

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Fifth Meeting, Monday, 15 February 2010, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

AGENDA

1. Call to order Professor Howard N. Zelaznik
2. Approval of Minutes of 25 January 2010
3. Acceptance of Agenda
4. Remarks by the President President France A. Córdova
5. [Remarks of the Chairperson](#) Professor Howard N. Zelaznik
6. [Résumé of Items Under Consideration](#)
by Various Standing Committees For Information
Professor Alyssa Panitch
7. Question Time
8. [University Senate Document 09-2](#)
Formation of the Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and
Review Committee Approved
Professor Morris Levy
9. [University Senate Document 09-3](#)
Revised Membership in the Committee for Student Excellence Approved
Professor John Grutzner
10. University Senate Document 09-4
Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate For Discussion
Professor Kathryn Orvis
11. New Business
12. Memorial Resolutions
13. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Fourth Meeting, Monday, 15 February 2010, 2:30 p.m.
Room 302, Stewart Center

Present: *Present: President France A. Córdova, Howard Zelaznik, (Chairperson of the Senate) presiding, Professors Janet M. Alsup, David C. Anderson, Zarjon Baha, Mark Bannatyne, Patricia E. Bauman, Alan M. Beck, Ernest R. Blatchley, J. Stuart Bolton, James Braun, Jeffrey L. Brewer, Kristina K. Bross, Becky A. Brown, Lynn A. Bryan, Bernd W. Buldt, Christian E. Butzke, Joseph W. Camp Jr. (Secretary of Faculties and Parliamentarian), Natalie J. Carroll, Ralph L. Cherry, Steve H. Collicott, Patricia G. Coyle-Rogers, Martin V. Curd, Larry P. DeBoer, Edward J. Delp, John P. Denton, Alphonso V. Diaz, Brian G. Dillman, Paul B. Dixon, Shawn S. Donkin, Phillip S. Dunston, Nancy E. Edwards, Charlotte E. Erdmann, Geraldine S. Friedman, Joan R. Fulton, Gabriele F. Giuliani, Ronald J. Glotzbach, Mark A. Green, James P. Greenan, John B. Grutzner, Chong Gu, Sally A. Hastings, L. Tony Hawkins, Michael A. Hill, Peter M. Hirst, Jeffrey D. Holland, Kristine Holtvedt, Neal R. Houze, David B. Janes, Richard D. Johnson-Sheehan, Adam J. Kline, Joseph F. Kmec, Ravi Krishnan, Eric P. Kvam, Christine M. Ladisch, Morris Levy, Andrew U. Luescher, Kevin R. Maurer, W. Gerry McCartney, Robert E. McMains, James D. McGlothlin, Samuel P. Midkiff, Mark M. Moriarty, P. Jane Morris, Daniel K. Mroczek, Rabindra N. Mukerjea, Mary B. Nakhleh, James G. Ogg, Martin R. Okos, Kathryn S. Orvis, Alyssa Panitch, Zygmunt Pizlo, Phillip E. Pope, Robert E. Pruitt, Teri Reed-Rhoads, Melissa J. Remis, J. P. Robinson, Thomas B. Robinson, Alysa C. Rollock, Carolyn Roper, John A. Sautter, Arthur P. Schwab, Marisol S. Sepulveda, Richard Sévère, Jie Shen, Robert D. Skeel, Mark J. T. Smith, Glenn Sparks, A. Charlene Sullivan, Elizabeth J. Taparowsky, Thomas J. Templin, Volker K. Thomas, Lynda J. Thoman, Marion Trout, Bert Useem, Samuel S. Wagstaff, Mara H. Wasburn, Herbert L. Weith, David J. Williams, G. Thomas Wilson, Randy Woodson and Yuehwern Yih.*

Absent: *Professors: Dana S. Beck, George M. Bodner, Donald Buskirk, Wei K. Cui, Raymond A. DeCarlo, Michael J. Fosmire, Steven G. Hallett, Robert Kubat, Mihails Levins, William D. McInerney, Suzanne L. Parker, Robert D. Plante, J. Paul Robinson, Sivakumar S. Santhanakrishnan, Lefteri Tsoukalas, Whitney Walton, and William J. Zinsmeister.*

