

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate
5 May 2003**

Senators present—Kris Bartanen, Terry Cooney, Julian Edgoose, Bill Haltom, John Hanson, Christine Kline, Juli McGruder, Hans Ostrom (Chair), Karen Porter, David Tinsley, Alexa Tullis, Roberta Wilson

Visitors present— Joel Elliott, Betsy Gast, Patrick O'Neil, Ray Preiss, Wayne Rickoll

Agenda Item #1 Approval of minutes from previous meeting – This was postponed as no minutes had been submitted

Agenda Item #2 Special Orders/Announcements — **Ostrom** announced that Senate and other elections are almost over. FAC results have been given to the Dean. He noted that PLU has had no faculty salary pay rises this year.

Agenda Item #3 Sense-of-the-Senate resolution—**Ostrom** circulated the following motion:

“The Faculty Senate of the University of Puget Sound hereby reaffirms its support for a wide diversity of views being expressed by those invited to speak at the University. The Senate endorses the notion that opinions from different points on a broad political spectrum should be represented on the University’s programming.”

(M/S/P with one abstention)

Agenda Item #4 Organizational Charts— **Cooney** circulated a package of web pages outlining the organizational structure of the University. A copy of the overview sheet is attached below:

Begin Embedded Document

Organizational Charts and Directories

Puget Sound Vice Presidents:

- **Academic Vice Present:** <http://www.ups.edu/dean/avporgchart2003.htm>
- **Office of the President:**
<http://www.ups.edu/humanresources/zzzz/forms/upsorgchart.pdf>
- **Office of University Relations:** <http://www.ups.edu/our/development/staff.htm>
- **Office and Finance and Administration**
<http://www.ups.edu/financeadmin/FVP%20org%20chart%20updated%203-25-03.pdf>
- **Division of Student Affairs:** <http://www.ups.edu/dsa/OrgChart.htm>
- **Enrollment**
http://www.ups.edu/admission/info/meet_counselors/meet_the_counselors.htm

Other Offices and Departments (alphabetical order):

- **Academic Department Chairs:** <http://www.ups.edu/dean/chairs.html>
- **Athletics:** <http://www.ups.edu/athletics/staff/>
- **Facilities (not available)**
- **Library:** http://library.ups.edu/the_lib/staff.htm
- **Office of Information Services:** <http://www.ups.edu/ois/content/orgchart.shtml>
- **Security Services:** <http://www.ups.edu/security/staff.html>
- **Student Financial Services:** http://www.ups.edu/financialaid/staff_directory.shtml

End Embedded Document

Agenda Item #5 Year-End Reports

a) Institutional Review Board – Preiss presented the IRB Report attached below.

Begin Embedded Document

TO: Hans Ostrom, Chair
 Faculty Senate
 FROM: Ray Preiss, Chair
 Institutional Review Board
 DATE: May 5, 2003
 RE: End-of-year Report

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) entered the 2002-2003 academic year with the charges of implementing the Puget Sound guidelines for protecting human subjects (monitoring and reviewing protocols), maintaining a web presence, conducting outreach, and considering changes in policies. I am pleased to report considerable progress on these issues, as this report documents.

On-going Charge to the IRB

Considering our activities this year, we have diligently pursued two standing charges from the Faculty Senate: (a) The routine activities of monitoring protocols and (b) Maintaining our presence on the World Wide Web.

Routine activities: As a Standing Committee, the IRB is tasked with monitoring protocols, maintaining a system for managing records, and deliberating on policy questions. During the 2002-2003 academic year, most of our time was devoted to evaluating protocols. We received 17 protocols and formally approved 6 research projects and authorized two modifications of existing protocols. It is noteworthy that 11 protocols will be processed at our May 7, 2003 meeting. We have not seen this late surge in submissions before and we are monitoring the situation to determine if this is a trend.

All deliberations are posted in IRB Committee Minutes. Because the Chair is often contacted with questions related to these deliberations, the Chair's Notebook tracks all protocols. The Associate Deans Office is the repository of records, protocols, and final reports.

