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
February 17, 2016


Absent: Gail Breen, Gregory Dess, Monica Evans, Carie Lambert, BPS Murthi, Ramachandran Natarajan, Ravi Prakash, Murat Turlak

Visitors: Andrew Blanchard, Grant Branam, Naomi Emmett, Calvin Jamison, Serenity King, Abby Kratz, Jennifer McDowell, Alex Piquero, Nichole Piquero, Marion Underwood

1. Call to Order, Announcements and Questions
Interim President Wildenthal called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. On February 29, 2016 the regents will convene to formally appoint Richard Benson as University of Texas at Dallas’s next President. The regents are still considering proposals for tuition and fee increases from each of the system schools. Dr. Benson and Dr. Wildenthal have been in email contact. Dr. Benson will be on campus on February 29- March 2nd, and will attend the March Council meeting. The President opened the floor to questions. There were none.

2. Approval of the Agenda
Murray Leaf moved to add the amendments to the Safety and Security Council charge as item 12. Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended agenda. Joe Izen seconded. The motion carried.

3. Approval of the January 20, 2016 Minutes
It was noted that Nicole Piquero’s name was spelled incorrectly. It will be corrected. Richard Scotch moved to approve the amended minutes. Matt Brown seconded. The motion carried.

4. Resolution on Campus Carry.
Matt Brown presented a proposal for a Senate resolution that would state that the Senate
1. strongly urges the President to follow the Handbook of Operating Procedures Process (UTDPP1056) by submitting a draft policy to the Faculty Senate and the HOP Committee for approval before forwarding a final version to the Regents;
2. strongly urges the President, in his determination of Campus Carry policy, to categorize classrooms as exclusion zones;
3. encourages the President to resist on principle attempts to permit concealed handguns in the classroom in the name of good pedagogy and faculty governance over pedagogical matters; and
4. pledges to lend their voices in support of the President in the face of any challenge from the Board of Regents, or any legal challenges to the policy.

Greg Dess suggested a division of the resolution. Point 1 would be addressed in one vote and Point 2-4 will be a second vote.

Matt Brown moved, “The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas strongly urges the President to follow the Handbook of Operating Procedures Process (UTDPP1056) by submitting a draft policy to the Faculty Senate and the HOF Committee for approval before forwarding a final version to the Regents.” Chris Ryan seconded. The floor was opened to discussion. Clarification was requested on the current status of the Workgroup’s recommendations. Alex Piquero noted that Dr. Wildenthal has the University’s Campus Carry Advisory Workgroups recommendations, and that the recommendations are not going through the HOP procedures process. Murray Leaf expressed his concern over having the campus carry recommendations as an official policy of the University. Matt Brown referenced the process described in the January Senate minutes. This process did not include faculty approval of the recommendations. Matt Brown requested that the recommendations go through the HOP procedure process because it is important for the faculty to actually see the ‘policy’, speak on the issue, and vote on the ‘policy’.

Joe Izen asked if there was a requirement that all policies coming from the president’s office go through the HOP process procedure. Matt Brown responded that, yes, all major campus policies and procedures must go through the HOP process. This is not just a campus requirement, but is actually from the Regents. Joe Izen confirmed that President Wildenthal’s orders from the Regents were that, regardless of sources of input, the president is responsible for creating the policy. President Wildenthal responded that the normal policies are sent to the office of general council but that is not the case. The UT System presidents must put forth a ‘plan’ how their university will comply with the state law. Each plan is submitted to system, and ultimately to the Regents for approval. Whether it is a “policy” or a “statement” is not clear. However, the presidents were given instructions on what they must send to their superiors. It did not appear to President Wildenthal that it required going through the complex and lengthy HOP process.

Murray Leaf noted his agreement with President Wildenthal. The ‘plan’ is a response to a legislative procedure, and if the faculty “had their druthers” they would not want campus carry. He felt the faculty should not endorse it, even if obliquely by putting it through the HOP procedure. Dr. Leaf noted that the president does not have latitude to allow the plan to go through the HOP procedure. It is a legislative requirement that classrooms are intended to be included.

