 600 faculty, offering undergraduate and graduate degrees through the doctoral level. Located in Wichita, Kansas, the largest city in the state with a metropolitan area of more than 400,000, Wichita State is a vital and integral part of a dynamic community.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs reports to the President; serves as the principal academic officer of the university; is responsible for the administration of the University in the absence of the President; prepares the academic budget; supervises faculty and academic program development; promotes scholarly and creative activities; and supervises institutional accreditation.

The following units report through their deans or directors to the Vice President for Academic Affairs: the colleges of business, education, engineering, fine arts, health professions, and liberal arts and sciences; graduate studies; research; library and media resources; continuing education; Ulrich art museum; computing and telecommunications; and the National Institute for Aviation Research; and admissions/records and financial aid.

Applicants or nominees must have an earned doctorate, have a record of distinguished academic accomplishments including success as a scholar and teacher, have significant college or university administrative experience, and be eligible for appointment at the rank of professor with tenure.

Review of applications will begin August 15, 1993, and will continue until the position is filled. Applications must be received by May 14, 1993, or soon thereafter as practicable. Applications should include a letter, resume, and the names of three references. Please send nominations and applications to:

Office of the President
The Wichita State University
1845 Fairmount
Wichita, KS 67260-0001

WSU is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer.
Minutes of the Meeting of April 5, 1993

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Allen, R. Armstrong, Bair, Berger, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Chopra, Clark, Daugherty, Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Erickson, Farnsworth, Fisher, Gosman, Griffith, Hawley, Horn, Hoyer, Jeffers, Kahn, Kelly, Mandt, Masud, May, Merriman, Murphey, Parkhurst, Romig, Shanahan, Sheffield, Teshome, Widener, Williamson, Yeager, Zytkow

MEMBERS ABSENT: W. Armstrong, Bajaj, Benson, Bereman, Billings, Furtwengler, Gythiel, Koppenhaver, Martin, Murdock, Pitetti, Sutterlin, Sweney, Thomson, Wherritt

GUESTS: Brunner, Strunk, Zoller

Summary of Action Taken:
1. Approved a ballot for nominations for search committee for VP of Academic Affairs.
2. Approved the Ad Hoc Tenure and Promotion proposal with amendments.
3. Approved establishing a committee to look into status of unclassified professionals.

I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER at 3:00 p.m. by President Griffith.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS. Senator Mandt announced the Governance Conference of 4-16-93. Please call him if you plan to attend.

III. PRESIDENT’S REPORT. President Griffith said that Regent Montgomery will be here 4-17-93. He will meet with faculty from 1:30-2:30 p.m. 314 CAC. Tenure & Promotion could be sent to the Faculty Friday, April 30, and Thursday, April 6, if the Senate finishes debate and votes.

IV. MINUTES. There were no minutes.

V. OLD BUSINESS.

President Griffith talked with President Armstrong and President Hughes, and President Armstrong has brought about a resolution of the VP for Academic Affairs search. The advertisement will have added "In the absence of the President, the Academic Vice President will be responsible for the University"; Review of applications will begin August 15 by a committee. The beginning date of the term is 1-94 or as soon as possible thereafter.

President Armstrong announced to the Senate the appointment of Senator Dreifort as Interim VP of Academic Affairs. Senator Dreifort said it is the faculty who do the day to day work and he asked for the faculty's help, guidance, counsel and criticism. He said he hoped he could be like a good umpire. A good umpire knows the rules and has good judgment, and if the umpire can do that, the game goes on and no one knows the umpire is there. He said President Griffith needs to be congratulated for her role in this.

