

Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
October 5, 2011

Tom Ingram, Faculty Senate Chair
Toni Sol, Chair-Elect
Joe Kongevick, Secretary
Douglas Klahr, Parliamentarian
Julie Alexander—Library
Randal Basham--Social Work
Robert Bing--Criminology/Crim Justice
Miriam Byrd--Philosophy & Humanities
Thomas Chrzanowski—Biology
Mark Cichock--Political Science
Norman Cobb--Social Work
Stephanie Cole—History
Minerva Cordero-Epperson—Mathematics
Reni Courtney—Nursing
Tap Efendi—Accounting
Jennifer Fox--Student Congress
Sarah Frisof—Music
Desiree Henderson--English

David Hopman--Architecture
Haiying Huang--MAE
David Hullender--MAE
Seiji Ikeda--Art
Aimee Israel-Pelletier--Modern Languages
Judy LeFlore--Nursing
Yonghe Liu--CSE
James Campbell Quick--Goolsby/Management
Barbara Raudonis--Nursing
M. K. Reja--Information Systems(Bus)
Joseph Sabbagh--Linguistics
Kevin Schuck--Staff Advisory Council
Johanna Smith--English
Michael Ward--Economics
Lewis Wasserman--Educational Leadership
Matthew Wright--CSE
Robert Young--Sociology Anthropology

Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes October 5, 2011

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Faculty Senate Chair Tom Ingram.

We are very pleased as is our custom to have the President and Dr. Bobbitt with us today. I think it is appropriate that we make mention that this will probably be Dr. Bobbitt's last meeting with us and I say on behalf of especially the executive committee that it's been an absolutely pleasure working with Dr. Bobbitt.

2. Remarks by the President: Due to that introduction I will defer my comments to Provost Bobbitt at this time.

3. Remarks by the Provost: I do want to thank this group for what I think was a great collegial atmosphere that exists in this institution. You that come from other institutions realize that this is somewhat unique. I think that UT Arlington is a very special place and this camaraderie and willingness to consider other points of view and work together for a common goal doesn't exist everywhere--even within the UT system. I just have to go back a little more than a year to remind us that we were working on a new course evaluation and how contentious that can be, one of our fellow institutions agreement could not be reached even after perhaps two years of work I think and so finally the administration of System had to step in and mandate the timeline and deliberations. We have an instrument that was

created collaboratively. And I compare that to what went on here; we understood the need to do so we worked to the best of our abilities back and forth. It is not a perfect instrument it will be changed based upon the needs of the faculty and students. But we were able to get something that is workable in a very short period of time and I very much appreciate we were able to accomplish that especially since I didn't have to have the executive vice chancellor mandate that system wanted this body so it is working out very well. I do want to though also remind us all that there is a new normal that exists. I don't want to contribute this attitude to any one situation within the state because I think it is national. We only have to read the Chronicle to remind ourselves of the fact that independent of what state legislature works voters are demanding that transparency in all of public funded institutions be maintained. The good news is that some recent surveys have shown that the voters, society in general do understand the value of education attributed value of higher education for the individual for their future economic well-being for society. So far our efforts are appreciated. What I think is still problematic is the fact that the cost of that and particularly how quickly the cost has risen in the past few years would justify or not our problem. And so enhanced accountability, transparency as has been requested and has come down the pike as kind of results that make sure that society is getting what it is paying for. I think the problems come because we force ourselves to take time out from our very busy schedules already putting in many more hours probably expect to to document. And to do so at a level of detail we never had to do before. All I can say is that I don't think it's wise for us to shy away from those responsibilities because we what the body do is very, very decent. We are doing a wonderful job helping our students. We are doing a wonderful job succeeding in our disciplines advancing the state of knowledge in our disciplines and we need to make sure that that is covered. One area, coming full circle in comments, that has really come to the forefront is in the area of teaching. Specifically if we simply allow our teaching course assessment instruments to be the only record of what we've done in that classroom for the semester then we deserve the fact that the people who will be judging us understand that four is bigger than three and three is bigger than two. It doesn't convey wide range of value that we all bring to our professions. So I encourage you, all of us, to think about this not so much as a chore but as part of our professional responsibilities. And when we do so document what was done in detail and perhaps tasks I think we are doing a great service not only to ourselves but to academy and I think that would be a growth for our future. So I want to thank you again for working together. I just report that we have gotten metrics from all the units that are designed to sort of define the different levels—board of regents come forward with and I would say it has exceeded my expections and I think it is something eventually the entire campus would be proud of and I think what will eventually come out of that is a document the regents will approve. We have a wonderful faculty here fully engaged in their discipline and moving this institution forward to Tier One. Thank you again for such an experience and I know that Ron will appreciate it as much as I do. Thank you.

