

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**Tuesday, February 14, 2012**  
**3:30 – 5:15 pm**  
**Senate Chamber, Old Capitol**

**MINUTES**

- Senators Present: T. Anthony, D. Black, D. Bonthius, W. Coryell, D. Cunning, W. Davies, E. Epping, E. Ernst, R. Ettinger, M. Fang, K. Gerken, F. Gerr, N. Grosland, D. Hasan, W. Haynes, M. Hill, Z. Jin, M. Johnson, D. Katz, K. Kreder, S. Levy, V. Magnotta, K. Markon, B. McMurray, P. Muhly, J. Murry, N. Nisly, F. Nothwehr, D. O’Leary, J. Pendergast, B. Rakel, C. Ringen, A. Rodriguez-Rodriguez, K. Sanders, S. Seibert, J. Sessions, P. Snyder, K. Tachau, A. Thomas, T. Treat, S. Vos, D. Wilder.
- Officers Present: E. Dove, R. Fumerton, L. Snetselaar.
- Officers Excused: C. Bohannan.
- Senators Excused: J. Adrain, D. Anderson, J. Brown, A. Budd, M. Finkelstein, C. Getz, G. Lal, B. Levy, J. Murph, J. Niebyl, S. Schultz, J. Solow, E. Wasserman.
- Senators Absent: N. Andreasen, L. Ayres, I. Barbuzza, J. Bertolatus, S. Clark, J. Cox, L. Fielding, S. Gardner, B. Gollnick, B. Hoskins, D. Jeske, J. Kline, S. Kurtz, D. Murry, W. Vispoel, R. Wachtel, J. Wemmie, S. White, S. Wilson, J. Wood, N. Zavazava.
- Guests: G. Barta (Athletics), A. Bergamini (*Daily Iowan*), D. Drake (Office of the President), D. Finnerty (Office of the Provost), D. Heldt (*Gazette*), R. Hichwa (Office of the Vice President for Research), N. Malik (Emeritus Faculty Council), T. Rice (Office of the Provost), E. Schettler (*Press-Citizen*), L. Zaper (Faculty Senate).

I. Call to Order – President Fumerton called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.  
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~facsen/archive/documents/Agenda.FacultySenate.02.14.12.pdf>

II. Approvals

- A. Meeting Agenda – Professor Tachau moved and Professor Treat seconded that the agenda be approved. The motion carried unanimously.
- B. Faculty Senate Minutes (December 6, 2011) – Past President Dove moved and Professor Hill seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

- C. Committee Replacements (Linda Snetselaar, Chair, Committee on Committees)
- Anita Jung (Art & Art History) to replace Sukumar Ghosh (Computer Science) on the Council on Teaching (Spring 2012).
  - Brian Gollnick (Spanish & Portuguese) to replace Glenn Penny (History) on the Faculty Council (Spring and Fall 2012).
  - William Davies (Linguistics) to replace Glenn Penny (History) on the Faculty Senate (Spring and Fall 2012).
  - James Brown (Urology) to fill the unexpired term of Rick Axelson (Family Medicine) on the Faculty Senate (2012-14).
  - Eric Epping (Psychiatry) to fill the unexpired term of Erin O'Brien (Otolaryngology) on the Faculty Senate (2012-14).

Professor Hill moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the committee replacements be approved. The motion carried unanimously.

### III. New Business

- *Revised Extra Compensation for University Faculty and Staff Policy (Tom Rice, Associate Provost for Faculty and Diane Finnerty, Director of Faculty HR and Development)*

Associate Provost Rice indicated that the revised policy had been reviewed by both the Faculty Senate's Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and the Faculty Council. He added that no changes had been made to the policy's existing language; the revision consists of the addition of a new section at the end of the policy. He explained that several years ago it had come to light that some faculty members were making large amounts of money by teaching courses in excess of their normal teaching load. In order to address this situation, a policy was quickly written by then Provost Loh and Associate Provost and Dean of Continuing Education Chet Rzonca. Although that policy was generally successful, the Provost's Office decided to review it, make some clarifications and minor revisions, and move it into the pre-existing Extra Compensation policy in the Operations Manual.