Presence on the World Wide Web: The IRB established a presence on the World Wide Web in the Summer of 1998 (www.ups.edu/dean/irb/). Documents posted on the IRB Web Page include the revised IRB Guidelines document and various forms for protocol preparation. These forms can be downloaded. In addition, the Web Page includes the IRB policy on the Ethical Care and Use of Animals that was adopted in the Spring of 1998. Based upon work three years ago, the IRB provides a link to the University of Puget Sound IACUC. Forms and procedures are now available on the IACUC Web Page.

We continue to add documents and links to resources that may assist student and faculty researchers. Currently we post links to the National Institutes of Health Office of Extra-mural Research, as well as an array of on-line resources useful to active researchers and students enrolled in research methods courses or engaged in independent research projects. In addition, the page now includes a description of the activities of the IRB, a roster of IRB members and department IRB designates, scheduled IRB meetings, and a list of frequently asked questions.

Informal feedback regarding the Web Page continues to be favorable. The Web Page is consulted regularly for forms and procedures, to resolve questions related to individual research projects, and as a guide for protocol preparation. We will continue to refine the Web Page as the needs of our students and faculty evolve. We are pleased to report that the Web Page has increased the visibility of the IRB and provides a useful resource.

One difficulty that occurred this year involved a dropped protocol. A modified protocol was submitted that was nearly identical to the original protocol. I inadvertently filed the protocol as "approved" although it had not been reviewed. Three weeks later, a senior member of the department enthusiastically brought the error to my attention. We have repaired the web forms to correct this error. First, we added a "date" line that will differentiate between similar protocols. Second, we changed the system for logging protocols at the Associate Deans' Office. When a protocol is submitted, an email is sent to the primary investigator notifying him or her of the IRB tracking number. Investigators are now asked to contact the Associate Dean if they have not received an email within 24 hours.

Outreach to the University Community

This year the IRB continued its efforts on the area of outreach and education. We have developed a survey on the use of human subjects. Next year the survey will be sent to all IRB designates who will distribute the information to departmental colleagues. We will use this information in personal contacts with individuals expressing interest in, or concerns about, research involving human subjects. This issue is important if we are to avoid unauthorized use of human subjects. We discovered, for example, that one department erroneously thought that a "blanket exemption" was in effect for their student research projects. The IRB contacted the department designate, exchanged correspondences with the professors, and received assurances that this practice had been terminated. The survey is designed to help identify other areas where intervention may be needed.

Proactive Monitoring of Protocols

The IRB was charged by the Faculty Senate to consider developing guidelines for oversight of ongoing research. Some members believe that "IRB Police" are not warranted. Others note that we have inadequate resources for this task. We estimate that we would need two release units each semester to conduct on site visits. A standardized report format is not feasible, as department norms dictate this content. We continue to discuss guidelines and consider ways to ensure confidentiality and consent.

Upcoming Agenda Items

Based upon the progress made in addressing the charges given by the Faculty Senate this year, the IRB has identified the following goals for the next academic year:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Upgrade and refine the IRB Web Page with information appropriate for student and faculty researchers.
3. Distribute a campus survey as part of a system of outreach and education that promotes IRB review as an integral part of the research planning process.
4. Continue developing a system for monitoring ongoing research.

I owe special thanks to IRB members for hard work at inconvenient hours: Mirelle Cohen, Patrick Coogan (Community Representative), Lisa Ferrari, John Finney, Judith Kay, Yvonne Swinth, Tom Wells, and John Woodward (Secretary).

End Embedded Document

Ostrom asked whether we would look out-of-step without proactive review. **Preiss** replied that we are ahead of similar institutions and saw this as a case of “governance creep.” **Cooney** agreed, noting the management cost of complying with ever greater expectations of research review.

Ostrom asked about the identity of IRB member Patrick Coogan. **Preiss** explained that he is a community member who brings fresh eyes to the committee’s deliberations.