Matt Brown responded that the plan will require substantive procedures to be put into place on campus. Although the president has to make the plan, it needs to be run through Senate, and HOP should be part of the process. The university has no choice to respond but it is up to the university to decide if it should be done through the normal procedure or extraordinary undemocratic procedures.
Alex Piquero noted that other schools have taken advisory input from their faculty, but none of them have gone through a faculty senate. The university has had an advisory board, and town halls. Those venues have allowed the Faculty to air any issues they may have. The advisory board did include four faculty members, and it was Speaker Redman’s opinion that the faculty were well represented. Speaker Redman expressed his concern that any action that would exclude classroom could be construed by the legislature as constructive dismissal. Such a response may not be good for the university. Vice Speaker Leaf reminded the senate that the regents have stated that any action that would essentially exclude classrooms would be vetoed.

The first point that Matt Brown felt needed to be addressed was that “Should the Faculty Governance have a voice in the campus carry plan?” He commended the hard word of Alex Piquero and the campus carry advisory board, but he noted that the group did not make their report public or known to the senate. Therefore there is no way that the faculty can know that their consultation was integrated into the considerations. Per the January minutes, Matt Brown noted that President Wildenthal would not consult the Faculty Senate. The Faculty have aired their grievances but one is not sure if they grievances were taken into account on the decisions made.

Speaker Redman called for a vote on the motion “The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas strongly urges the President to follow the Handbook of Operating Procedures Process (UTDPP1056) by submitting a draft policy to the Faculty Senate and the HOP Committee for approval before forwarding a final version to the Regents.” There were 8 Aye votes, 12 No votes, and 22 Abstain. The motion failed.

Matt Brown moved, “The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas strongly urges the President, in his determination of Campus Carry policy, to categorize classrooms as exclusion zones; The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas encourages the President to resist on principle attempts to permit concealed handguns in the classroom in the name of good pedagogy and faculty governance over pedagogical matters; and The Academic Senate of the University of Texas at Dallas pledges to lend their voices in support of the President in the face of any challenge from the Board of Regents, or any legal challenges to the policy.” Joe Izen seconded. The floor was opened for discussion.

Murray Leaf again objected to telling the president not to take the legislature or the faculty senate seriously. Matt Brown responded that the president should be looking for a reason to oppose this kind of policy and to resist what the legislature is doing. A resolution like this would give rationale for the president to say on our campus our faculty strongly encourage classrooms to be exclusion zones. The legislature put exclusions in the bill, which was crucial to its passing. Classrooms as exclusion zones were not in the bill itself. This resolution gives the president the power to resist guns in the classroom.

Joe Izen expressed his belief that someday there will be a disaster on some UT campus. There will be investigations about how the campus carry happened. As a member of faculty he wanted it noted for future generation that the faculty of UTD knew there was a problem, advised there was a problem and the faculty was ignored. Why was the faculty not listened to? Why was the collective faculty not consulted on a matter they felt was a fundamental safety and pedagogical matter? Viswanath Ramakrishna noted that this could be accomplished by an article in the Mercury, or the like. There must be something public noted of the faculty’s opinion.

Nadine Connell noted that the Faculty Senate passed a resolution originally on March 20, 2013, and then approved again on February 18, 2015. “The University of Texas at Dallas Faculty Senate believes that
the carrying of firearms on campus by anyone other than law enforcement officers is detrimental to the safety and security of all on campus.” Murray Leaf reminded the senate that the incoming president was a dean at Virginia Tech when 32 people were killed, and is extraordinarily close to these issues. He should be allowed to express his own voice on this issue. After extensive debate, Speaker Redman called for a vote on the proposed motion by Matt Brown. There were 10 Aye votes, 27 No votes, and 0 abstain. The motion failed.

5. **Speaker’s Report – Tim Redman**
   1. Speaker Redman expressed his thanks to R. Chandrasekaran, Jennifer Holmes, and Murray Leaf for their service on the Presidential selection committee.
   2. Speaker Redman noted that one of the goals of the senate was to address contract issues of non-tenure system faculty. The 3+3+3 committee was chaired by Richard Scotch and presented a good report. Richard Scotch, Jennifer Holmes, and Ravi Prakash were the tenure-system faculty representatives, and then David Cordell, Liz Salter, and Betsy Schlobohm were the non-tenure system faculty representatives. Dennis Kratz, Bruce Novak, and Hasan Pirkul were the Dean representatives. Abby Kratz and Tim Shaw assisted as well. Speak Redman expressed his appreciation to all of them.
   3. An additional point that Speaker Redman felt the senate should address would be the salary compression and inversion issue which is currently with the budget advisory committee. They will also discuss the establishment of a UT Dallas credit union, which would require an enormous amount of work. Lastly, Speaker Redman is pushing to add changing stations in both men’s and women’s bathrooms in every major building in university. The expense would not be that great, but it would be something good for the university.
   4. Everything was on the agenda.

