APPROVED AND CORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Senate. They have been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are the official minutes.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
August 17, 2016


Absent:  Naofal Al-Dhair, Elizabeth Bell, Thomas Brikowski, Gregg Dieckmann, Kimberly Hill, D.T. Huynh, Syam Menon, Viswanath Ramakrishna, Shiloh Warren, Alejandro Zentner

Visitors:  Andrew Blanchard, Cristen Casey, Joanna Gentsch, Sheila Hayes, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Michelle Lockhart, Jennifer McDowell, Dennis Miller, Inga Musselman, Akshitha Padigela, Clint Peinhardt, Alex Piquero, Elizabeth L. Rugg, Marion Underwood, Eric Van Leevanen

1. Call to Order
Speaker Tim Redman called the meeting to order at 2:31 PM and announced that President Benson was delayed but would share his announcements once he arrived.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Richard Scotch moved to approve the agenda. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the May 18, 2016 Minutes
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes with minor grammatical revisions. Betsy Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

4. Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman
1. On July 28, 2016 the Committee on Committees met. Speaker Redman felt that the school of Interdisciplinary Studies should have a representative and recommended that the charge be updated. It was also noted that the school of Interdisciplinary Studies does not have a representative on the Committee on Qualifications of Academic Personnel (CQ). Also, he noted that CQ is made up of thirteen men and only one woman. Speaker Redman indicated that this situation is unacceptable and that one way of adding of adding a woman to the pool is to add an Interdisciplinary Studies representative.
2. Speaker Redman noted that it was recently reported that the schedule for the proposed "Cotton Belt", a planned 67.7-mile (109 km) commuter rail line in Tarrant, Dallas, Collin, and Rockwall Counties, may have its construction date moved up from 2035 to 2023. The Cotton Belt will provide service from Dallas's northeast suburbs to Southwest Fort Worth with a major terminal at the north end of Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport. This project is very important to the University as a station is planned to be on our campus. This will provided greater transportation opportunities for our students to come to campus, and it will improve UTD's ability to recruit bright students from all over the Metroplex.

3. Speaker Redman reminded the Senate that all committee reports to the Senate were due August 31, 2016.

4. All other items are on the agenda.

5. UT Dallas's SACSCOC Reaffirmation Project – Serenity King

Serenity King gave a brief update on the SACSCOC Reaffirmation Project. Each Reaffirmation Committee’s webpage now includes agenda packets and minutes. The Leadership Team resumed its meeting schedule on August 4, 2016. Some committees have met during the summer to get started on their assignments. The Provost’s Technology Group (PTG) created working folders for each committee on the Degas server. Each principle has a “seed document” or a baseline document to be updated for the 2017 Compliance Certification Report (CCR). PTG has completed a new web version of the 2007 narratives along with other reports, such as the Fifth-Year Interim Report.

Lisa Berry, Assistant Director for Library Planning and Assessment at the University of Houston, Downtown (UH-D), visited UTD to share her expertise and advice on reaffirmation processes.

Dr. Gloria Shenoy, the Director of Assessment in the Provost’s Office conducted the inaugural 2-day Assessment Seminar (August 11-12, 2016) which was held in conjunction with JSOM’s Project Management Institute. There were 70 participants, including 30 UT Dallas program heads, assessment coordinators, and instructors with representation from all of the schools. During this seminar, participants learned about learning outcomes assessment. This summer, the Office of Assessment and the Center for Teaching and Learning launched its first desktop development, called “10-in-10” – 10 teaching tips in 10 minutes or less. Dr. Shenoy will be presenting at both the New Faculty Orientation and Graduate Assistants Orientation on the importance of learning outcomes.

6. Announcements and Questions – President Benson

The semester has started and he eagerly awaited the new students on campus, and faculty. He hopes to visit the various schools as time permits. With no other announcements, he opened the floor to questions. There were none.

7. Monitoring Recap Presentation - Serenity King

Serenity King presented a detailed timeline of the July 2013-December 2015 SACSCOC Monitoring.