4. Remarks by the President: Don has been Provost 39 months and it has been a very significant 39 months in the life of our university. He has contributed a tremendous amount he's been a great partner and superior Provost and he's one of the last people I want to see leave UT Arlington. But having said that it is a great compliment to us as an institution for the University of Arkansas system to come over and kidnap him from us after 39 months of his tenure as Provost here. So we wish him well and appreciate deeply his contributions to move UT Arlington forward. I would also say that I think we are very fortunate to have Ron Elsenbaumer who will be stepping into the Provost office in three weeks from now. His long years of service and the variety of responsibilities he has had are very significant to prepare him for being Provost, including a stint as Interim Provost about four years ago. I think all of you saw that we announced yesterday the interim appointments for the Research office and I think we have a very strong team on the interim basis to step in and replace Ron as he exits the Research office. To continue our momentum in the research field campus wide and we'll be doing a national search for a

new Vice President for Research. We haven't appointed the committee yet but former dean Paul Paulus is going to be the chair of the search committee that will begin working probably later this month or very early next. The other thing I want to mention and I think I touched on this and I just want to say that I think you all will be very interested, excited to see the culmination of what's been going on between Pecan Street and Center Street the whole college park district; and I hope some of you are taking advantage of those 1,100 parking spaces that now exist that didn't exist a few months ago. There are 700 more being built right now that will be finished by next August. The next milestone in this project which is the College Park Center will be completed by the end of December which is not much more than 8 weeks from now and will open on February 1 for two of our basketball games Men's and Women's. I had a chance to tour the building last week and I hope you all will be there for one event or another because you will truly be impressed with it. I want to say that it is something that is as important as it is for the Athletic program of UT Arlington it has so many more implications and so many more uses: Commencement—our commencements first and foremost but we have 19 high school commencements that have been scheduled already for College Park Center in June. All of AISD and beyond, there's been tremendous interest in using this facility from both on and off campus. Don was just telling me and I wasn't aware of this until very recently. The Tarrant County Regional Science Fair is going to be at the College Park Center in March. We will literally have hundreds of top high school and younger science students here on campus. College Park Center is going to be a magnet for attracting the best students for bringing families and students it is going to be a facility that I think will change a lot of the way we do things here at UT Arlington and serve many, many purposes so I just want to encourage you to see it and be a part of it when it opens in just a few months. Open up for questions, this is the last chance for Don so if you have any really tough questions I prefer you ask Don (laughter).

5. Questions from the Senate:

Q. Chrzanowski-Biology: Can you give us some idea of the revenue stream that College Park Center is anticipated to bring into the university?

A. President: We can't predict with any precision but within the next year or two we think it will more than pay for itself. There is the center and then there's the retail, the residence hall, the student apartments, the welcome center—they are all going to be built over there in addition to the 17-18 hundred parking spaces. So this is truly a multi-use area of 20 acres but I think it is going to contribute positively to the university. There is free admission so we want to encourage people to come and see the facility and get acclimated to it.

Q. Cichock-Political Science: Sure you are aware of the story in the Dallas Morning News this week about four year graduation in the UT System and I think UT Arlington was ranked last about 16% it wasn't a very complimentary figure but what I'm curious about is whether or not we are experiencing any type of pressures from the legislators or members of the Board of Regents about why we have such lower rates than all the other schools around.

A. President Spaniolo The truth is that the students that come to UT Arlington are very difficult to graduate in four years because so many of our students work at least one or two jobs. To answer your question are we receiving pressure, feedback, and criticism for our four year graduation rate--not really. Could it better—yes. Would we like it to be better and are we going to do what we can to make it better—yes. I think the most important thing is increasing the number of graduates—period.

