The meeting was called to order by Faculty Senate Chair Bruce Balick at 2:32 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda.
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes.
   The minutes were approved as corrected.

3. Opening Remarks from the Chair.
   Bruce Balick, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

   Senate Chair Bruce Balick gave status reports on Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) and the faculty salary policy discussions.

   He recounted that ABB is a concept that concerns how funds are distributed within the University. This system of distribution will be in its first phase of implementation in July. Balick’s understanding of this model is that it will have little effect on academic planning, rather it is a more understandable and transparent way of directly funding instructional activity and the requisite infrastructures that support instruction. The current operating model is very nearly incomprehensible. An early draft of the new ABB model came out late Friday and accurately encapsulates what Senate leadership has heard and what has been reported throughout the process. He anticipates hearing feedback on the draft from the Provost in time to report at the next regular Senate meeting.

   Faculty salary policy discussions drag on, complicated greatly by the anticipation of significant further budget cuts in the near future. It seems clear that the intent of the original salary policy was to include some flexibility in the policy that would allow for adjustments at times of financial exigency short of a financial emergency. Faculty and administration alike will benefit from consensus now about how the policy will be interpreted over the next several years.

4. Report of the Provost & Executive Vice President.
   Provost Phyllis Wise.

   Provost Phyllis Wise reported that the legislature continues to meet into its fourth week of an extended session. Democrats agree that there must be more taxes to prevent further cutting, but they cannot agree on what taxes to increase. She trusts that some agreement will be reached by the end of the week. The more favorable budget is the one on the Senate side – with a 6.2% cut to all institutions of higher education as opposed to differential cuts proposed in the budget on the House side.

   She and her staff are currently in the process of meeting with forty-five college and unit representatives to talk about last year’s cuts and how that was managed at the unit level in view of a probable additional 5% cut this year. She anticipates that the new ABB model of distribution of funding will help buffer the cut to academic units.
5. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.  
David Lovell, Faculty Senate Past Chair and Committee Chair.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) Chair David Lovell reported that SCPB had not met very many times since he had last reported to the SEC. Action taken on the UW Tech Fee plan has been reported to the Senate. SCPB had discussions about ABB and the faculty salary policy, but the Committee has not yet taken any action or made any recommendation regarding those issues.

Jim Fridley, Faculty Legislative Representative.

Faculty Legislative Representative Jim Fridley described himself as “a survivor” of the legislative session. Although a week ago he had anticipated being able to recap the completed legislative session to the SEC, instead the session continues.

Both the Senate and House had prepared budget proposals – each requiring $800-900 million in revenue beyond what is currently projected in taxes. The problem is coming to agreement on how to make up that considerable shortfall. A decision must be made by April 13.

Another element of the new federal money is that it comes with the proviso of a cap on state cuts to educational institutions. Without that, the legislature may well have made deeper cuts to higher education. That protection will end next year.

Questions and answers touched on the how accurately the legislature reflects the opinion of the state in their continuing tendency to devalue higher education; on the few matters of legislation (other than the budget) of interest this year to the UW; and the status of the plan for a campus north of Bothell.

7. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.  
Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien reported that legislation to change the structure of the Faculty Senate had passed, with 85.6% of those voting in favor of the proposal. One thousand and eighty-four voted – just over one quarter of voting faculty – which is much higher than normal for Class A legislation. The President has given his final approval so the legislation has now become a part of the Faculty Code. She thanked all who had worked so hard, and for so long, to bring this to fruition. She and her staff are well into the process of implementing the new legislation and are preparing for elections of new senators under new procedures. A new room for the smaller Senate has been found – a much more suitable room than the one in Gowen Hall – in the newly refurbished Savery Hall.

Class A legislation eliminating the Faculty Council on University Relations, whose duties had been transferred to a Special Committee on Honorary Degrees, also was approved by a vote of the faculty.

Class A legislation creating a Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning (which would absorb the members and mandates of the Faculty Councils on Instructional Quality, Educational Technology and Educational Outreach) would be up for second consideration later during this meeting.

Class B legislation revising and updating Scholastic Regulations was sent to the faculty on March 23, with a deadline of April 13 to submit objections. Only 3 objections have been received so far, and it will take approximately 250 objections to send this legislation back to the Senate for further consideration.

She encouraged members of the SEC to consider submitting nominations of their colleagues for the University Faculty Lecture Award. The deadline is April 14.

She also reminded SEC members of the importance of merit reviews, even during times when there are no funds available for salary merit increases for several years running. Merit reviews need to be
conducted on a yearly basis, regardless, to ensure a record that won’t jeopardize a faculty member’s status and tenure.