July 2013: SACSCOC Notification of Complaint: July 2013
President Daniel and Dr. Blanchard, then SACSCOC Liaison, received notification from SACSCOC that a student complaint had been forwarded to them from the THECB. UT Dallas was not notified by the THECB that they had received and referred the complaint.

- UT Dallas received the letter from SACSCOC on July 22. Our response was due August 16.
- Complainant cited some of the SACSCOC principles, but SACSCOC requested evidence of compliance with eight Principles of Accreditation (http://dox.utdallas.edu/publication1209).

Fall 2013: UT Dallas Response to address eight Principles of Accreditation (due August 16, 2013)

UT Dallas response needed to show evidence of compliance in addressing complaint:

- Whether undergraduate and graduate programs, specifically the Arts and Technology BA, MA, MPA, and PhD programs adhered to institutional processes;
- When requested, whether institutional processes were appropriate, published and followed.

1. CR 2.8 (Faculty) – The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs. Upon application for candidacy, an applicant institution demonstrates that it meets the comprehensive standard for faculty qualifications.
   - Provide evidence that a sufficient number of faculty teaching in the ATEC suite of programs. Data was to include full-time and part-time faculty coverage and load during a specific timeframe (spring 2012-spring 2013). A master list of courses, including independent study, with instructor name (including TA’s and co-instructors), and enrollment for each course in each term needed to be included.

2. CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, education programs, to include student learning outcomes) – The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: educational programs, to include student learning outcomes.
   - Demonstrate that the ATEC suite of programs had identified expected outcomes and the extent of achievement for these outcomes. Evidence should include an analysis of the results and support the resulting improvements.

3. CS 3.4.3 (Admissions policies) – The institution publishes admissions policies consistent with its mission.
   - Summarize published admission policies that have been approved through institutional processes. Demonstrate evidence of consistent adherence to these policies by the ATEC suite of programs.

4. CS 3.4.6 (Practices for awarding credit) - The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery.
• Provide an overview of institutional practices in awarding credit for all programs, and then focus on consistent adherence by the ATEC suite of programs.
5. CS 3.6.1 (Post-baccalaureate program rigor) – The institution’s post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, master’s and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than undergraduate programs.
  • Demonstrate how the ATEC doctoral program consists of progressively more advanced academic content than that of the ATEC MA and MFA programs, and how the MA/MFA programs consist of progressively more advanced academic content than that of the BA program.
6. CS 3.6.2 (Graduate curriculum) - The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.
  • Address whether the ATEC graduate programs adhered to the standard to structure its graduate curriculum.
7. CS 3.6.4 (Post-baccalaureate program requirements) – The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-baccalaureate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs.
  • Address whether there was an insufficient number of ATEC doctoral courses and the program’s course sequencing.
8. CS 3.7.1 (Faculty competence) – The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (*See Commission guidelines ‘Faculty Credentials.’*)
  • Supply a roster for all faculty teaching all courses within the ATEC suite of programs during spring 2012-spring 2013.

Met the August 16, 2013 deadline by submitting a report with over 250 pages.

SACSCOC requested follow up supporting documentation throughout fall 2013 such as incomplete assessment reports, questions on faculty credentialing, discrepancy between the ATEC PhD assessment report and progress report to THECB, transcript concerns, and evidence of adherence to policy.
January – April 2014: Monitoring Report Begins

- The Monitoring Period began on January 22, 2014 when Drs. Daniel and Blanchard received notice that SACSCOC had ruled at its December 9, 2013 meeting to request a First Monitoring Report for questionable compliance with six principles.
- SACSCOC cleared the institution on 2.8 Faculty and 3.6.2 Graduate Curriculum.
- The letter stated that a Special Visiting Committee would visit the UT Dallas campus for two days at the end of April 2014, and that the First Monitoring Report would be due to that committee no later than two weeks prior to the visit.