Guests: *Cheryl Beloshapka, Jonie Chevillet, Mara Levy, Mikel Livingston, Mike Loizzo, Valerie O'Brien, Ken Sandel, Marissa Sura, Eric Weddle, and Trina Zych.*

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Chairperson Howard N. Zelaznik.
2. The minutes of the meeting of 25 January 2010 were approved as distributed.
3. The agenda was approved as distributed.
4. President France A. Córdova presented remarks to the Senate.
5. Professor Zelaznik presented the report of the chairperson (see Appendix A).
6. Professor Alyssa Panitch presented, for information, the Résumé of Items under Consideration (ROI) by Various Standing Committees (see Appendix B).
7. At "Question Time" numerous questions came from the floor concerning the proposed changes to salary and benefits. In addition, two questions had been submitted by

Professor William Cramer from the Department of Biological Sciences. The gist of these inquiries and associated answers are presented below.

Question #1 from Professor Cramer: “Given the recent appointment of another Vice-President in the midst of the fiscal crisis, please provide information on the number of senior administrators at Purdue compared to other peer institutions. It is noted that the remuneration of the latest appointee is equivalent to about \$200- in medical benefits for the entire faculty.”

Vice President Diaz responded to Professor Cramer’s question by stating that the new Vice President for Human Resources (VPHR) is an upgraded position from that held by the previous director of Human Resources. Approximately \$300,000 have been allocated for three years to bring the salary over \$200,000/yr for the new VPHR. However, after the initial three-year period, it is expected that the VPHR will offset this increase with savings generated by his unit. The initial \$300,000 in funding was obtained from accumulated savings. President Córdova emphasized that it was important to fill this position because Purdue’s HR functions are currently distributed across campus and to achieve real savings through enhanced efficiencies centralization is required. The process of centralization may lead to downsizing of the entire HR operation.

President Córdova responded to the other part of the question by saying it was complicated, but comparisons have been made between Purdue and 12 – 15 other institutions. She says that for the offices of the President, Provost, Treasurer and Legislative Affairs, Purdue is below the mean in terms of centralized administrative personnel. It should be noted that the centralized administration does not include administrators from units such as research, development, engagement and the colleges/schools. Purdue will retain an outside firm to look at all administrators at all levels in the Purdue system. According to VP Diaz, it should take between 3 and 6 months to accomplish this review which should begin shortly.

Question #2 from Professor Cramer: “What is the purpose of the University endowment? Although a large fraction of it was lost in the recent fiscal crisis, it still totals approximately \$1.5 B. Every year some small fraction is re-invested in University infrastructure and programs. It seems that it would be appropriate this year to use a small percentage of it in the present fiscal crisis to avoid other solutions that would be internally destructive.”

President Córdova stated that approximately 86% of the endowment is made up of restricted funds that can only be used for specified purposes. VP Diaz said that about \$5 - \$6 million/yr in unrestricted endowment funds are used for needed projects. For example, important one-time expenditures like capital projects are funded from these unrestricted funds.

Professor Natalie Carroll next asked how many Senators would like to have more discussion of the salary and benefits issues with the Board of Trustees. Following a brief discussion, the consensus of the Senate was that the efforts of VP Diaz and Professor Zelaznik that are currently underway are an adequate way to address these issues. VP Diaz and Professor Zelaznik will be meeting with various groups of faculty and staff as well as working with the existing committees to ensure that the faculty and staff input are taken into consideration. President Córdova reminded the Senators that the President’s fora are open to all and they are also available, after the fact, on the web.

Professor Eric Kvam asked if there was a compelling reason for dealing with the salary and benefits issues at this time as opposed to waiting until the next fiscal year. President Córdova said that the current fiscal situation is not sustainable and something has to be done to address this issue. The current retirement contribution of 14.6% means that each salary dollar is burdened by approximately 50% more than if the retirement contribution was 10%.

Professor David Janes stated that we may be losing sight of the big picture. How do we re-focus to look at the long-term strategic view and not get lost in the noise? President Córdova said that she agreed completely with Professor Janes and she hopes that by working together we can maintain our focus on the long-term strategic view. She said that the administration has worked to put up a “stop sign” to get the Board of Trustees to consider additional input, as the faculty and staff have requested. Working together we should be able to determine what makes the most sense for total compensation for faculty and staff.