Finally, the Secretary of the Faculty announced that she would soon be soliciting new members for faculty councils and committees. She especially hopes to target “disenfranchised” senators for possible recruitment, and would value Senate Executive Committee members’ input and advice on possible nominees.

8. Nominations and Appointments.
   a. **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Xheni Diko, ASUW representative ex-officio member on the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2010, with voting rights to be determined by the SEC through the faculty council.

   The nomination was approved.

   b. **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration, Jim Fridley, Professor, Forest Resources and Mechanical Engineering, as the 2010-11 Faculty Legislative Representative.

   The nomination was approved.

9. Report from the Faculty Council on Student Affairs.
   Brian Fabien, Council Chair.
   **Discussion:** Intelligence Officer Training Program and its possible effect on academic integrity, safety and security of the UW’s global activities.

   Senate Chair Balick began the discussion by recounting that at the November 16 SEC meeting a concern was raised by Group Representative Christoph Giebel requesting that the SEC look into the issue of intelligence officer training programs and their possible effects on academic integrity, safety and security of the University of Washington’s global activities. After discussion, it was decided that this issue should be referred to a Faculty Council. Therefore, Council Chair Brian Fabien agreed to address these concerns with the Faculty Council on Student Affairs (FCSA), and he was present at the meeting to make a report on the Council’s findings.

   Council Chair Brian Fabien then distributed copies of a memo from him to Senate Chair Bruce Balick, dated April 5, 2010, regarding Intelligence Officer Training Programs (Exhibit A), explaining that this was a partial report. The Council has not yet heard from those involved with the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER) and is not yet ready to make a recommendation, or suggest guidelines, to the Faculty Senate.

   Group Representative Christoph Giebel explained that concerns were raised about housing an Intelligence Officer Training Corps (IOTC) on campus – that it might invite hidden intelligence activities that may negatively impact security. A second concern was about how this might impact open academic inquiry. A third concern was that while the INSER study-abroad program is now restricted to ROTC students as a matter of university policy, a new IOTC program would again compromise and endanger the University’s overseas programs, thus necessitating a comprehensive university policy response.

   David Lovell clarified that when he was Chair of the Faculty Senate concerns raised about INSER were reviewed by the Faculty Council on Research. Further, specific concerns about the impact of the program on students were referred to FCSA. Lovell went on to report that whether something like this ought to exist was not discussed while he was chair. He suggested that most faculty dealing with research are entrepreneurs, and there’s no systematic way in the context of a Senate or SEC meeting to conduct that kind of discussion effectively.

   Ensuing discussion touched on the role of teaching intelligence-gathering at the UW, the safety of students, and the impact of this program on the viability of other international programs that involve UW students. FCSA will continue gathering information and will report back to the SEC.
10. Information.

There was no information to convey.

11. Announcements.

There were no announcements.


a. Class A Legislation – Final Consideration. \{Exhibit B\}
   
   Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.
   
   **Title:** Proposed Changes to the Faculty Council Structure – Volume Two, Part IV, Chapter 42.
   
   **Action:** Conduct final review of proposal to submit legislation to the faculty for approval or rejection.

   The legislation was approved.

b. Official Request for Code Interpretation of Chapter 24, Sections 24-70 and 24-71. \{Exhibit C\}

   **Action:** Decide whether or not to accept the advisory opinion of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

   Balick reported that this issue was introduced by David Lovell at the November 16 SEC meeting when a motion was adopted requesting the SEC make a request for an interpretation of the Faculty Code concerning the Faculty Salary Policy to the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations.

   After reviewing the status of the issue and introducing Karen Boxx, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, discussion followed that compared the merits of taking action on the Advisory Committee’s recommendation or on the summary, as articulated by David Lovell in his e-mail message to Senate Executive Committee members (see content below).

   Gerry Philipsen made a motion to accept the interpretation of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, regarding Sections 24.70 and 24.71, and that the SEC adopt, as the interpretation by the Senate Executive Committee, the summary of those sections of the Faculty Code as relayed in an e-mail message to the Senate Executive Committee by David Lovell.

   After some discussion, the summary interpretation as articulated in Lovell’s e-mail was amended as follows:

   1. Section 24.70.B.1 declares that a salary increase “shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review.” The implementation of this principle and the specification of an initial minimum percentage increase have been left to an Executive Order, in which procedures and amounts are more readily adapted to changing circumstances. For this reason, no specific percentage is required to meet this provision of the Faculty Code. This provision, however, was designed to support salary progression over the course of a career for meritorious faculty. For this reason, any reconsideration of a minimum percentage increase amount, the SCPB must be consulted and allowed to give input on what would be a reasonable percentage based on normal salary progression in light of current economic conditions at peer institutions, in light of current economic conditions.