First Monitoring Report to address six Principles of Accreditation (due April 15, 2014)

1. CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, educational programs, to include student learning outcomes) - address a gap in assessment activities with little to no supporting documentation within the ATEC suite of programs. Explain the discrepancy between the doctoral assessment report and the president’s letter as whether there were ATEC doctoral graduates.
2. CS 3.4.3 (Admissions policies) – address remaining questions as whether the ATEC graduate programs adhered to institutional admission requirements and produce documentation showing consistent adherence to these policies.
3. CS 3.4.6 (Practices for awarding credit) - address why credit awarded practices did not adhere to the graduate catalog policy. Also address how credit for repeatable courses is awarded.
4. CS 3.6.1 (Post-baccalaureate program rigor) - address how concurrent courses and courses for master’s and doctoral students reflect progressively more advanced academic content beyond the baccalaureate.
5. CS 3.6.4 (Post-baccalaureate program requirements) – explain why specific UT Dallas faculty transcripts show the conferral of MFA degrees with fewer credits than the stated required credits. Demonstrate that the institution and the ATEC suite of programs adhered to the published graduate catalog requirements.
6. CS 3.7.1 (Faculty competence) – address remaining questions about qualifications for specific faculty members in teaching assigned courses.

Submitted the First Monitoring Report (640+ pages) two weeks prior to the site visit.

Additional documentation was requested prior to the visit.

April 2014: Site Visit
• The Visiting Committee (chaired by Virginia-Commonwealth University) interviewed people in a variety of groups, including one-on-one discussions with ATEC administrators, ATEC faculty, ATEC students, Assessment Office staff, Graduate Dean, Undergraduate Dean, University Registrar, CEP faculty members, and Graduate Council representative and CUE representative.

Sample Questions Grouped by Common Themes during Site Visit

Adherence to Policy
• Why do you have such a robust faculty governance process only to have one person (Graduate Dean) override the entire process?
• Are you making more exceptions to graduate catalog policy than following the policy?
• What rationale is there for overriding admissions standards and what assessment data is provided to evaluate how those students who have certain criteria waived perform?
• How are any of the exceptions to policy documented?
• A lot of responsibility with adherence to awarding credit and related compliance with SACSCOC principles falls on the Registrar’s Office, so why are so many Registrar Office functions performed by the Graduate Dean here?
• Is your fast track program policy consistently applied?
• Do you all inherently trust one another; do you not agree that it is unusual that so little documentation exists?

Courses / Academic Content
• Why are you allowing so many exceptions to the repeatable course restrictions listed in their catalog course descriptions?
• Why do you use topics courses to introduce new courses instead of new course numbers?
• How do you document what students do each time they take a repeatable course?
• Why are the syllabi for these courses not posted?
• How do you know students in concurrent undergrad/grad courses are receiving appropriate level of rigor?

Transcripts
• Why are you not transcripting different sub-topics for independent study courses on student’s transcripts?
• Why are you not transcripting fast track hours on graduate transcripts?

Assessment Activities
• Tell me about assessment in the other degree programs…
• Why did one of the faculty say they have never seen their program's student learning outcomes? Does the sharing/use of assessment data not get broadly dispersed by program heads to their faculty?

April 2014: Site Visit Outcomes

The Visiting Committee held an exit meeting the following day with President Daniel, Provost Wildenthal, SACSCOC Liaison and Dean of Undergraduate Education Andy Blanchard, and Assistant Provost Serenity King to preview their report.

• The Committee cleared the ATEC programs and closed the complaint.

Based on what they heard during the visit, the Committee cited the university's processes on 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, educational programs, to include student learning outcomes) and [a principle to which we had not yet been asked to respond], 3.4.5 (Academic policies).

• 3.4.5 Academic policies: The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution.

Assessment Office

• In 2011, four individuals (complete staff) left the university.
• Two new hires (Assistant Provost for Assessment and Assessment Specialist) made in summer 2011 to begin September 1.
• Assistant Provost for Assessment left the university in spring 2012.
• Assessment Office supervision transferred to Assistant Provost for Policy and Program Coordination (King)
  – Part of assessment team in 2006-2008
  – “Discovered” three-year reporting cycle and no online tool
• Director of Assessment hired June 2012; had a part-time faculty role.
• Assessment and Accreditation Coordinator Dr. Michael Carriaga hired February 2013 to replace Assessment Specialist.
• Assessment Coordinator Dr. Gloria Shenoy hired April 2014.