Professor Jim McGlothlin warned that the public might not notice the cut in benefits, but they will certainly notice an increase in salaries for faculty. He said this could lead to a public relations nightmare and wondered if the Board of Trustees (BOT) could put this off for a year. President Córdova reiterated that the low salaries of Purdue faculty are an important concern to the BOT members that they wished to address sooner rather than later.

Professor Sally Hastings asked if the changes could be implemented for new faculty only. President Córdova said that other universities had done this and it is part of the discussion at Purdue, too. The current pause in the decision-making process provides an opportunity to benchmark what other universities are doing and determine the best policies for Purdue.

Professor Ravi Krishnan mentioned that the proposal still did not consider the half-time faculty and staff and their compensation package. President Córdova reminded the Senators that there is no final proposal yet. VP Diaz stated that Purdue needs to evaluate what should be done for all part-time employees. Hewitt Associates will evaluate what other universities are doing for their part-time employees, but there are no specific proposals at this time for Purdue.

Professor Bernd Buldt from IPFW mentioned that any benefits cuts will have a disproportionate effect on the regional campuses because the compensation packages start from a lower base for regional campus faculty.

Professor David Williams asked if the *ad hoc* committee formed at January’s Senate meeting would continue to meet with VP Diaz. Professor Zelaznik said that if the Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review (BIER) committee is approved at today’s Senate meeting, then it will be important to coordinate the activities of the various committees with the BIER committee which will have the specific charge to evaluate budget issues.

Professor Thomas Templin asked the President what one should say to an assistant professor when asked about the uncertainty of the current situation. President Córdova said that we will do the best we can for these (and all) faculty members. One caveat is that the current benefits policies are still in force. At this time, nothing has changed. Professor Templin mentioned that retention is an issue and the reduction in benefits

could negatively impact retention of faculty. The President hopes that Purdue will remain competitive, but not necessarily off-scale as are our current retirement benefits.

Professor Kristina Bross asked for more details on the following quote from VP Diaz in today's (Monday's) *Purdue Today*: Vice-President Diaz said that "we cannot guarantee that changes in medical premiums can be offset by salary increases dollar-for-dollar." VP Diaz commented that with the retirement benefits, we can get an exact amount going to this type of benefit. On the other hand, with medical benefits there are multiple factors that add complexity, including the options available to faculty, that make it difficult to determine what the appropriate offset is. In addition, VP Diaz said that he does not have to bring the final proposal to the BOT meeting in April, but he does have to present a balanced budget, absent the final salary/benefits proposal.

Professor Joan Fulton commented that faculty understand that this is a difficult time for the university and are willing to work with the administration and BOT to create a workable solution. Assistant professors are also well aware of the total compensation package issues. As Senators she said that we have the responsibility to get our fellow faculty members involved in the ongoing discussions by providing their input and getting them to attend the meetings and fora.

Professor Yuehwern Yih said that it would help faculty members understand the issues if several examples could be provided as possible options and how these options will benefit the university. For example, examples of projections five years out would be very informative.

Professor Carolyn Roper applauded the ongoing efforts, but believes that the BOT members need to hear the faculty voice for more than the next two months. Professor Zelaznik noted that he has had a conversation with BOT member Bill Oesterle and that five Senate leaders met with BOT Chair Keith Krach to provide faculty input and represent the faculty voice. He cannot guarantee that additional conversations will occur, but is hopeful that they will continue meeting with BOT members.

Professor Charlene Sullivan asked if the Senate could invite Chairman Krach to address the Senate. Professor Zelaznik stated that he has already extended an invitation and perhaps one or more board member would attend a Senate meeting. It was noted that student trustee Tyler Teykl was in attendance at the Senate meeting. Professor Sullivan said that faculty input had been put forth, but wondered if the voice of the staff members had been heard. Mr. Kevin Maurer, APSAC Senate representative, said that his group would be meeting VP Diaz on the 19th of February.

Professor Steven Collicott said that more clear articulation of the issues regarding benefits and salary would help alleviate much of the confusion and consternation currently being expressed by the faculty and staff.