Associate Provost Rice then directed the group's attention to the new section, *17.17(6) Extra Compensation for Teaching Academic Courses*. He noted that the subsection entitled *Term Considerations* provides guidance for what counts as overload teaching. Under *Course Number and Enrollment Limitations* the policy specifies that no more than two courses per academic year can be taught for extra compensation. Exceptions, however, may be requested. Associate Provost Rice also pointed out that student enrollment in Guided Independent Study (GIS) courses will be limited to 36 students. This particular limit was imposed for several reasons. Prior to the development of this policy, faculty members were paid per student for this type of course, leading to extremely high rates of compensation in some cases. There were also concerns about the quality of teaching when so many students are moving at individual paces through course material. And, it was determined by the Provost's Office that teaching 36 students enrolled in GIS courses was roughly equivalent to teaching a regular overload course.

Professor Tachau asked how the conclusion was reached that teaching 36 students in a GIS course was equivalent to the amount of work required for any other type of teaching. Associate Provost Rice responded that workloads were not compared for exact equivalency. Proceeding from the assumption that allowing an unlimited number of GIS students leads to

quality concerns, the Provost's Office instead looked at average compensation for a regular overload course and determined that teaching 36 GIS students yielded a comparable amount of compensation. Professor Tachau commented that the compensation per student aspect was a far more compelling argument, adding that it is hazardous to arrive at conclusions regarding faculty workload based solely on numbers of students. Writing-intensive courses, for example, require more faculty work than large survey courses with experienced teaching assistants. Taking up another issue, Professor Tachau referred the group to lines 243-246 of the policy, *The request for approval to teach a course for extra compensation may be initiated by a faculty member, including staff members teaching with adjunct faculty appointments, and/or by a department or college based on their needs.* She then commented that this line appeared to allow for administrators to request permission to assign overload teaching to their faculty members and added that this would be in conflict with other policies. Ms. Finnerty responded that faculty members would have the right to refuse to teach on overload, however. Professor Tachau urged that the policy clarify that the word *request* in this sentence refers only to the initiation of a process. As the sentence stands now, it could be construed to mean that an administrator has the power to change a faculty member's portfolio. Professor Ringen concurred with Professor Tachau that this aspect of the policy should be clarified. President Fumerton suggested that a parenthetical phrase, *(with the agreement of the faculty member teaching the course)*, be inserted after the word *college*. He noted that the culture of some departments might be such that a faculty member would not initiate a request for overload teaching without consultation with the DEO.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Pendergast seconded that the sentence, *The request for approval...based on their needs*, be removed from the policy.

Professor McMurray voiced the opinion that the parenthetical phrase suggested by President Fumerton was sufficient to prevent a faculty member from being coerced to teach on overload. He also noted that sometimes it is necessary for a department, rather than a faculty member, to initiate a request for overload teaching. Professor Pendergast stressed that this policy addresses the issue of compensation only and that matters of process are discussed elsewhere in the Operations Manual; therefore, the sentence in question should be removed.

The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Hill seconded that the revised *Extra Compensation For University Faculty and Staff* policy be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

- *Report from Gary Barta, Athletic Director*

President Fumerton welcomed Mr. Barta to the Faculty Senate and indicated that the Athletic Director had also recently given a presentation to the Faculty Council. Mr. Barta began his remarks by noting that he comes before the Senate on a nearly annual basis. He commented that the Athletics Department tries to maintain strong ties with other entities across campus. For example, he serves on the President's Cabinet, while members of the Athletics staff serve on a range of campus committees. Regarding interaction specifically with faculty, Mr. Barta noted that Athletics staff work with the Presidential Committee on Athletics, currently chaired by

Professor William Hines. He added that two new Faculty Athletics Representatives, Ellen Herman and Gene Parkin, were appointed recently, following the retirement of Betsy Altmaier from that position after ten years of service, and that Mike O'Hara is the current UI representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, a coalition of university faculty senates.

Mr. Barta indicated that for ten out of the past eleven years, UI student athletes have graduated at a rate higher than that of the UI student body as a whole (74% v. 70%). Moreover, out of the 70 football teams that participated in bowl games this year, the UI football team had the eighth highest graduation rate. Student athletes are able to take advantage of the resources offered at the Gerdin Learning Center (tutors, academic advisors, computer labs, etc.). Mr. Barta stressed that the Athletics Department seeks to produce student athletes who don't just graduate, but go on to become leaders in their communities. In addition to graduating their student athletes, the Athletics Department is also expected to win, and the department strives to do both with integrity. Mr. Barta commented that in his experience, when it comes to athletics, faculty members fall into three categories. There are those faculty who are strong supporters of collegiate athletics. A second group of faculty has occasional interest in it, while a third group questions the need to have collegiate athletics programs at all, viewing athletics as irrelevant to the academic mission. Mr. Barta expressed hope that the third group would at least view athletics at UI as being done "the right way."