Provost Bobbitt: The President asked me what investments we could make to effect four year graduation. I don't think we can get four year graduation because it is fixed by the students that we attract and external pressures they face trying to complete their education. Can we effect a six year graduation—absolutely. Because that time frame even with these outside pressures they can continue to make progress. So we have focused keeping them pointed in the right direction getting over the hurdles to see how well we're doing, because as the President mentioned, so many of our students

come to us as transfer students. Take our full time which is when you get to 12 to 14 hours you are considered full-time; divide the number by six see what should our steady state degree production be. Our degree production is actually above that level. That means we are getting our transfer students out in less than six years which one would expect because they are coming here with some credits on their record. There's a lot of ways to look at this data and just focusing on the four year is not the way to look at it. I think that is why the external pressure hasn't been very hard on us on the four year. On the other hand six year is something we really need to focus on and do as good a job as possible. We're often pleased because we are making progress but we are definitely not satisfied.

Q: Cichock—Biology: Are you saying essentially that the people on the Coordinating Board, Board or Regents, and Legislators actually do understand problems that we face?

A: President: I think it's a mixed picture. The facts are there for those who want to grasp them.

Q: Courtney—Nursing: Several of our faculty raised this question in various ways and it has to do with Tier One. Where is the dividing line with process between an aspirational goal moving toward Tier One, which I think we are all committed to, and a mandate that we act like a Tier One institution when in fact we are not that yet. Do you understand what I'm asking? We are all trying to grow and yet there is a growth process. It is not that all of a sudden you change signals in the criteria, recognizing that you do have to enhance those, but what is the difference between aspiration and mandate for performance and who gets to decide that?

A: Provost Bobbitt: One of the things that you always want to consider in any race is that people engaged in the race have the same footing. To answer your question people who are entering the race coming to UT Arlington now they have the resources to be able to provide scholarships. Next thing is that we can't do everything ourselves in fact we've come into this business because we wanted to teach and mentor a very accomplished, eager, curious, group of students so the next we have to do, obviously, is attract a group of students who fit that metric. And I think we have done a great job enhancing UTA. We are competing for students who were looking to go out of state are where we get out students. Finally, our reputation is made by the undergraduates who are here in the next couple years go out and do amazing things. And if you look at our freshmen class you will see a lot of potential to attract people. Our SAT scores go up we're putting together the infrastructure for that Tier One. We just have to every year ratchet up the requirements we have for each other in terms of performance.

A: President Spaniolo: I would just emphasize that last point. My goal for our institution is to make progress every year in all the things that matter. The more we begin to resemble a Tier One institution the quicker it is that we're going to get there.

Q: Smith—English: Happy to hear that start-up packages have improved but certainly some of us that have been without for a while continue to feel underfunded, under resourced, under supported in our efforts to continue. . .

A: Provost Bobbitt: It's an excellent point and whenever you as an institution accept as your goal that you want to try to strive for this very lofty and difficult aspiration that is Tier One there's probably going to be bimodal distributions of individuals who have come at different points in the evolution of the institution such as the case that is happening now. I will say that I think it is the responsibility we look at the tremendous portfolio of talent that resides in the schools and colleges and use things like enhanced designated tuition to try and give every individual the opportunity to do the things that they think they need to do. That is a tremendous freedom that we now have with EDT did not exist a few years ago where we were dependent on the state and designated tuition.

Q: (?) Can you give an example of that, discretionary and EDT?

A: Provost Bobbitt: EDT means enhanced designated tuition and does not come from any preconceived categories.

President Spaniolo: no restrictions

Provost Bobbitt: Example, it can be used for the development of talent, travel, it can be used for personnel; it can be used for fringe benefits, used for publication costs, set up a laboratory. It really has no restriction whereas state funds come in with very distinct restrictions.

President remarks: Dr. Pryor, UT System resigned earlier last week. He will continue to serve until a replacement is found. He is someone who believed and acted in a role of faculty. He will be missed.

No further questions. President and Provost exit the meeting.

6. Quorum Call: Parliamentarian Douglas Klahr determined a quorum was present

7. Approval of the minutes:

a. Minutes of 20-April, 2011 unanimously approved as presented. Motions carried.

b. Minutes of 7-September 2011

Q: Stephanie Cole – History: Under Roman numeral number VII non-voting member name was wrong in the minutes; should have been Jennifer Fox (Student Governance) not Stephanie Cole (History). Correction was noted and with no further objections motions carried and seconded unanimously the minutes were approved.