Professor Mark Bannatyne addressed the recent somewhat disparaging reports of Purdue's academic quality published in the print media. He said we did not want to get into a "spitting match" with the reporters and asked what the President's Office is doing to address these reports. President Córdova stated that Teri Thompson, VP for Marketing and Media, has sent information to the reporters to educate them on the academic rankings for Purdue. VP Thompson will also be available to answer any questions the reporters might have.

Professor Kristine Holtvedt commented that the faculty in her department, Visual and Performing Arts (VPA), would be in favor of a proposal to lower the retirement contribution while putting more money into salaries. This is a big issue for the VPA faculty and illustrates that there are a variety of opinions on campus relative to the issue. Professor Holtvedt's question was the last question during "Question Time."

8. Professor Morris Levy, chair of the University Resources Policy Committee (URPC), presented University Senate Document 09-2, *Formation of the Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee*, for action. Professor Levy briefly described the rationale for the formation of this new faculty committee. A motion was made and seconded to consider this document. Professor David Janes asked if there had been any changes to the document since the last meeting. Professor Levy responded that no changes had been made. Following this question, the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
9. Professor John Grutzner, chair of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), presented University Senate Document 09-3, *Revised Membership in the Committee for Student Excellence*, for action. The membership revision will make the Director of the University Honors Program a permanent member of this Faculty Committee (subcommittee) that reports to the EPC. A motion was made and seconded to consider this document. There was no discussion and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.
10. Professor Orvis next presented University Senate Document 09-4, *Nominees for Vice Chair of the Senate*, for discussion. Professor mentioned that no nominees have been identified yet and called for additional nominees from the Senators. This document will be voted on at the March 2010 Senate meeting.
11. Professor Joan Fulton reminded the Senators that the HLC Accreditation Team will be here in March. She lauded those who have worked hard in preparing the campus for this visit and she encouraged the Senators and all faculty to visit the accreditation link on the Purdue home page. The team will be here immediately after spring break. Vice Provost Ladisch added that additional information about the visit will be distributed to the campus in the near future.
12. No memorial resolutions had been received.
13. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE - PROFESSOR HOWARD N. ZELAZNIK

Hi, thank you for the opportunity to address the Trustees.

We are living through very interesting times right now, and this difficult financial environment has produced a chorus of faculty voices relative to long term prospects of making Purdue even a better institution to educate students, be one of the intellectual engines in the state, and a partner in helping return Indiana to being economically prosperous.

The faculty and especially I are in support of the formation of a College of Health and Human Sciences. The original task force document, along with the transition blueprint report, both written under the wonderful guidance of Bill Harper were presented to the Educational Policy Committee and then presented and discussed on the floor of the Senate. The discussion was spirited and supportive. The senate accepted the report from the EPC, and we trust that this college will be off to a great start between today and I presume July 1, 2010.

Of course, you must be wondering about how faculty have received the proposals relative to changing the relation between salary and retirement benefits for staff and faculty that are in the TIAA-CREF plan.

Before I provide a summary of faculty beliefs let me first make it crystal clear that the members of the Senate, as well as the faculty at large clearly recognize that upper administration as well as the Trustees has been incredibly willing to meet with faculty and provide any and all information requested. We are aware that at many other institutions the budget issues have been dealt with in a less collaborative fashion. Next, we have the utmost confidence that Ken Sandel is the perfect person to lead a newly formed team to examine the way that Purdue does business, and will be able to find significant mechanisms to provide recurring savings.

What did the Senate do? First, with the wonderful help of VP Diaz, we had several meetings with Senate members, with the Faculty Affairs Committee, with the Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee.

Once this group of about 15 faculty were in agreement that we understood what the current proposal was, David Williams (Chair of the FAC) and I sent out an email to the Senate. We asked that they share this email with their colleagues, and we would love to hear back. Wow!!!

The biggest question that came out of round one was: "How does this save money?" A second email came out explaining that matter.

Also, I have visited four academic department faculty who wanted a face-to-face informative session with me. The most daunting one was with the Math department... I went back to my calculus textbook and relearned the infamous chain-rule of differentiation and was ready. It did not help. I was asked to integrate an equation, and am now being sent back to class.