McGruder said that, while she understood the problems faced by the IRB due to their low staffing, she would appreciate their efforts to have more frequent and regular meetings. Her students often have problems getting IRB approval before they can commence their research – problems with IRB approval can cause delays of many months. **Preiss** explained that the committee meets on the first Monday of each month. **McGruder** responded by noting that many committees meet more frequently, and that the IRB should meet more frequently and possibly throughout the summer.
(M/S/P with one abstention to receive report).

b) University Enrichment Committee – Elliott presented the UEC Report attached:

Begin Embedded Document

DATE: 5/5/2003
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Joel Elliott, Chair, UEC Committee
SUBJECT: University Enrichment Committee Annual Report (2002-2003).

Committee members: Moriah Blake (student member), Michael Casey, Bill Dasher, John Dickson, Joel Elliott, John Finney, Jennifer Hastings, Sunil Kukreja, Kate Levin (student member), Jeffrey Matthews, John McCuiston, Janet Pollack, Amy Ryken, Jeff Tepper, Carolyn Weisz, Roberta Wilson.

The Faculty Senate charged the UEC Committee in the fall of 2002 to:

1. Consider establishing and supporting a Student Research Day.
2. Continue the regular duties of dispersing funds.
3. Consider ways of making the reporting process less burdensome for faculty (reporting on conference-participation, summer research, etc.)
4. Review and discuss policies for procuring airline tickets (etc.) for professional travel.

The actions of the UEC committee to the charges were:

1. The UEC committee discussed student research on campus and the best ways to recognize and support students in this endeavor. It was recognized that there are already many different venues for students to present their research on campus and a variety of different "awards" events. The committee decided that instead of organizing a Student Research Day, we should put more effort into publicizing the events that are already taking place.
2. The committee reviewed proposals for travel and research grants and dispersed funds according to the UEC guidelines.
3. The committee examined various options for making the reporting process less burdensome for faculty, and voted to approve several modifications made by Jeffrey Matthews regarding faculty reports on conference participation found in the Reporting section, page 4 of the document "University Resources for Faculty professional Development". These modifications streamline those reports by omitting some of the report requirement details. This will also allow faculty to report in a fashion appropriate for their particular discipline.
4. The committee reviewed the present policies for procuring airline tickets and after consulting with the Office of Finance we decided to modify the recommendations for procuring airline tickets in award letters so that tickets can be arranged through Carlson (with direct bill to the university) or through on-line avenues (using personal credit cards and subsequent reimbursement from the university). Any further changes await decisions from a university review of travel arrangements.

Other actions of the UEC committee:

5. *Streamlining committee processes.* As a result of discussions during the fall faculty conversation, at the start of the academic year we examined a variety of options to make the committee process less burdensome for faculty. The committee voted to accept an offer from Associate Dean John Finney to take over the initial responsibility for reviewing travel grant applications to ensure the criteria were met. This reduced the number of applications reviewed by the committee, and John Finney agreed to bring any cases that did not meet the criteria of the faculty travel grants to the full committee. After one academic year this process is considered to be working effectively.
6. *Creation of subcommittees.* The committee decided to divide up the review of grant applications by creating three subcommittees: Faculty, Graduate, and Undergraduate research. This worked well in the fall when there were similar numbers of graduate and undergraduate research applications. However, a large number of undergraduate applications in the spring resulted in the Graduate subcommittee also reviewing undergraduate proposals. We suggest that in future different subcommittees be formed in the fall and spring to reflect the expected number of proposals.
7. *Released Time Units.* The committee reviewed and ranked the released time proposals and forwarded their recommendations to Dean Cooney.
8. *Discussion of Dean Cooney's proposal to decouple the Lantz Fellowship from regular sabbaticals.* The committee agreed that allowing more flexibility in awarding the Lantz

Fellowships had merit, but we felt that the present system of awarding fellowships was working effectively and did not need to be modified. The committee decided that we could revisit this issue if further arguments favoring revisions of the awarding procedures were brought to the committee's attention.