8. Chair, Tom Ingram: When you are elected under a “normal” cycle it is for a two year appointment. Fall to Spring Fall to Spring and the President, Provost and our incoming Provost have asked me on several occasions to remind the Senate that it’s a year long appointment which means we meet periodically over the summer. Additionally the maximum by our by-laws that you can be elected three consecutive terms without going off the senate is a total of six years. If you are elected for one term and go off the senate come back then that six year period starts over again. I am in my second and a half year, Senator Sol will now be taking over as the Chair Elect, Joe Kongevick will be functioning as our Secretary, Douglas Klahr continuing to function as our Parliamentarian, and Mr. Kongevick agreed to continue on with the Texas Counsel of Faculty (TCOF). We do have an issue however, by our own by-laws and the HOP the these committees: President Advisory Committee, Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee, the Equity & Ethics Committee which are “statutory committees” you may only serve on one of those at any time. Just those three committees, you can only be on one of them. Additionally, our by-laws state that there can be a maximum of one rep from each “college or school” so I had it typed up what was put on our list from last month. [See attached Committee List] there are some replications I ask that that committees talk to each other resolve that. Dr. Ward agreed to continue to serve as chair on the Tenure and Academic Freedom Committee. Senator Cichock agreed to serve as chair of Equity & Ethics. These two committees in particular deal with very important issues and I would encourage every unit to have a Rep on them. We encourage people to consider that especially senators and people that are from larger units that aren’t here and need to be here encouraged to participate. Our other “expanding” committees most of these committees meet when we need to those committees are always on the web or HOP try to remember that. We’ve got additions and in some cases we need to subtract especially on the two statutory committees on Equity & Ethics and Tenure and Academic Freedom we do have active cases there so those need to get formed up and off and running very quickly.

9. Report by the Chair: Moving on there are a couple things to point out in my report. Start with the UT System FAC.

a. UT System FAC: For those of you who are relatively new myself as chair, Dr. Sol as Chair-Elect and then we have a little bit of an unusual situation luckily Dan Formanowicz who is not here today just

completed serving as the president of the UT System FAC. He is now the past president so he will serve out the rest of this year. The three of us attended the September meeting of UT System FAC. Ordinarily Dan would give you a detailed update; I will give you a short synopsis (Toni feel free to jump in). Again, to help you understand, we meet with reps, there's two from each of the UT System components both the academic campuses as well as the medical schools and universities. So it is a very diverse group in terms of backgrounds. It is very educational because you hear things all along as a faculty member that we can't do this because of UT System policy for example then you go to a meeting like this and you find out that one of the other components has been doing it like this for years. Or just little things that come up like that that help out quite a bit. It also helps to share, one thing I found out in attending is our university tends to be very well run. Can we do better, absolutely. But there are some components that have a lot more issues and problems than what we have and have had for a number of years. So I think that is good to see that we are certainly not perfect but there are a lot of things we take care of very, very well on our campus. We do get routine briefings from Dr. Pryor who just stepped down. And I will miss him and he is going to be hard to replace as far as an advocate for the individual institutions and the role of faculty and the relationship between faculty and students. I met with him on several occasions as he escorted around various members of the Board of Regents on our campus. He had a lot of impact in things that impact not only this body but as individual faculty members. Two or three of the things that continue to be of issue at the system level: Board of Regents has two committees; one dealing with information about terms of use is transformational learning which has to do with blended whether it is exclusively online some online offline some components thereof. That is something that UT System wants to see more of, they have a task force formed with more ingredients investigating ways to do that. The other deals with some of the student related issues that do not have support that has gathered a ton of data on how faculty are evaluated and responsive they are to students also it is a good step. They have not reported in the last Regents meeting. The incoming president of FAC is a medical doctor out of UT System Tyler branch.

b. Post Tenure Review: Chancellor and Dr. Pryor the number two at the office of general counsel hammered a post tenure review proposal that hopefully will be accepted. That was presented to UT System back at our September meeting. It was met with considerable resistance from two UT System components basically they weren't very cooperative in understanding that essentially it was a political necessity to compromise appropriately because you have multiple stake holders in the field not just faculty not just a particular component of UT System so that the net result was the proposal that had been hammered out with the people I just mentioned did not get voted on and passed by UT System FAC or Faculty Advisory Council.