Commenting briefly on team performances recently, Mr. Barta noted that the wrestling team is now ranked third in the country. The women's basketball team has played in four NCAA championships and is in the midst of another successful season. The men's basketball team has struggled in the past, but under new leadership is improving and drawing more fans. Both the field hockey team and the men's golf team finished their seasons with high national rankings. This week UI will host the Big Ten women's swimming and diving championships, followed by the Big Ten men's swimming and diving championships next week, both at the Campus Recreation and Wellness Center. In March, UI will host the Big Ten men's and women's gymnastics championships and in April, UI will host the Olympic wrestling trials. These events will bring much economic activity to the local community. A recent study indicated that the seven home football games alone had injected over \$100 million into the local economy. Mr. Barta commented, as he frequently does, that athletics is not the most important activity that takes place on campus, but it is one of the most visible. Thirty million viewers watched UI football last year. UI Athletics has 350,000 fans on Facebook and 30,000 followers on Twitter, along with two million visits per month to its website. Mr. Barta expressed hope that UI could put this extensive publicity to positive use.

Regarding facilities, Mr. Barta commented that renovations to Carver-Hawkeye Arena were recently completed, while a new pool and boathouse have been built. Currently under construction is the indoor football practice facility, with a golf practice facility also planned. Taking up the topic of finances, Mr. Barta stated that the Athletics Department budget was just under \$75 million this year. This comprises about 2.5% of the overall university budget. For several years, the Athletics Department has been generating its own income through ticket sales, donations, corporate sponsorships, etc., and does not receive tax money or student fees. Many of

the Big Ten institutions, UI's primary competitors, have larger Athletics budgets. While the UI Athletics budget is self-sustaining, the approval process is the same as for any other UI entity. The budget must be approved by the Vice President for Finance and Operations, President Mason, and the Board of Regents, State of Iowa.

Professor Tachau commented on a recent incident in which a UI coach exhibited an inappropriate level of anger during a game, noting that faculty members would not be permitted to display such behavior in the classroom. She added that this behavior was a poor model of male leadership. Mr. Barta responded that there are indeed lines that should not be crossed in terms of behavior. However, he noted that there is a difference in environment between a university classroom and a nationally-televised sporting event. Professor Murry commented that there has been much national scrutiny lately regarding how student athletes are treated. He brought up an example from the national media that a student athlete on scholarship could lose that scholarship after an injury. Mr. Barta responded that this is not the policy at UI. Here, if a student athlete on athletic scholarship is injured, that student athlete receives a medical hardship scholarship. If s/he continues to progress academically, that scholarship will last until graduation. Regarding health insurance, the parents' insurance is charged first for treatment of injuries and then the institution picks up uncovered expenses. Professor Murry then asked what happens to student athletes who end up not performing to the level that was expected of them when they were recruited. Mr. Barta explained that for some time now at UI, if a student athlete does not perform at the expected athletic level, the university maintains its commitment to that student athlete, as long as s/he continues to work hard academically and athletically and follow NCAA, Big Ten, and university rules. What often happens in such cases, he added, is that the student athlete, realizing that s/he will not be playing much at UI, will eventually transfer to another institution.

Speaking more generally about student athletes, and referring to his own experience as a student athlete, Mr. Barta expressed his opinion that it is a great privilege to receive an athletic scholarship. Much responsibility goes along with that privilege; however, the student athlete receives an education, room and board, travel opportunities, etc. Student athletes on scholarship who demonstrate financial need may still be eligible for Pell Grants, while the university can also provide supplementary funding for unexpected expenses (winter clothing, emergency travel). The national conversation is currently focusing on need-based financial supplements for student athletes on scholarship.