President Griffith passed out a ballot for consideration to be sent to the faculty for nominations for the Search Committee for the VP of Academic Affairs.
Senator Carroll asked what the final composition would be. President Griffith said 9 faculty is all we know. The Executive Committee would like to reserve the opportunity to add to the list nominated by the faculty for diversity possibilities. Senator Erickson moved to accept the proposal. Senator Fisher seconded. Senator Gosman said to add 'or division' in the first sentence. Senator Zytkow asked what was meant by diversity. President Griffith said minorities, women and professional diversity of rank and experience. Senator Daugherty asked if the intent was to add and not subtract. President Griffith said yes. President Armstrong said the committee will not be approved until President Hughes comes. Senator Sheffield asked what would be the proper measure of diversity. President Griffith said we don’t know, but we want a fair representation.

Senator Wherritt moved to amend the 2nd sentence to read 3 instead of 2 names. Senator Erickson seconded.

Senator Murphey asked if anyone got bumped for diversity. President Griffith said no. Names would be added.

Senator Alexander said the point is that there won’t be any more ballots so vote now or forever hold your peace. He suggested placing 'final ballot' at the top.

Senator Zytkow said in para 2 to replace "with the following limits" with "Additional people may be included to satisfy the following requirement." Senator Carroll said the part about the secretary contacting and seeing if people could serve should come after para 1 so sequence of action is followed. The motion passed as amended.

Senator Chopra said he appreciated the work on the T&P document, but it is still murky and messy. He said p. 5, 6, and 14 are disturbing. He said he was told there were three commandments: teaching, research and service. He said it was surprising to him that we have not discussed the soul of this document. We have spent too much time on other things. He moved to postpone until next fall. Senator Zytkow seconded. Senator Sheffield said he sympathized about the substance of the document, but it is our job as faculty to decide on T & P. He urged defeat of the motion. Senator Hoyer said we have discussed this for a long time and needed to decide. Senator Gythiel said that 3.142 is the only part he has a problem with.

The motion to postpone was defeated.

Senator Gythiel said he continues to be in favor of traditional expectations as spelled out in the Faculty Handbook.

Senator Carroll said across colleges there is diversity. Fine Arts and math faculty products are not the same. We want the colleges to define their standards. Senator Sharp said colleges or departments should define criteria. Senator Wherritt said the committee had in mind a whole set of criteria to be developed. He said this is not a matter of an individual making a choice, but a matter of an individual fulfilling expectations.

Senator Sheffield said the arguments were not compelling or convincing. No one has said the current procedure is faulty. Not only is the system we have not broke, but the one we are considering changes T&P, particularly Promotion. We are not going to eliminate hard decisions. There are going to be cases that try our souls. Decisions should be made close to home for T&P. But this also includes making the criteria. Colleges should supplement university policies, and they do. Why not common expectations at the university for T&P for equity and fairness? A college could choose 100% teaching as a criteria and that is not appropriate.
Senator Daugherty said she tended to support the direction of the committee. This isn’t a radical document. We didn’t throw out university guidelines and criteria. And given those, we can live with some flexibility. In the present system there are some problems with T&P. Some departments don’t provide adequate documentation. This requires it.

Senator Hoyer said this document removes some of the discrepancies. He moved the question. Senator Gosman seconded. The ad hoc Tenure & Promotion Proposal motion passed 27 to 11.

Senator Alexander moved to accept the Ad Hoc T & P recommendation to form a university committee with equal representation of the parties involved to explore the problem of unclassified personnel and faculty with administrative duties. Senator Carroll seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Clark said that Health Profession senators concurred to temporarily replace Senator Pitetti with Diane Huntley. Senator Sheffield asked if she didn’t have a time conflict with clinic work on Monday. Senator Clark said he would check.

V. NEW BUSINESS.

Sexual Harassment. Senator Bereman said she and Senators Sheffield and Huntley had been meeting on Sexual Harassment and have come up with the draft before us. What the committee has done is take a rather standard definition of sexual harassment. They have met with legal defense. She said she preferred 1, 2, & 3 be left as worded, but there is not unanimous sentiment for that in the committee. There is a section on retaliation what is in fact the law. The state attorney said to take out 'good faith complaint' wording. There are other things that are not retaliation. There was unanimous agreement on consensual relationship statement. From heresy it is weaker than KSU or KU’s document.