6. **Senate Elections- David Cordell**
   The nominating phase will begin on Monday, February 29 and will end on Friday, March 11. The election phase will be held Monday, March 21 – Friday, April 1. The Senate consists of a maximum of 51 members, drawn from and elected by the voting faculty. The voting faculty includes all tenure system faculty who serve at least half time and all senior lecturers and clinical faculty who serve full time.

7. **Discussion: Moving the Time and Date of the Faculty Senate**
   The chancellor’s bi weekly meetings with the UT System presidents has shifted a week, which allows President Wildenthal to attend and Chair Council and Senate. Secretary Cordell reported on the survey that had been distributed. Murray Leaf will develop a plan B for the Senate.

8. **UT Dallas’ Reaffirmation Project – Serenity King**
   The 2018 SACSCOC Reaffirmation Leadership Team has re-structured the reaffirmation committees by creating eight committees, a reduction of 5 committees from 2007. The Leadership Team’s proposed nominations were culled from the UT Dallas community of faculty, staff, and students. The 2018 Reaffirmation Committees represent a minimal membership at this point. The membership can be expanded to include additional members as needed. The list of nomination is included in Appendix B. Appointment letters will be going out shortly, and meetings will begin once letters start coming back.

9. **FAC Report- Murray Leaf**
   The Faculty Advisory Council Met on January 21-22, 2016
UT Dallas was represented by Murray Leaf and David Cordell.

1. First order of business was a review of the recent Board of Regents meeting by the chair, Ann Killery.

2. The first visitor was Dr. Patti Hurn, Vice Chancellor for Quantum Leaps and Technology Development. Quantum Leaps is an initiative of the Chancellor to designate selected areas where the UT system as a whole can find synergies to make very substantial advances. Most of the discussion, however, was about the rules to be written to implement the new Regent’s Rule 90101, on intellectual property. This asserts in part that the regents own all intellectual property produced by all employees “in the course and scope of employment.” The FAC members object strongly to this Rule and the system administration is aware of this, but I do not know how much of this objection has been conveyed in detail. Dr. Hurn passed out a list of committees to be involved. Most of them have representatives of faculty. Many of these are from the Faculty Advisory Council. I am not among them. The one person from UT Dallas is not from the faculty advisory Council and not on the UT Dallas senate. Dr. Killery praised Dr. Hurn’s willingness to involve the faculty. It was only after the meeting, and privately, that she noted that Dr. Hurn did not use the recommendations that had been agreed to when Dr. Hurn met with us at the previous FAC meeting. As projected by Dr. Hurn, the process will be complex and probably not finish this year. It may involve rewriting part of the Regents Rule. Until then, the current policies will remain in effect.

3. The next visitor was Dr. David Troutman, Director of Strategic Initiatives. The topic was the proposed collaborative research by his office and members of the Faculty Advisory Council on the increased use of dual credit courses in high schools and its impact on instruction in the UT campuses. The discussion focused on possible things to look at. The intent is to make it a major example of cooperative policy research.

4. The next visitor was Ed Matteson, the new chief information security officer for the UT System. Matteson commended the U T Dallas model of cooperation, and made clear that he intended to support it. Apparently, campuses across the system are adopting dual identification. Mr. Matteson asked how this was going and representatives of them IS indicated that it was working very well. No one reported problems.

5. The next speaker was Regent Sarah Martinez Tucker. Regent Tucker is very knowledgeable about higher education support in the United States. She had been on the search committee for the UT Dallas President and remarked that she had been well primed there on the importance of shared governance. In the course of the meeting, however, she was made rather sharply aware that not all campuses had the same level of faculty involvement and effectiveness as UT Dallas. I think this gave her a much better appreciation of the importance of FAC as the means by which faculty governance organizations on the several campuses advise and support each other, rather than simply addressing themselves to the Regents.