Q. Leflore – Nursing: What does FAC stand for?

A. Chair Ingram: Faculty Advisory Council. It is UT System FAC, the equivalent of our senate component on each campus.

Q. Leflore – Nursing: And the gentleman you were referring to is the incoming President?

A. Chair Ingram: He's the next Dan. he goes from an academic unit as president the next president is a medical unit it rotates back and forth.

Q. Cordero – Mathematics: what will it take to get it approved steps?

A. Chair Ingram: The next time the Regents meet is November it's on their site. The FAC Exec expects UT System to present the proposal. The summer draft will be presented to the Regents in November I looked on their agenda to see if it is there or not. Again they don't need our approval what they were striving for was to say here's a document that all the constituents can live with so that the Regents and their staff will grab it and say we're going to write it for you. That was essentially the number one and two.

The impact on us at our campus whatever happens at the Regents level which we suspect is going to happen sometime this year if not the next meeting. That really will be the guiding block that then each campus is to write their “rules” about. So very simply, Regents rules is going to pass something on post tenure review different than what stands, we fully expect that. Once that is done then UT Arlington will be asked to evaluate our post tenure review policy. Go into the HOP which Faculty Senate has a role to put together as an advisory. That will be in place—once that is done then each unit down to the department will be asked to put together you departmental /unit guidelines. Immediately some of us have been involved in the last several months with the exercises on campus. You’re going why if we spend this time at the departmental level redoing this when we are going to have to redo it once Regents do their deal. Seriously our campus tries to be proactive one we have been out front on most of the things that came out of the legislative and/or some of the things out of the Regents and in most cases we had very minor modifications to take care. My opinion is that Dr. Bobbitt was trying to do that from the post tenure review that he knew was coming. Hopefully most units whatever UT Arlington does relative to what Regents does will be fine tuning what we’ve already got done so you are not wasting a lot of time, effort, and energy on what is going on. That’s the short version; we all think managerially that a good process to go through.

The Provost Office wanted to provide for people and this is only applying to tenured faculty people that are in different roles whether you are research intensive, teaching intensive, maybe a mix of administrative services and some other components. If you are doing a good job in those components what you “signed up” for then you should be rewarded equally and that was the intent of the percentages. Then you will also be evaluated at post tenure review relative to those standards. Again if you signed up and at this point in your career as a tenured professor teaching intensive 60%, research 30%, service 10% (I’m making up these numbers) that is what you will be evaluated as at post tenure review. Post tenure review essentially becomes something which we talked about at executive committee, a discreet measurement you fall into one of the four categories but on your annual assessment it is more of a continuous—maybe everybody in your department is doing great everybody getting ranked in that level. Probably the most difficult thing about the process is not all colleges or units have been communicating at the same level and especially information going down to the individual units. We ask for that to continue and be pressed on from that. That is kind of a spin-down that was what a lot of the FAC was [question]

Q. Chrzamowski – Biology: Post tenure review has always been punitive kind of event. You were always fined because you didn’t meet any expectations but there is no favor given to you for exceeding expectations. Has there been any movement on that aspect like when untenured come through they get big pay raises when they get promoted from assistant to associate, associate to full and then it’s do your job or we are going to cut the legs out from you. Any movement on making it more reward based process to encourage people to continue to do well?

A. Chair Ingram: My recall on this summer’s draft was they made mention that it could be used as evaluation. That’s about the extent of the wording as I recall.

A. Chair-elect Sol: The annual review would get one, two, or three. One you would help, zero you would probably get booted. But the merit increase is a separate exercise so someone can get two but some will be better twos than other twos so you are going to look at what exactly your production is. The annual from what I understand going forward is we’re all okay. Then you can look and see exactly what you did. Someone to be okay with four articles somebody else with two articles they are both okay but this one is ok’er. So that one would get it, if there were any money for merit. (laughter)

A. Chair Ingram: OGC was demanding that if you get zeros you’re on your way out. They wanted a category that said if you really melted down they wanted a way to take immediate action instead of using all the other laws and rules that they already have. But maybe with a year or two of help you can get yourself back on a good track.

A. Chair-elect Sol: The FAC has a list of best practices sent down to the university. This is what we expect if you get a two or a one, this is what we expect if you get a three if you need help you need teaching resource centers so it doesn't fall on your colleagues to help do your work.