Second Monitoring Report to address two Principles of Accreditation (due April 1, 2015)

1. CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional effectiveness, educational programs, to include student learning outcomes) – asked the institution to demonstrate that other educational programs engage in
assessment activities and indicate how they implement changes to their programs based on analyses of assessment results.

2. CS 3.4.5 (Academic Policies) – asked the institution to address numerous exceptions to various policies and to address repeated coursework and how these courses may be applied towards total academic credit, and also address how academic credit earned through Fast Track may be applied.

April 1, 2015: UT Dallas submitted its Second Monitoring Report (2130+ pages) with CS 3.4.5 commitments.

3.4.5 Commitments

• No exceptions to repeatable course limit
• Rationale for repeatable courses included in catalog review process
• Specify sub-topics for independent study and/or Topics courses; course sub-titles recorded on transcripts
• Documentation of new student work in repeatable courses
• Student information system changes for repeatable courses
• Documentation of exceptions to policy beyond school
• Fast track language clearer, consistent with departmental website and/or marketing brochures
• Use stand-alone new course numbers for new courses instead of existing Topics courses
• Allow new courses three times/year

Changes at UT Dallas and Third Monitoring Report (April – December 2015)

• April 22, 2015: Assistant Provost King became SACSCOC Liaison.
• May 1, 2015: Gloria Shenoy became Director of Assessment; she began meeting with programs to which she had not previously been assigned.
• June 11, 2015: President Daniel received a phone call that UT Dallas would be required to submit a Third Monitoring Report for only 3.3.1.1 due September 7, 2015 (and extended to October 9, 2015).
• Cleared on 3.4.5 Academic Policies due to changes and commitments
• June 30, 2015: President Daniel departed UT Dallas to assume the position of Deputy Chancellor at UT System.
• July – August 2015: Upon the recommendation of Deputy Chancellor Daniel and President ad interim Wildenthal, King met with experienced SACSCOC institutional effectiveness reviewer Dr. Neal Armstrong. Dr. Crystal Baird, SACSCOC Vice President, visited the campus. Both agreed to review the Third Monitoring Report before submission. They both had the same advice: Be completely candid. Neal also suggested that the Assessment Office
create a maturity matrix to document progress to date while Baird suggested the report focus on commitment to improve.

October 2015: UT Dallas Submitted Third Monitoring Report (3140+ pages) with CS 3.3.1.1 commitments.

December 2015: UT Dallas cleared based not only on progress made but also on commitments to sustain progress

3.3.1.1 Commitments

• Improved communications from Assessment Office
  – Informative website, more face-to-face discussion, assessment office plan/report, service survey, timely sharing of information with schools
• Annual assessment cycle university-wide. Plans for upcoming year/reports for last year due each October
• Online tool (Hyoka) for annual assessment reporting
• University-wide assessment committee (including administrators in schools)
• Workshops and training by assessment office (including TA training, adjunct training, new faculty orientation, CTL partnerships)
  – 7 workshops, 276 participants. Thank you!
• Increase maturity matrix score by better sharing/use of data in schools
• Catalog updates consistent with assessment reports

Moving Forward

Continue consistent adherence to institutional processes:

• Track exceptions in undergraduate and graduate deans’ offices
• Report annually exceptions to CEP by Undergraduate and Graduate Deans
• CEP review frequency of exception versus policy itself
• CUE, Graduate Council, and CEP review authority of Undergraduate or Graduate Dean to waive/exempt faculty policy
• Document exceptions/waivers
• Share documentation. Remember Graduate Dean’s office conducts functions of Registrar’s Office
• Determine appropriate document storage location
• Produce evidence of consistent adherence/compliance to institutional policies at all levels: university-wide, school, and program
• Balance "SACSCOC makes us" with "general best practices" and what makes sense for us. Shared responsibility, not micro-managing
• Assessment: Office provide up-to-date assessment training of new faculty, new program heads
• Provost's Office continue to sponsor faculty at assessment and/or SACSCOC conferences
• Provost's Office provide timely information on changes to SACSCOC expectations