In the course of the meeting, one of the members asked Regent Tucker what she thought the governor wanted. The question was a bit startling, but the answer was very encouraging. She said she had not been personally interested in the position but had been asked directly by Governor Abbott to take it. His principal reason was that he was aware of the damage that had been done to the reputation of the university system nationally and internationally by the recent efforts of Gov. Perry, and was intent on repairing it.
6. On the following morning the first visitor was Tony Cuolo, Associate Vice Chancellor and liaison to the FAC. He is a retired Lt. general and among other things has been director of the Army War College. Like Chancellor McRaven, Mr. Cuolo’s understanding of the value of education is strongly focused on preparing people for public service, rather than simply for employment. Discussion was wide-ranging. Mr. Cuolo forcefully asserted the need for shared governance, but also recognized that the way it was organized would vary from campus to campus. He said that he would ask what he could do on each campus to strengthen the relationship. A topic raised by FAC members concerned the use of metrics. How would the administration measure progress? There was good agreement or, what was superficial, that superficial measures were not desirable, and that assessments should themselves be consultative and part of the shared governance process.

Another topic was the “Rooney rule” embodied in a new system policy on administrative hires above the level of department head. The rule is that minority candidates would have to be included in all final lists, if qualified. FAC members had two major questions. One was why department heads had not been included. The other was whether this would force the inclusion of less qualified candidates. To respond, Mr. Cuolo said he would ask the legal team that drafted the policy to join the discussion. They did. The discussion showed that they were aware of the difficulties of composing pools to fit the rule if the candidates were drawn wholly from within the unit—which was one of the reasons for not including department chairs. They also made clear that their definition of minority was based on the Civil Rights Act, which is quite broad, and not other laws that are more narrowly drawn. The most basic point was that the candidates must be qualified. If no qualified candidates to fit the rule can be found, this can be said.

7. Lunch involved a working discussion with Dr. Steven Leslie, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Dr. Leslie again picked up the theme of the importance of shared governance. I noted that the FAC appreciated the greater interaction with the regents, but were very disappointed about being left off of the committee to revise regents rule 90101. We had been explicitly promised by Chancellor Cigarroa among others that we would be included. Dr. Leslie said he had not been aware that we had been told we would be included or that we had been left off. He did not know who actually made the appointments. I suggested that in the future any committee involved in drafting modifications to Regents Rules that bore on areas of faculty concern should have members of the FAC on it. He did not disagree. I suggested that appointments to such always be made in consultation with the appropriate Executive Vice Chancellor. He agreed.

8. The final visitor was Dr. John Zerwas, the chair of the House Higher Education Committee. Dr. Zerwas is an anesthesiologist. He began by expressing his view of the value of a broad education in the liberal arts, not just a technical or professional education. He described the attitude of the legislature toward higher education as a much more supportive this session than last, although he noted that the failure of the previous legislature to approve Tuition Revenue Bonds reflected more personal politics than a general legislative attitude. They were passed this year. The budget apart from the TRBs was also substantially increased. In discussion, he was asked if a bill for open carry on campuses was likely to be approved. He said it was not. I asked about what had been Senate Bill 15 in the legislative session before last year, offered by Sen. Seliger. Dr. Zerban said that he was not closely familiar with or engaged with the bill in this past session. He knew that Sen. Seliger had brought it up and found little interest. So he had dropped it. I said that this was a very important for the long haul for faculty all across the state. If it were brought up again, without the distraction of the CLH bill, it
might be possible to mobilize wider support for it through the FAC and the Texas Council of Faculty Senates. He indicated that he would consider it.

9. The only item that the FAC voted on was a request addressed to Mr. Cucolo to make a section of the UT system website available for electronic binders that would contain links to the major academic policies on each campus, so each campus could easily see how other campuses had handled various common problems. Mr. Cucolo had agreed to the idea of such a website in his conversation with the FAC, but asked for a formal request.

10. Student Government Report
No representative was present, therefore no report was given.

11. CEP Proposals - Clint Peinhardt

The Committee representative presented the following committee report.