The basic tenor of the faculty is simple. They do not understand why Purdue needs to change something that is very special, and thought to be an anchor of retention to something that will be average, and the change to our salaries will not produce an order of magnitude movement along a salary scale with our peers.

That being said, what the faculty believe is that additional time is needed to discuss the ramifications of proposed changes in salary/compensation on the fabric of the university. I would be thrilled to explain what that means during question time.

Said differently, many faculty have expressed a view that this budget crisis should cause Purdue to evaluate the current strategic plan. We should not be fixed on the current one... Strategic plans are living documents and need to be evaluated as the context that our current plan was formed has drastically changed.

We invite the Trustees to invite the faculty and staff to discuss these issues. Visiting the Senate might be one place to begin the discussion, but not the only one. The faculty want to work hand in hand with upper administration, as well as the Trustees to navigate Purdue through these choppy seas so that our students as well as the citizens of our state can continue to reap the benefits of the intellectual achievements of Purdue.

TO: University Senate
FROM: Alyssa Panitch, Chairperson, Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Résumé of Items under Consideration by the Various Standing Committees

STEERING COMMITTEE

Alyssa Panitch, Chairperson
apanitch@purdue.edu

The primary responsibility of the Steering Committee is the organization and distribution of the agenda for each meeting of the University Senate. This committee also receives communications from any faculty member or group of members and directs such communications to appropriate committees or officers for attention.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Chairperson of the Senate

Howard N. Zelaznik,
hzelaz@purdue.edu

The responsibility of the University Senate Advisory Committee is to advise the President and/or Board of Trustees on any matter of concern to the faculty.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Kathryn S. Orvis, Chairperson
orvis@purdue.edu

The Nominating Committee is responsible for presenting nominations for the University Senate and University committees. In filling committee vacancies the Nominating Committee seeks to have all interested Senators serve on at least one committee.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

John B. Grutzner, Chairperson
grutzner@purdue.edu

1. Remedial 1-credit course for students on probation
2. Core Curriculum
3. University wide policy on starting date for new and changed Plans of Study
4. Internationalization initiative
5. Transfer credit for military service

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

David J. Williams, Chairperson
djw@purdue.edu

1. Benefits proposal
2. Review of faculty surveys at Purdue
3. Annual budget for Senate activities
4. Review of Executive Memorandum C-19 regarding faculty grievances
5. Review of Research Faculty promotion guidelines

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Thomas J. Templin, Chairperson
ttemplin@purdue.edu

1. Review of the Student Bill of Rights
2. Follow-up concerning the Student Conduct Code
3. Follow-up with Student Services Office concerning disciplinary process

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE

Morris Levy, Chairperson
levy0@purdue.edu

1. Review fiscal policies and aid in generating budget transparency and economy
2. Review of campus energy sufficiency, safety, and other Physical Facilities operations
3. Enhancing graduate education and research opportunities
4. Review of faculty committees

Chair of the Senate, Howard N. Zelaznik, hzelaz@purdue.edu
Vice Chair of the Senate, Joan Fulton, fultonj@purdue.edu
Secretary of the Senate, Joseph W. Camp, Jr., icamp@purdue.edu
University Senate Minutes; <http://www.purdue.edu/usenate>

To: The University Senate
From: University Resources Policy Committee
Subject: Formation of the Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee
Reference: University Senate Bylaws
Disposition: University Senate for Approval

Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee

Rationale

During the Spring semester of 2008, the Steering Committee of the University Senate appointed an *ad hoc* Committee on Budget Transparency to begin a process of analyzing Purdue's budget and expenditure policies. The committee assembled data about Purdue's revenues and appropriations for fiscal years 2002 through 2009, with the intent of providing the Senate an understanding of past trends to inform its future recommendations. The Treasurer's office provided particular assistance in this effort. During the Spring semester of 2009, the committee Chair, Professor Charlene Sullivan, presented a report of the committee's findings to the Senate. In the course of preparing the 2009-10 Senate agenda, the consensus of the Steering Committee was that a permanent standing committee was essential for the Senate to be able to understand and participate appropriately in University fiscal matters. The University Resources Policy Committee hereby asks University Senate approval for creating such a permanent standing committee, the Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee, that will report to the University Resources Policy Committee.