9. *Guidelines for student research proposals.* After discussing the research proposal review process, it was decided that the guidelines for student research proposals could be made more explicit so that they would be submitted in a standardized format. This would allow committee members to review the proposals more effectively. A subcommittee consisting of Joel Elliott, Amy Ryken, and Carolyn Weisz revised the guidelines so that they were more explicit about application requirements. The subcommittee was then asked to create a second set of guidelines for student travel reimbursements for presentations at professional conferences. The intent of separating travel and research proposals (as for faculty proposals) was to have student travel funds available as needed (rather than by a specific deadline, as currently required). The committee recommends that the UEC review these changes next year to determine if they are successful.
10. *The Dirk Andrew Phibbs Memorial Award.* The committee is still in the process of deciding the award for 2002-2003.
11. *Regester Lecture.* The 2002 Regester Lecture was presented by Ili Nagy of the Art Department on Wednesday, November 6th in the Norton Clapp Theater. Rob Beezer of the Math Department is the faculty speaker for the 2003 Regester Lecture. This year the UEC committee selected Doug Edwards of the Religion Department to be the 2004 Regester Lecturer.

Respectfully submitted,

Joel Elliott
Chair, UEC Committee

End Embedded Document

McGruder explained that her students have papers accepted at conferences that occur after they have graduated. She asked whether they would still be eligible for UEC travel funding. **Elliott** replied that they would if they had received UEC funding for their research. He noted that they will revisit this issue at a later date if the new rules lead to a large increase in student travel requests. **McGruder** noted that often departments step in to assist with student travel funding, but urged the UEC to be "crystal clear" in its eligibility criteria. **Bartanen** asked Elliott to notify ASUPS of this change in funding structures. **Tullis** asked if the pool money is for meetings only. **Elliott** answered that research money is from the research funds.
(M/S/P to receive report)

c) Student Life Committee – Gast presented the SLC Report attached

Begin Embedded Document

Student Life Committee, End of Year Report, May 5, 2003

Members: Kris Bartanen, Heather Douglas, Keith Ferguson (student), Betsy Gast (chair), Duane Hulbert, Diane Kelley, Kurt Walls, Carrie Washburn

The committee met fourteen times during the 2002-2003 school year to address the following charges (revised in SLC minutes of Oct.30):

- Give comments on the revised Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities.
- Continue to give suggestions on the Conspiracy of Hope project.
- Hear from Monica Nixon about the “Safe Streets” block party and improving off-campus student/neighbor relations.
- Hear from a range of students living on-campus to gain their perspectives on their experiences in campus residences and with campus security.
- Communicate with appropriate offices to streamline the recommendation process to which faculty-members contribute for R.A.s, Peer Advisors, Orientation Leaders, *Trail* editor, theme houses, etc. One goal is to make routine recommendations less burdensome for the faculty. The SLC may want to consider whether recommendation forms might be simplified.
- Explore ways of encouraging campus conversations aimed at promoting greater responsibility, accountability and civility on campus.

Charge #1 - There was no work forthcoming from ASUPS this year on the Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities. The SLC continues to be available to review and respond as the document develops.

Charge #2 – The SLC made contact with student leaders letting them know we were available as consultants. The Conspiracy of Hope project proceeded to successful completion without committee involvement.

Charge #3 – We met in the fall with Associate Director for Student Services, Monica Nixon and Moriah Blake, a student intern in the Student Services office. Monica reported that plans to obtain permits from the city of Tacoma are in the works for a fall 2003 block party with the objective of building cooperative relationships between off-campus students and neighbors. The pros and cons of involving faculty members who live in the neighborhood as “hosts” for the block party were discussed. Moriah Blake stated that she thought students living off-campus are more interested in independence than anonymity and that most would willingly participate in block parties with neighbors. Monica also reported that a new campus-owned gathering place exists on North 11th St. specifically for off-campus students. The committee was given copies of the “Guide to Off-Campus Living” and the “Fall 2002 Survey of Off-Campus Students” with an invitation to make suggestions on either document. Approximately 37% of UPS students live off-campus (about 900). Kris Bartanen provided copies of the Student Affairs brochure, “Party Planning”, for the committee’s information. Fall and spring workshops were planned for students on risk management for hosting parties. We concluded that Monica and her office were taking solid action on improving relations with students living off-campus and their neighbors.