A. Dual Degree between JSOM and Dongguk Business School
Students will spend two years at their school, and two years at UTD. The undergraduate student would get a degree from both UTD and Dongguk. These students must fulfill all the UTD requirements to receive a degree from UTD. CEP had no issue with the recommendation.

B. Late Catalog Additions - Undergraduate
The new PPOL courses that were requested to go with the new Public Policy degree plan were submitted for approval. MUSI 2127, MUSI 3118, MUSI 4118 all were previously approved but the course titles changed. ATEC 3370 and BMEN 3130 had a prerequisite change. MKT 4334 had the course offering update. BIOL 3520 was added to replace BIOL 3V20 and BIOL 3V20 was removed. CHEN 111 was added back to core at the request of the Math department.

C. Late Additions - Graduate
9 new courses were added to the spring 2016 catalog for JSOM. All of the courses are zero credit hours. This is to assist the school when one course starts in one semester and goes into another. ECS is adding MECH 6392 Advanced Mathematics for Mechanical Engineers I, and MECH 6393 Advance Mathematics for Mechanical Engineers II.

D. Degree Plan Approval
In the past, marked-up copies of every degree plan in the catalog were submitted for review. It is a very daunting task to review all the information. A simplified report was submitted to the Committee on Undergraduate Education and Graduate Council for review that highlights the changes that were made in the degree plans. If the committees had a specific question on a degree plan, the full marked-up degree plan could be brought before the committee for review. Based upon the report, all the associate deans in the undergraduate programs approved the undergraduate degree plans for 2016. The report has a column for changes and for assessment. This year during the review process the associate deans and the undergraduate and graduate councils were asked to work with their departments to ensure that, if the faculty had mentioned in their assessment plan a change in curriculum or a change in degree plan, the change was reflected in the current catalog. If not, it will be reflected in the next catalog. On
the other hand, should the faculty note that there is no rationale for a change, it is documented as 'none'. 'None' in the assessment column means that an assessment was done but there were no changes needed. Any other additions or changes had been approved by the Senate recently and are now in formal documentation.

E. Authorization to Review Minors and Concentrations
Currently Serenity King does not have authorization to review concentrations and minors before they are submitted to CEP. Clint suggested that the CEP give Serenity King the same authority to review minors, concentrations, and diplomas. This would assure that no minor, concentration, or diploma was sent to committees until all the requested information had been completed.

F. Grade Change Policy
Dr. Reinhardt noted that the view of CEP is that the grade change process needed to be standardized and student-focused. The purpose of addressing the grade change policy is to standardize the policy relative to the university calendar. There is a timing difference between fall semester grade changes and spring semester grade changes. The fall semester grade changes must happen within the first 8 weeks of the spring semester. The spring semester grade changes, in the past, needed to occur in the first 8 weeks of the fall semester, with the summer in between. Two points of note were stated. The first is that the university operates year round, including the summer months. Thus, the summer should not be a barrier to completing a grade change. The second is that if a student needs a spring grade change and must wait until the fall semester for that grade change, it can cause a problem for the student. For example, the student may need to register for a course that lists the incomplete course as a prerequisite. If the grade change is not approved in a timely manner it may delay the student an entire semester because he/she cannot take a course that semester. The consensus from CEP was that no change should be made to the policy. The floor was opened for discussion.

Matt Brown again expressed his displeasure at requiring faculty to work when they are not under contract. Tonya Wissinger noted that it is no different than normal preparations for the next semester. Lisa Bell noted that grade changes don’t happen until the eighth week of fall, they do not have the right pre-requisite course, which can cause problem with financial aid. Ravi Prakash noted that it is the faculty’s responsibility to do what is right by their students. Delaying a grade change could put international student out of status, could affect who could work here, and could cause the student to be unable to stay. Speaker Redman noted that with email it is now possible to do the approvals via electronic means. The motion was approved with one nay vote.

12. Amendment to UTDPP 1018- Charge to the Core Curriculum Committee – Andrew Blanchard
In the past four years the committee has made significant changes to the core curriculum. The suggested changes are due to revisions in the Higher Education Coordinating Board’s requirements since 2004. One of the suggested changes is that the membership of the committee be made up of faculty who participate in teaching core subjects. This will realign the committee. Another change is additional student involvement. Also, appointments as chair shall not exceed two consecutive terms. Richard Scotch moved to approve. Murray Leaf seconded. The motion carried.