Senator Daugherty said it is a significant improvement over the first document presented to the Senate. She would like to defend the inclusion of the clause in #3, p. 1. For example, a student may not see cause and effect. A student can feel intimidated. She said she is not comfortable with language that is too vague.

Senator Sheffield said he wasn’t sure how one got to equating disadvantaged outcome with a hostile environment. A student should not be subjected to pressure, and Faculty should not be subjected to slander. He said that court cases fall into two categories: 1, Quid pro Quo harassment and 2, Hostile working environment.

Senator Horn said the document says 'unprofessional conduct.' Sometimes conduct may be dangerous, but not unprofessional. Eliminate the last sentence.

Senator Clark asked if under Consensual Relationship between Faculty and students if the intent was with students in own class. Senator Bereman said this was discussed extensively. If a student in Business enters into a relationship with a faculty member in Business, but is not in the class of the faculty member, other faculty could still make decisions. It’s not really voluntary because of the status differential.

Senator Clark asked what are the arguments about tabling out the entire section and relying on 1, 2, & 3. Senator Sheffield said that was discussed. The basic problem is we’re trying to point out in a faculty-student combination the student has a serious opportunity to be disadvantaged. He said we have students and faculty here who might be different than in more traditional universities. You could meet off campus and not know status. There is a serious professional and institutional obligation.
Senator Bereman said if we look at court cases outside the academy the power differential is higher on the supervisor, and all we’re trying to do is spell out the fact of life.

Senator Wherritt said to replace with “in so far as they may lead to problems covered in 1, 2, & 3.”

Senator Masud said you can’t legislate how people behave, you can only warn them. We might have difficulty offering a husband and wife positions in the same department. Senator Bereman said the university would not be able to deny husband/wife hiring by this document. This is not just for faculty/students, but also for the university as a whole. The crucial part is when people enter into a consensual relationship, the relationship can’t be used as a defense if it breaks.

Senator Romig asked if a student who observes a relationship can complain about fairness. Senator Sheffield said fairness yes, sexual harassment no. Senator Romig said couldn’t a student say this is offensive to them? Senator Sheffield said you don’t have a right not to be offended. The principal advancement of sexual harassment comes from the Equal Opportunities Office. The problem is their work is in the context of a work environment, but in an academic environment, questions may be raised.

Senator Alexander said the issues are complex. Informal and formal review procedures are designed to investigate if there is a basis for complaint. Not all of us know enough and need to be warned of consequences of consensual relationships. Third party grievances need to be written into this.

Senator Bereman asked for a straw vote. Senator Gosman said 1 & 2 seemed redundant. Senator Bereman said the state attorney said they were not. 1 & 2 need to be there. These 3 definitions are from EEOC and leaving them out doesn’t eliminate the legal consequences. Senator Sheffield said 1 & 2 seem redundant to him. EEOC have 3 point definition and can keep them in or out. He said #3 poses a serious problem in the last statement and he doesn’t believe it is a good idea.

Senator Murphey asked if the committee had considered the detailed memorandum he submitted. Senator Bereman said they received several memorandums and considered them.

Senator Sheffield said this was our best effort so far, and not all agree with the document. Senator Carroll said one is a hiring component and one is a continued employment component. Senator Horn asked if there were any national standards. Senator Bereman said these. Senator Horn asked if there was more to that document. Senator Bereman said no. Senator Gosman said it would be helpful in the future to show in the 1st para, that this is embedded in EEOC.

Senator Clark said he is not sure why we are doing this. Senator Sheffield said the committee charge was to devise a policy statement that would apply to faculty in sexual harassment cases and a procedure for resolution.

Senator Gosman asked for a straw vote on including 1 & 2. The straw vote approved inclusion.

Senator Sheffield said that sexual harassment is a problem in society and on campus. A little common sense and a lot of consideration will go a long way to solving the problem morally, professionally and legally no matter what policies are.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Cavarozzi, Faculty Senate Secretary