Takeaways

• Could be "blindsided" by a request for compliance documentation.
• All Principles are fair game any given day.
• Not much time to gather documentation, so multiple people need to be aware of where documents reside, particularly in summer months.
• Communicate, particularly during personnel transitions.
• Be prepared. Any student in any program could complain on any given day.
• Inform SACSCOC Liaison if you know a student has complained beyond the university, even if it has not yet reached SACSCOC.
• Do not focus on individual making complaint. SACSCOC can follow through on complaints from individuals not affiliated with us.
• Do not panic.
• Remember SACSCOC accredits institutions, not programs, not offices. We all pass/fail together.
• Be patient.

8. FAC Report- Murray Leaf
There was nothing to report, but the FAC Executive Council will be meeting later in the month.

Mr. Campain shared Student Government’s (SG) goals and projects for the 2016-2017 academic year. SG is focusing on how students can interconnect with each other, and communicate more effectively. The Comet discount program has been transferred from Human Resources to SG. They have been contacting over one hundred vendors to confirm proposed discounts. He requested that, should faculty have any suggestions for locations for Comet discounts, to let SG know. SG is working to display signage of the Comet Creed throughout campus with the help of the facilities department. He opened the floor to questions, but there were none.

10. CEP Proposals- Clint Peinhart

Professor Peinhart presented the following Committee report.

A. Amendments to UTDPP1075- University Policies related to Graduate Student Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, and Graduate Assistants
The amendments would create a new category, Graduate Assistant. This will be in addition to Research Assistant and Teaching Assistant. This will allow students who provide administrative assistance to specific departments and staff not be tied to a specific faculty member. Each department would pay for the students out of their departmental funds. The Graduate Assistants will be recruited through Human Resources. Clint Peinhartd made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the amendments to UTDPP1075. The motion carried.

B. JSOM New degree: MS in Financial Engineering and Risk Management
   The new program reflects the additional mathematics that is required to work in the risk management field. There is a growing demand for this type of program, especially from the large insurance companies moving into the Metroplex. Only one new professional development class would be required for this new degree. Clint Peinhartd made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the MS in Financial Engineering and Risk Management. The motion carried.

C. JSOM Degree Name Change: MS in Healthcare Management to MS in Healthcare Leadership and Management
   The program was originally created in 1998. It was initially open only to typical graduate students, but in the past few years, it has been open to physicians and medical administrators. The program currently has 300 students, and there is a very long wait list for admission into the program. Leadership is key in the field as it continues to change in today's market. In order to reflect the students they are serving, the school recommended changing the degree name, but none of the courses would require changing. Clint Peinhartd made a motion on the behalf of CEP to the degree name change from MS in Healthcare Management to MS in Healthcare Leadership and Management. The motion carried.

D. Graduate Supplemental Course - MAS 6102
   This supplemental course was approved by the Graduate Council in May. It is a 1 credit hour course, which should be taken in the first semester of the degree. It is a professional development course that will prepare the students to be competitive in the global economic environment. The course would be offered on pass/fail basis. Clint Peinhartd made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve MAS 6102. The motion carried.

E. Syllabi Language for Concealed Handgun Policy
   The following statement was recommended to be added to the syllabus template.

   "The University’s concealed handgun policy is posted on the campus carry website: https://www.utdallas.edu/campus-carry/ ."

   This statement would be added under a heading "Campus Carry" on the syllabi policies and procedures page (https://coursebook.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies) between the headings "Sharing Confidential Information" and "Technical Support.”
   Clint Peinhartd made a motion on the behalf of CEP to approve the addition of the statement to the syllabus template. The motion carried.