13. Amendment to the charge of the Safety and Security Council – Murray Leaf
The amendments came out of Staff Council at their last meeting. The council has not met during the 2016 school year. The appointed chair has not responded to appointment letters, or email. As this is an important university committee, it is critical that it meet. Staff Council suggested that there be co-
chairs, one from staff and the other from faculty. Either would be able to call a meeting. The purpose for the council is to coordinate the administrative departments, and committees. Murray Leaf moved to approve the amended charge. Richard Scotch seconded. The motion carried.

14. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:35 PM.

APPROVED: Tim Rodman
Speaker of the Faculty

DATE: 2-5-16
University Safety and Security Council - UTDPP1036

Policy Charge

Safety and Security Council

Policy Statement

The University Safety and Security Council is a University-wide, Standing Committee appointed by the President not reporting to the Academic Senate of The University of Texas at Dallas.

The Council will oversee the University’s compliance with the Requirements for Safety and Security in Section V, Subsection 6.4.3, of the Criteria for Accreditation issued by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, viz:

- The institution must provide a healthful, safe and secure environment for all members of the campus community. Administrative responsibility for environmental health and safety programs must be assigned. A comprehensive safety plan must be developed, implemented, and evaluated regularly. The plan should give special attention to the adequate provision and use of safety equipment in laboratories and other hazardous areas; to the modification of buildings, if necessary, for easy egress in the event of fire or other emergency; and to familiarizing all building occupants with emergency evacuation procedures.

The Council will provide a forum and clearing house for the common discussion and mutual coordination of the activities of all the campus departments and committees concerned with the campus environment in matters that affect personal health, safety, or physical security, including but not limited to ongoing safety arrangements and matters of general maintenance and operations that bear on safety and security. It will publish information to enable members of the campus community to direct complaints and recommendations on safety matters to appropriate committees or administrative officers. It will serve as a resource for the University Facilities Committee or whatever ad hoc committees the administration may form to consider plans for new facilities. It will review, evaluate, and make recommendations concerning the University Safety Plan and monitor its implementation.

The Council shall consist of 4 members appointed from the membership of the General Faculty, 6 representatives of the University staff, two representatives from Student Government (one graduate and one undergraduate), and the chairs of the Institutional Biosafety Committee, the Campus Facilities Committee, the Committee on Parking and Security, and the Radiation Safety Committee. The 6 representatives of the University staff will be one representative of the Callier Center physical plant one Workman’s Compensation Insurance representative from the Office of Environmental Health and Safety, one representative from staff concerned with the science laboratories, one representative from Student Life concerned with disability services, the Americans with Disabilities Act compliance officer, and one representative selected by the Staff Council. The University Chief of Police or his/her designated representative, the Dean of Students, the Associate Vice President for Facilities Management, the University Environmental Health and Safety Director, and the Emergency Management Coordinator shall be members ex-officio.
Instead of a Chair and Vice-Chair, the Council shall have two Co-chairs. The One Co-Chair shall be chosen from among the members from the General Faculty. A Vice-The other Co-Chair shall be chosen from among the representatives of the staff. Either Co-Chair can call and preside over a meeting. The Responsible University Official shall be the Vice President for Administration. The RUO shall assure that the Council has adequate secretarial and office support.

The terms of office of the appointed Council members shall be two years, effective September 1 to August 31, staggered in time to make approximately equal numbers of appointments expire each academic year. Members may be reappointed by the President for additional terms. If a Council member resigns, the President shall appoint another individual to serve the remainder of the unexpired term.

The meeting schedule of the Council should provide for both flexibility and openness. The Council will hold at least one general regular meeting per long and summer semester but may also delegate its powers under this charge to subcommittees or such other working units as it may see fit to form to focus on specific issues. The purpose of the general meeting is to assure coordination and communication among all the concerned committees and departments, review any difficulties that may have arisen since the previous meeting, monitor the implementation of plans in place, and receive complaints and suggestions from the university community.

The dates of the regular meetings should be publicized through the entire university. Additional meetings will be called by the Chair or RUO as may be necessary to address items referred to it by academic or administrative units of the University or by the Council members.
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