Q. Raudonis – Nursing: What we've struggled with especially in grant writing and with the climate we are in right now you can submit five grants and they could still not get funded. Did that mean you are minimally expectation--that is why it is going to be very critical for our individual units just because you write even if you are tenured there is no guarantee with the push toward grant money I think we really have to be careful.

A. Chair Ingram: I want to say that was one of the examples used at FAC and the discussion there, that would be a two. You've done all your work you've done everything and you're out there pushing it's beyond your control that you didn't get the grant but you did everything right.

Q. Randy Bahsan – Social Work: I guess if you got a one it would be okay but I wouldn't let it happen twice so I think remediation might be differentially applied.

A. Chair Ingram: That is part of what is going to have to be hammered out. In the big picture once the Regents rules in what's going to come into play, so yes.

Q. Young – Sociology: if that kind of rules applied to the assessment of grant activity that is does the same apply for both occasions?

A. Chair-elect Sol: Your department decides that.

Q. Young: They said that System that is right

A. Chair Ingram: This was the FAC discussion.

Q. Courtney – Nursing: You are distinguishing and I am glad you are the difference between annual review and post tenure review. Post tenure review different criteria different scale, how's it different?

A. Chair Ingram: Absolutely. One thing Regents has communicated to UT System is over arching principal is standardization. Whatever you are being evaluated on post tenure review should be very similar in nature to the annual review.

c. Student Congress Resolution Review – Comments: We have the president here Jennifer Fox. Passed a resolution and the Provost asked me for input only from Faculty Senate. I will give Ms. Fox a chance to explain her position. On the back of your handout is Student Congress Resolution 10-32. Remarks: Student Congress President – Jennifer Fox: In Fall 2010 student congress passed this resolution which basically asked that UTA provide the Wednesday before Thanksgiving off for students so they can have time to travel home for the holidays. It was passed through congress and went to President Spaniolo and he referred it to the Registration Congress scheduling committee but for some reason it never got to that committee. So that went ahead and passed the university calendar starting on Thursday and they never saw the resolution in order to talk about it. We spent almost two months researching this and found out that the Wednesday before Thanksgiving is probably the least productive day we have and especially for Monday and Wednesday classes especially that Wednesday before Thanksgiving students are not showing up for class more than likely so they are losing that time. The student congress recommended that we start school on Wednesday instead of Thursday like we have done the past two years to make up for that day and then have no classes the Wednesday before Thanksgiving so students can travel.

Response: Chair Ingram: I do sit on the Calendar Advisory committee and Dr. Bobbitt reminded me that the committee knows that there are no more state holidays available on the calendar so if this did go forward the university would still officially have to be open. So it is not a motion or it would not impact the university itself being open. All the administrative offices would be open. It is designated by the legislature how many state holidays you can have.

Q. Ikeda – Art: This is meant to be implemented this semester?

A. Fox – Student Congress: No. If anything, possibly by next year but the university calendar has already been approved through 2013-14 so this would have to be something that is revisited or moved forward to 2014-15.

Q. Raudonis – Nursing: I served on that committee and Dr. Moore shared that it was very productive to bring the new freshmen in earlier and get them acclimated and the programs they had were very well attended. So that was part of the rationale of sticking with starting on Thursday.

Q. Hoffman – Architecture: Is this something we want to discuss?

A. Chair Ingram: I can send it to the appropriate committee for further discussion and they can report back next meeting if that is what you guys would prefer.

Motion on the floor: Leflore – Nursing: I make the motion that we send it to the appropriate committee. Second.

Point of information: Cichock – Political Science: What will the appropriate committee be— operational procedures?

A. Chair Ingram: Probably the Student Liaison Committee.

12. Dr. Cichock: The Equity and Ethics Committee we are short science and architecture so if we have any volunteers that want to serve. There is right now a major case that needs to be discussed.

Q. (inaudible): Does that have to be a tenured person?

A. Chair Ingram: Our by-laws do not specify but for this one it is probably not a good place for a non-tenured person.

Senator Horton: Forms

Chair-elect Sol: Discussion group on Yahoo instead of Blackboard; Tom will send out email uta.facsenate@yahoo discussion list; Joe will send out a bullet list of what we discussed today and any issues or questions that you have you can send us that to contact the rest of us. We are “attempting” to get handheld microphones it was Nursing’s idea.

13. Old Business: None

14. New Business: None

15. The meeting is adjourned at 4:10 p.m.