Charge #4 – The committee's primary focus of the year was charge #4. In efforts to inform ourselves, we wrote a list of questions for Todd Badham, director of Security Services, and invited him to two fall meetings to explain the multiple roles of Security Services, the policies governing Security personnel’s access to student residences on campus and the challenges in working with students. We learned that Security Services’ duties are vast and include evening escort service for students living within a mile and a half of campus, transport in cases where an injury (e.g. broken leg) requires temporary accommodation, and response to a range of emergencies including car trouble, medical assistance, and letting students into buildings.

We decided that the most efficient and effective way to “hear from a range of students living on-campus” was to invite students to two focus groups at the beginning of spring term led by SLC members and structured with a set of questions. A cross-section of students was represented: those living in residence halls, Greek houses, and university-owned houses, men and women, sophomores, juniors and seniors, in leadership roles and not. Though we had no freshman, Bartanen informed the committee that there are 1600 students living on campus, 624 of them

being freshman, thus the majority of on-campus students are not freshman. The list of questions was asked of each group with no judgment or information given by the facilitators (Addendum #1).

We learned that many students have had positive experiences with assistance from Security Services personnel. For example, students seemed generally pleased with prompt, consistent response to requests for after hours access to the music building, gym and labs. Opinions were mixed on whether Security responds quickly enough in emergency or “lock-out” situations and students did not seem to know the policies on the “unlock” schedule. Many students do not know about the range of services provided or, because of inadequate or misinformation, perceive Security personnel to be in more of a policing role than a support role. For example, several students stated they would choose to call 911 or take an intoxicated student to the emergency room rather than call security personnel for fear of retribution. They did not seem to know that routing an emergency call through Security Services enables emergency personnel to reach a student in distress more swiftly and that the role of security personnel in such situations is to ensure the safety of students and to file a report. Students also stated that they did not have much of a relationship with Security personnel, especially the professional (non-student) staff so when they do interact, it is with some distrust.

Kris Bartanen provided us with results of the Residential Student Benchmarking Survey which showed that UPS students feel somewhat safer on campus, in their rooms and in residence halls than the national average. She also provided us with the university’s sexual harassment report from last year and samples of the kinds of response reports made by Security Services this year.

The committee was impressed with the breadth of services provided, the clear focus on student safety and the challenge of the multiple roles of Security Service personnel. In March we met again with Todd Badham to clarify some of the questions that arose from the focus groups and to discuss how best to improve students’ perception of Security Services on campus. When asked if the staff has received any conflict resolution training, Todd explained that he has been working on it but it’s difficult for his professional staff to participate in training together, because of their tight schedule. The committee recognizes the stress created by staffing constraints. It is worth noting that a professional staff person is on duty at all times. A list of the committee’s recommendations have been forwarded to Todd (Addendum # 2).

We discussed the possible role of faculty in helping to dispel some of the myths surrounding Security Services and in discussing campus expectations with students. Our discussion opened the door to Charge #6.

Charge #5 – The process for faculty campus recommendations for student leadership positions was streamlined along with other campus recommendation processes in the fall term, so the committee decided that no action needed to be taken on that charge.

Charge #6 – Discussion on charge #6 did not begin in earnest until our second to the last meeting. We agreed, based on Douglas’s clarification of the differences between a “civic” community and an “intellectual” community, that as an intellectual community, we hold to a higher standard of interaction on many levels: intellectual, behavioral and interactional. We began discussing ways the university currently models this or could increase this focus, for example, during Prelude students learn that they have more responsibility for their education and increased accountability to peers and faculty. We noted there could be more student advisory committees and need-based focus groups. Bartanen suggested possible models for structured conversations, such as the “Michigan Dialogue Model”. Hulbert offered that talks that take place in student residences have a different level of discussion than those in academic buildings and suggested that having faculty present at these events would be beneficial. Ferguson recommended the idea of an “Alumni Hall of Fame” to highlight models of intellectual and civic accomplishment for current students, adding that distinguished alumni could be invited back to campus for talks and discussions.