Professor Bonthius referred to the recent scandal at Penn State University and asked if the university had instituted new policies to prevent such a situation from occurring at UI. Mr. Barta answered that, to his knowledge, no new policies had been implemented, but that the existing policies were being reviewed in light of the Penn State episode. President Fumerton added that a report on reviews performed at all three Regents institutions was presented to the Board of Regents, State of Iowa at the last Regents meeting. Professor Coryell mentioned the incident last year in which an outbreak of rhabdomyolysis occurred among twelve student athletes. Mr. Barta responded that immediately after the outbreak occurred, President Mason formed a committee to investigate the incident. Recommendations made by that committee have all been followed. The affected students subsequently recovered.

Referring to Mr. Barta's description earlier of the three groups of faculty and their attitudes toward collegiate athletics, Professor Sessions proposed a fourth category: faculty members who love sports and who may have even been student athletes, but who question the consumption of scarce university resources by particular sports. Mr. Barta responded that at UI significant resources are spent on football. He added, however, that only two sports, football and men's basketball, are able to cover their own expenses. Football, in particular, not only allows for the Athletics Department to be self-sustaining, but also supports the other UI sports programs. He reminded the group that the marketplace determines what coaches are paid. Professor Cumming asked if data were kept on employment information or graduate or professional school enrollment for student athletes. Mr. Barta responded that the university does have some data of this type. Speaking anecdotally, Mr. Barta commented that employers appreciate the time management and leadership skills of student athletes, as well as their ability to handle both victories and defeats with equanimity. President Fumerton thanked Mr. Barta for his presentation to the Senate.

- *Authorship Policy (Richard Hichwa, Senior Associate Vice President for Research)*  
President Fumerton indicated that the Research Council had been working on this policy for some time and had sought input from various campus entities, including the Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee and the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council's suggested edits to the draft policy were indicated on a tracked-changes version of the document that was distributed to senators. Professor Hichwa explained that the university had not previously had an authorship policy. The lack of such a policy made it difficult for students and junior faculty to determine how they fit in to the authorship list of a publication. He added that nearly all of the other CIC institutions have such policies. To create the UI policy, the Research Council drew upon best practices from institutions across the country.

Vice President Snetselaar presented an edit that the Research Council wished to make to the draft in section d.(2)(b), *Since it is possible that readers may infer endorsement of the data and conclusions from an acknowledgement of support, those acknowledged ~~must~~ should give written permission to be acknowledged...* She commented that the Research Council members felt that it may be too difficult to obtain written permission in every instance.

Vice President Snetselaar moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the word *must* be replaced with *should* in the last sentence of paragraph d.(2)(b) of the Authorship Policy. The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Tachau acknowledged that the Research Council had sought to make the policy broad enough to cover a wide range of disciplines while still maintaining the necessary specificity. Nevertheless, she found much in the policy that was irrelevant to her discipline. For example, in her discipline, inclusion in the acknowledgements never implies an endorsement of the views of the author(s) [d.(2)(b)]. Professor Hichwa responded that this policy is not discipline-specific, nor is it an "absolute roadmap," but that the policy was designed to cover a variety of potential perceived conflicts of interest. Referring to the same sentence that Professor Tachau had commented on, Professor Ringen asked why written permission to be acknowledged

should be obtained if a disclaimer will be included. Professor Hichwa responded that this language was mainly intended to address concerns in the medical fields. He gave the example of a tobacco company providing funding for research. If the research findings indicate that smoking is not harmful, then the tobacco company may be perceived as endorsing the research findings. Professor Pendergast gave another example. She indicated that the university has access for research purposes to some data of a local health insurance company. Whenever she publishes research based on this data, however, the insurance company requires her to include a disclaimer stating that acknowledgement of the company's contribution of data does not constitute the company's endorsement of the research findings. Professor Pendergast added that she has found herself acknowledged on research papers by authors who try to bolster their credibility in this way when she has had only a brief conversation with the author and in no way supports the author's conclusions.