11. Discussion: One Card System Concerns – Tim Redman
   Murray Leaf has suggested that an ad hoc committee to discuss concerns brought to the committee. The ad hoc committee will be chaired by Murray Leaf. The other members will be: William Hefley,
Joe Izen, Jennifer Holmes, Nicole Smith, Tres Thompson, Terry Pankratz, and Debbie Reynolds. Redman will contact Terry Pankratz to nominate a staff member from the procurement office to be a member as well. Joe Izen moved to appoint the committee. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

12. Committee on Committees Appointment Recommendations - Tim Redman
A set of nominees for committees is in the agenda packet. Additionally, Shayla Holub was nominated to chair the Assessment Committee. Joe Izen moved to approve the amended appointments. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried. Speaker Redman noted that the committee worksheets for committees with Staff appointments be sent to Staff Council.

13. Approval of the April 2016 Caucus Minutes – Tim Redman
Richard Scotch moved to approve the Caucus Minutes. Betsy Schlobohm seconded. The motion carried.

14. Discussion: Campus Carry – Alex Piquero
Speaker Redman reminded Senate members that only questions not addressed in the FAQ section of the UT Dallas Campus Carry website would be answered during the discussion. The new Campus Carry Policy went into effect on August 1, 2016. Dr. Piquero has been fielding media requests on this topic for the university. All UT System campus representatives are in contact with each other, which helps campus representatives not to feel alone when dealing with this highly debated issue. The Campus Carry Work Group (CCWG) will continue to meet and work on the campus carry issue as it evolves.

Joe Izen requested additional clarification on what “oral notice” means. Dr. Piquero responded that a faculty/staff occupant of an individual office should say to each person entering the office, either:

"Pursuant to Section 30.06, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with a concealed handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a concealed handgun," or "The carrying of a concealed handgun is prohibited in this office."

Posting a sign is not sufficient notice since it is not oral. A faculty/staff occupant of an individual office who chooses to designate the office as an exclusion zone is responsible for ensuring that all persons who enter the office receive oral notification that the carrying of concealed handguns is prohibited in that office. The faculty/staff occupant should determine how frequently oral notice must be given in order to ensure that all persons entering an office have received it. Faculty should be mindful that announcements made in class at the beginning of a semester may not effectively reach all students due to absences or add/drops. To err on the side of caution, it is recommended that oral notice be provided each time a person enters the office. Chief Zacharias noted that should a student be hearing impaired a written card may be given, this is the only time that written notice can be given. This is to accommodate the students with hearing difficulties ONLY. If faculty choose to put something on their door, they can, but that is not considered legal notification.

Chief Zacharias noted that he spoke at every freshman, transfer, staff, and faculty orientation. Following the FY16 orientations he was inundated with questions. This year only a handful of questions were asked. It is his opinion that the incoming freshman/transfer do not appear to be
seriously concerned about the issue. Student Government has compiled a list of feedback for the Campus Carry Workgroup, and will be submitting them via Campus Carry email.

Faculty raised a concern of what they should do if they had a reasonable apprehension of bodily harm, i.e. the legal definition of an assault. Faculty should call x2222 for help from the campus police force. An example of such a situation is a disgruntled student whose emotions are greatly heightened.

Inga Musselman is organizing emergency situation training for faculty. Training topics will include weather related emergencies, medical related emergencies, and conflict related emergencies. In the past twenty years there has been no training for faculty on these topics. Dr. Musselman expressed her opinion that faculty will be pleased that this type of training is available, and she anticipates a roll-out in fall 2016.

15. **Resolution on Salary Compression and Inversion – Richard Scotch**
   Betsy Schlbohm moved to defer the resolution until the September Senate meeting. Jennifer Holmes seconded. The motion carried.

16. **Discussion: Parking Sticker Policy – Tim Redman**
The parking and transportation committee is addressing this issue. Some faculty have expressed concern that the new policy of issuing orange parking tickets to students has forced faculty to buy high-priced purple stickers. Judd Bradbury, a new member of this committee will keep the Senate informed.

17. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Joe Izen moved to adjourn. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 4:04 PM.

APPROVED:  

Tim Redman  
Speaker of the Faculty  

DATE: 14, 8, 16