The SLC concluded that clarifying the expectations for students as part of an intellectual community is important, therefore we would like to continue addressing this charge next year.

Suggested Charges for the 2003-2004 school year:

1. Continue to address charge #6: explore ways to encourage campus conversations aimed at promoting greater responsibility, accountability and civility on campus.
2. Give comments on the revised Student Bill of Rights and Responsibilities
3. Examine sophomore programs, specifically support for the transitions particular to sophomore year.
4. Examine and suggest ways in which models of civic and/or intellectual accomplishment can be highlighted.
5. Improving publicity procedures on campus, for example, standardizing the computer programs used in the various publicity offices.
6. Explore the relationship of student life and Facility Services. (The suggestion was made that efforts of Facility Services are unappreciated by students.)

Student Life Committee Final Report 2002-2003

Addendum #1

Questions asked at student focus groups held on January 28 and 29, 2003:

1. Why did you decide to come tonight?
2. How has Security been helpful or not helpful?
 - a. What does Security Services do?
3. Do you remember how you learned of Security Services?
4. What impressions do you have of Security Services, positive or negative?
5. How do you view student Security staff?
6. Would you ever consider working for Security Services?
7. What changes would you like to see in Security Services?

Student Life Committee Final Report 2002-2003

Addendum #2

Date: April 30, 2003

To: Todd Badham, Director of Security Services

From: Student Life Committee, Betsy Gast, Chair

Re: Recommendations

Todd, at the end of this year of discussion with you and with students, the Student Life Committee would like to make the following recommendations aimed at improving campus relations and dispelling some of the misperceptions of the role of Security Services. We want to thank you for your help in this process and hope you find these suggestions useful.

- A **change of name** from Security Services to Campus Safety in order to emphasize the full range of responsibilities which Security Services offers in addition to policing responsibilities. The committee believes this may help bring into focus the other ways in which Security Services offers assistance to students.
- **Improve campus outreach.** Make a **personal connection** with students through avenues such as Orientation events at the beginning of the year and your planned participation in **crime prevention education** in the residence halls in the fall. The committee acknowledges the potential risk for persons responsible for enforcing rules and policies, such as Security Services, in creating a friendly relationship with those they regulate, but also recognizes the similar multiple roles of Student Development staff in befriending and regulating students. One concrete example might be developing your web site in a way that could foster a friendlier relationship to students.
- **Improve communication to students** regarding the “unlock” schedule. Recognizing that this is the kind of information that may need to be communicated more than once, we suggest that emails to the residential campus community or other forms of additional advertising could help. Another concrete area for improved communication is when students call with an emergency, to provide an expected time for response.
- **Creation of a Parking Appeal Board.** The committee supports your idea that faculty, staff and students could potentially sit on a board that hears appeals of those served with parking violations. A possible option for paying parking fines may be to donate points from students’ meal plans to various charities in the Tacoma area, similar to what Collins Memorial Library has offered students in order to pay overdue book fees. This charitable option

would also be an appropriate manner in which students may engage in the activities of an Intellectual Community.

- Another option considered by the Student Life Committee, was the creation of a **Student Advisory Committee** that would make recommendations to Security Services. Some doubt the effectiveness and appeal of such a body while others think it may be a timely opportunity to create an invitation for greater dialogue which could better the relationship between Security Services and the student body. Furthermore, advising students could serve as virtual ambassadors to campus, more accurately representing Security Services. The committee suggests that students could be identified to participate by responding to an invitation from Security Services.
- **An open panel discussion** is also suggested as a potential way to give students a greater sense of ownership in Security Services. Different than the Student Advisory Committee, these open panel discussions would be a forum for discussion among interested parties, and therefore would not be the activity of a designated and committed group of members, as with the Student Advisory Committee. It was felt that discussions should be offered periodically throughout the year and would be most beneficial if they were open-ended and topical. The committee acknowledges the potentiality for one participant to monopolize the discussion with personal grievances but does not feel that such a potentiality was great enough to choose not to offer a panel discussion.
- While we understand that scheduling may be prohibitive given staffing constraints, the committee recommends that you continue your efforts to provide **conflict resolution training** for your staff.