President Fumerton asked if support other than financial support was contemplated by the policy in paragraph d.(2)(b). Professor Hichwa responded that support could take the form of information, funding, personnel, or other material resources. Professor Cuning commented that the entire paragraph seems to imply exclusively financial support of one kind or another. Professor Hichwa stressed that whom to acknowledge is entirely up to the author's judgment; support could be construed by the author as funding provided and/or as a stimulating conversation with a colleague. He added that the policy requires authors to read their manuscripts, noting that he has observed research misconduct cases in which people have put their names on publications that they have not read, and then found their names linked to misconduct. Professor Tachau proposed that this paragraph be revised to eliminate some of its vagueness. She found the opening sentence, *All authors...must disclose the source(s) of support for the work...*, too strong for disciplines such as history, in which conversations with colleagues are often cited as leading to the exploration of a particular research topic. It seems unnecessary in such cases to obtain the written permission of these colleagues for acknowledgement. She also suggested that language be added to indicate that authors should follow the procedures for acknowledgement required by their granting agencies. Professor Hichwa expressed concern about making the policy so loose that it has no value. President Fumerton suggested putting the phrase *financial or material* before the word *support* throughout the paragraph to clarify what type of support is implied by the policy. Professor Gerr pointed out that paragraph d.(2)(a) describes non-financial types of support to be acknowledged and therefore paragraph d.(2)(b) should be revised to explicitly address financial types of support. He then questioned whether those providing support as described in d.(2)(a) should be asked for written permission to be acknowledged. President Fumerton argued against requiring written permission for this type of acknowledgement.

Professor McMurray commented that faculty members may be concerned about how to apply their discipline-specific standards to this policy. He observed that the policy does not provide guidelines for situations in which discipline standards may conflict with the policy. Professor Hichwa responded that one should follow the more prescriptive guidelines, whether that means the discipline standards or this policy. He added that the Office of the Vice President for Research is involved in adjudication and evaluation of authorship disputes and this policy will facilitate the resolution of those disputes. Professor McMurray asked if the office would

consult discipline-specific standards as part of the resolution. Professor Hichwa responded that the university generally does not refer to outside policies when resolving internal matters. Professor Murry observed that the journal, rather than the author, decides what will be published. He asked if an author is out of compliance with the university policy if the acknowledgements required by that policy are not published by the journal. Professor Hichwa responded that as long as an author has documentation of the acknowledgements, there should not be a problem. The Faculty Council had added language to the policy to cover this type of situation, *All authors...must disclose the source(s) of support for the work **unless otherwise instructed by the journal or publication.*** Professor Ernst commented that, while the policy may not be perfect, it is important and necessary for the university community.

Professor Ernst moved and Professor Ringen seconded that the word *financial* be inserted before the word *support* in the second and the fourth sentences of paragraph d.(2)(b) and that the sentence beginning *Since it is possible that* at the end of d.(2)(b) be duplicated at the end of paragraph d.(2)(a) with the following change, *...a disclaimer ~~shall~~ **may** be included specifically indicating that inclusion...*

There was brief discussion regarding whether only the word *financial* was sufficient clarification. Alternatives were offered and the group decided upon *financial support and tangible resources*, suggested by Professor Hichwa.

Professor Ernst accepted this friendly amendment to her motion.

Some opposition was raised to the second half of Professor Ernst's motion, so Professor Tachau suggested that the Senate vote separately on the two parts of the motion.

The first half of the motion carried unanimously.

Professor Ernst explained that her intention in the second half of the motion was to alter the language of the sentence to encourage acknowledgement but not to require it in paragraph d.(2)(a). President Fumerton expressed concern that the cultures of disciplines are so different that this statement might be inappropriate for some disciplines. Professor Tachau suggested adding the phrase *in those disciplines in which this is normal* before *those acknowledged should give written permission...* Professor Hichwa responded that it would then be difficult to determine which disciplines are implied. President Fumerton suggested that an introductory statement be added in d.(2) recognizing that acknowledgement practices vary considerably among the cultures of different disciplines. Professor Cuning commented that with the addition of *financial support and tangible resources* to paragraph d.(2)(b), it now seemed unnecessary to duplicate the last sentence of d.(2)(b) at the end of d.(2)(a). Professor Pendergast commented that if it was not the intention of the acknowledgements described in d.(2)(a) to enhance the credibility of the research findings (a situation that she had referred to earlier), then perhaps no modifications were necessary to d.(2)(a). Professor Nisly suggested that the phrase *if such a disclaimer is a common practice for that discipline* be added to the end of the duplicate sentence in d.(2)(a). Professor Sessions observed that in her opinion paragraph d.(2)(a) focuses on recognition of contributions of those who cannot be considered as authors



under the policy; concerns about support and endorsement seem irrelevant here. Therefore, she urged senators to reject the second half of the motion.