A. Membership

Eight members: five faculty members, including two liaison members from the University Resources Policy Committee; one liaison to represent the Office of the Provost; one liaison to represent the Office of the Executive Vice President for Business and Finance, Treasurer; and one liaison from the Office of Vice President of Physical Facilities.

B. Nomination, Election and Tenure

The University Senate Nominating Committee shall nominate three faculty members to staggered three-year terms. The Chair of University Resources Policy Committee will appoint the two liaison members from University Resources Policy no later than May of each year. The three Offices represented shall appoint their liaison members no later than August of each year.

C. Chair

The Chair shall be a member of the Faculty. In April or May of each year, the outgoing Chair shall: a) arrange for the continuing and newly appointed members to elect a Chair for the succeeding year, and b) report the name of the new Chair to the University Resources Policy Committee and to the Secretary of Faculties.

D. Area of Responsibility

The Committee shall be charged with continuing to collect and analyze data about Purdue's revenues and appropriations and to convey information about Purdue's budgetary policies to the Senate. Furthermore, with coordination and consultation with the University Resources Policy Committee, this Committee will work with the fiscal officers of the administration to examine and evaluate budgetary policies.

E. Meetings and Reports

Recommendations and reports will be made directly to the University Resources Policy Committee for consideration. The Budget Interpretation, Evaluation and Review Committee shall send minutes of its meetings and present a brief summary of its activities to the University Resources Policy Committee and to the Secretary of Faculties.

Approving

Opposed

Not Voting

Morris Levy, Chair
Varun Agrawal
Lawrence DeBoer
Shawn Donkin
Charlotte Erdmann
Geraldine Friedman
Mark Green
Richard Johnson
Eric Kvam
Daniel Mroczek
A. Paul Schwab

Martin Okos
Phil Pope

CALENDAR OF STATUS OF LEGISLATION
--

SENATE DOCUMENT	TITLE	ORIGIN	SENATE
*09-1	Reapportionment of the Senate	Professor Alyssa Panitch	Approved 11/16/09
*09-2	Formation of the Budget Transparency and Evaluation Committee	Professor Morris Levy	Approved 2/15/10
*09-3	Revised Membership in the committee for Student Excellence	Professor John Grutzner	Approved 2/15/10
09-4	Nominees for Vice Chairperson of the University Senate	Professor Kathryn Orvis	For Discussion 2/15/10

*Approved

SENATE REPORTS	TITLE	ORIGIN
09-1	Report to the Senate Concerning the Creation of a College of Health & Human Sciences	Professor John Grutzner

To: Steering Committee of the University Senate
FROM: University Senate Educational Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Revised Membership in the Committee for Student Excellence
DISPOSITION: University Senate for Discussion

The Committee for Student Excellence is one of four committees reporting to the University Senate Educational Policy Committee. The Educational Policy Committee recommends the addition of the Director of the University Honors Program as a voting member of the Committee for Student Excellence. These changes have been discussed and approved by the EPC and are being brought to the Senate for discussion and action.

Proposed Change

Present	Proposed
Committee for Student Excellence Membership Fifteen members: ten members of the faculty representing the various schools; four student members; the executive vice president and provost; and the vice president for student services.	Committee for Student Excellence Membership Sixteen members: ten members of the faculty representing the various schools; four student members; The Director of the University Honors Program; The executive vice president and
Proposed provost; and the vice president for student services	
Committee for Student Excellence Membership Sixteen members: ten members of the faculty representing the various schools; four student members; the Director of the University Honors program; the executive vice president and provost; and the vice president for student services.	

Approving

George M. Bodner
Ronald J. Glotzbach
John B. Grutzner
Chong Gu
*L. Tony Hawkins
Joseph F. Kmec
*Robert A. Kubat

*Christine M. Ladisch
Andrew Luescher
Mark M. Moriarty
Teri Reed-Rhoads
Glenn G. Sparks
Melissa Perram (student)
Gabriela Szteinberg (grad student)

Absent (with apology)

Janet M. Alsup
R. Neal Houze
Eddie Van Bogaert (student)
W. Randy Woodson

* Advisors