End Embedded Document

(M/S/P to receive report)

d) Library, Media and Academic Computing Committee Report – O’Neil presented the LMAC Report attached

Begin Embedded Document

LMAC Report to the Faculty Senate
May 5, 2003
Patrick O’Neil, Chair

Senate Charges:

1. *Continue reviewing potential "course-ware" products and continue other business carrying over from last year.*
2. *Suggest ways to enable faculty-members of the LMAC to function more autonomously and to address concerns of the faculty with regard to library, media, and computing issues more effectively.*
3. *Given the establishment of the Technology Planning Group, the LMAC should consider a redefinition of the LMAC's duties. (Some specific suggestions for redefinition arose at the Senate meeting, but for the time being the Senate wishes to keep this charge broad.)*
4. *If the LMAC determines that it is unable to achieve meaningful progress with regard to charges 2 and 3 above, then the Committee should consider recommending the dissolution of the LMAC.*

Activity:

Assisted OIS with the implementation of Blackboard courseware on campus, in providing input for training on campus for faculty.

Considered introduction of new hardware on campus, such as the Smart Pad, and the expansion and priority of new technology enabled classrooms on campus.

Considered expansion of library service to 24 x 7 to meet student demand.

Wrote, with library staff input, a letter to the Freshman Seminar instructors encouraging them to directly integrate library training (“information literacy”) into their classes.

Discussed the possibility of technology-oriented workshops on campus to utilize Murdock and Culpeper funds, and the desire to maintain these funds in future for faculty training and course development.

Findings:

LMAC continues to play a modest but important role in linking faculty and librarians to media and computing issues, which is likely to grow in importance in future.

The hiring of a new librarian makes LMAC particularly important as a sounding board and liaison during this period of transition. Continuation of LMAC is recommended.

End Embedded Document

Cooney thanked O’Neil for his service on the library search committee. Commenting on the future role of LMAC, he noted that our increased reliance on electronic databases leads to new types of challenge as database companies frequently change their accessing software. **Hanson** added that faculty should be proactive in database acquisitions and that LMAC could take leadership in this area. He also urged that they try to present a more proactive and global vision of the role of technology on campus. As examples, he asked whether certain types of computational skills should be demanded of all new students, or whether LMAC should push for “technology across the curriculum” to echo recent initiatives on writing.

Cooney noted that there have been many such efforts but that faculty are notoriously resistant to technology mandates. He also noted that when it was once suggested that all students have laptops, computer science majors were some of the most vocal opponents. They believed that mandated laptops would limit their access options. He also noted that mandated laptops would add to tuition costs that are already under pressure.

Ostrom urged LMAC to continue their exploration of 24/7 library hours. **Cooney** noted that it is already 24/7 during finals, but that added pressure for longer hours is expected as the campus becomes more residential.

(M/S/P to receive)

Agenda Item #6 Other Business—Haltom noted that only one of the committees reporting today had a Senator in its ranks. He recommended that Senators also serve on standing committees. Noting the string of five consecutive nouns used by John Finney as reported in the UEC Report (“Travel Grant Applications Review Burden”), **Haltom** suggested an even longer string:

Goofups Relief Education Travel Academe Grant Application Review Burden Organizer.

Lest this be thought too long, to say nothing of its syntax, **Haltom** pointed out that we could use its acronym: GRETA GARBO.

Returning to Haltom's first point, **Cooney** noted that Senate representation on the standing committees might represent a burden for Senators. **Ostrom** added that issues of more widespread participation needed to be considered.

McGruder asked whether there needed to be a sense-of-the-Senate motion about more frequent IRB meetings. **Ostrom** replied that this could be part of the IRB's charge for next academic year.

The Senate then adjourned.

Respectfully recorded by Julian Edgoose and Chris Kline