The second half of the motion was defeated.

Professor Gerken expressed strong concern about the limited discussion of dispute resolution and disciplinary action under f.(1). She remarked upon several cases known to her of inappropriate authorship within her discipline, particularly relating to students. She added that informal resolution channels are frequently ineffective and do not protect the interests of students, who may hesitate to “make waves” in their departments. Or, a student may be offered the opportunity to be listed as an author without meeting the criteria for authorship. Professor Gerken stressed that this portion of the policy needs to be strengthened. President Fumerton pointed out that the policy contains a significant discussion of authorship roles, clarifying what activities qualify a person to be considered an author. Professor Hichwa added that if informal resolution (which is usually handled within the department) does not resolve a situation, a formal complaint can be brought to the Research Integrity Officer in the Office of the Vice President for Research. Professor Nisly commented that in incidents of sexual misconduct, for example, a complainant can decline the option of informal resolution and proceed directly to formal resolution. She asked if this course of action could be made available under the authorship policy, for the benefit of those complainants who see themselves as too vulnerable to approach departmental personnel with their authorship issues. Professor Hichwa responded that this was already an option and added that often complainants will first approach the Office of the Ombudsperson. The ombudspersons may then contact the Research Integrity Officer to discuss options while maintaining the complainant’s confidentiality.

Professor Sessions noted that in the policy the complainant *is encouraged to pursue informal mediation*. She expressed the opinion that informal resolution almost always works to the detriment of the more vulnerable party. Professor Hichwa stressed that the policy must remain somewhat flexible and cannot dictate what every department should do in situations of inappropriate authorship. Professor Sessions commented that the policy implies that a complainant should first pursue informal mediation and only turn to formal resolution if the informal mediation does not resolve the problem. President Fumerton suggested adding *when the person feels comfortable doing so* at the end of the first sentence in f.(1). Professor Murry suggested simply listing the options available to a complainant.

Professor Sessions moved and Professor Nisly seconded that the first two sentences of paragraph f.(1) be revised as follows: *A person who believes their authorship rights have been intentionally violated or who wishes to report other improper authorship practices as identified in part (e) of this policy is encouraged to **may** pursue informal mediation of the issue through departmental or collegiate channels. If an issue remains unresolved despite informal efforts, an individual, **or** may bring a formal complaint under this policy to the Research Integrity Officer (RIO) or other designated individual appointed by the Vice President for Research for resolution.* The motion carried unanimously.

Professor Tachau moved and Professor Cunning seconded that the Authorship Policy be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. From the Floor – There were no items from the floor.

V. Announcements

- The next Faculty Council meeting will be Tuesday, March 6, 3:30-5:15 pm, University Capitol Centre 2520D.
- The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, March 27, 3:30 – 5:15 pm, Senate Chamber, Old Capitol.
- The call has gone out for nominations for the Michael J. Brody Award for Faculty Excellence in Service to the University and the State of Iowa. Please encourage your colleagues to nominate someone. The deadline to submit nominations is Thursday, March 8.
- The online committee recruitment drive has begun. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- Online Faculty Senate elections begin on Friday, February 24 at 10 am. Please encourage your colleagues to participate.
- The annual Tenure Workshop, sponsored by the UI AAUP, Faculty Senate, and the Provost's Office, will be held on Wednesday, April 4, 6:30-9:00 pm, in room W401 of the Pappajohn Business Building. The workshop will provide practical advice on how to be successful in obtaining tenure. Please encourage your tenure-track colleagues to attend.
- President Mason will host her annual reception for Faculty Senators on Thursday, April 5, 5:00-6:30 pm at her residence, 102 Church Street.
- The UI Chapter of the AAUP will host a reception for Craig Lang, President of the Board of Regents, State of Iowa on Thursday, February 23, 4:00-5:30 pm, in Schaeffer Hall Commons, room 302. Refreshments will be served, and President Lang will speak. Faculty members, staff, retirees, and graduate students are invited to attend. President Fumerton urged Faculty Senators to attend this reception.

VI. Adjournment – Professor Pendergast moved and Professor Tachau seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried unanimously. President Fumerton adjourned the meeting at 5:20 pm.