   2. Section 24.71.A states: “The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and, each biennium, shall subsequently recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in Section 24-70.B” If there is any reconsideration of a minimum percentage increase amount, the SCPB must be consulted and allowed to give input on what would be a reasonable percentage based on normal salary progression over the course of a career during current economic conditions.
A motion to postpone discussion until the following meeting failed.

The question was called on the original motion, as amended, and the SEC approved the call.

A vote was taken and the motion on the floor, with the amended summary interpretation, was approved.

   April 22, 2010, Faculty Senate Agenda. {Exhibit D}
   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

   The Faculty Senate agenda was approved.


   The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Prepared by: Marcia Killen, Secretary of the Faculty
Approved by: Bruce Balick, Faculty Senate Chair
April 5, 2010

To: Professor Bruce Balick, Chair
Faculty Senate

From: Brian Fabien, Chair
Faculty Council on Student Affairs

Re: Intelligence Officer Training Programs

The Faculty Council on Student Affairs (FCSA) met with Professor Christoph Giebel to discuss issues related to the Intelligence Officer Training Program, and the potential impacts on academic integrity at the UW. At this time the FCSA is not ready to make a recommendation to the faculty senate, since we have yet to meet with some key members of our community regarding these issues. However, below, you will find a summary of our discussions to date.

Background

The federal government has established the Intelligence Officer Training Corps (IOTC) program which is similar to the military's Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program. Details regarding the aims and scope of the program can be found at the Intelligence Community – Centers of Academic Excellence (CAE) Program website (http://www.dni.gov/cae/iotc.htm). Brief articles on the program have appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education (http://chronicle.com/article/Obama-Administration-Proposes/47778), and in the Washington Post (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/19/AR2009061903501.html).

Some important highlights of the program are as follows.

- The Intelligence Community (IC) partners include the CIA, DEA, FBI, NSA, Department of Homeland Security, State Department, and all US military agencies.
- The IOTC program aims to establish 20 Centers of Academic Excellence by 2015. There are currently 10 centers, including the Institute for National Security Education and Research (INSER) at the UW. Funding for the centers range from $500,000 to $750,000 per year.
- The CAE will recruit students for the various IC partners. Some students participating in the IOTC program may qualify for tuition and stipend support.
- The CAE develop curriculum to support the intelligence community; they support faculty via sabbaticals and research related activities; and they provide awards to students for study abroad programs.

Impact on scholarly activities at the UW

Much of the discussion in the FCSA centered around the potential negative impacts the IOTC program would have on academic integrity at the UW. Some of the specific concerns that were raised include the following.

- Classroom interaction: Council members felt that the free and open exchange of ideas in the classroom would be thwarted if students believe that their colleagues are involved in intelligence gathering.
- Study abroad programs: Council members believe that some students and faculty will avoid participation in study abroad programs if members of their group may be involved in intelligence gathering or espionage. Moreover, since the students associated with the IOTC program will not be identified, there is a concern that foreign governments will consider all UW students to be intelligence officers.
- Research abroad: Council members expressed a concern that some countries would refuse entry to, (or greatly restrict the activities of,) researchers from the UW. This outcome would be particularly harmful to scholars in fields such as anthropology, geography, and foreign languages.
Faculty Senate Proposed Changes
(Additions are underlined, deletions are struck through)
Changes to Volume Two, Part IV, Chapter 42, Section 42-31, Section 42-42, Section 42-43, and Section 42-45.

Rationale:

A review of Faculty Councils minutes for the past several years, conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty, has shown substantial overlap in the issues currently pursued by three Councils – the Faculty Councils on Educational Outreach, Educational Technology and Instructional Quality. Additionally, the original charges of the existing Councils do not fully reflect the current status and focus of issues related to teaching and learning at the university. After consulting with the Chairs of these three Councils, deliberations were launched on a proposal to combine the three Councils into one Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, with a proposed structure to allow for subcommittees to address specific issues as needed. A survey of the current members of these three Councils showed strong support for this merger. The merger is proposed as a vehicle for more efficient functioning of the Council and to promote integration of faculty discussions about policies related to teaching and learning.

Chapter 42

FACULTY COUNCILS (THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY) AND THEIR DUTIES

Section 42-31. The Faculty Councils

A. As the principal advisory bodies to the Senate there shall be the following Faculty Councils:
1. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards;
2. The Faculty Council on University Relations;
3. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs;
4. The Faculty Council on Research;
5. The Faculty Council on Student Affairs;
6. The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services;
7. The Faculty Council on University Libraries;
8. The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality;
9. The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach;
10. The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement;
11. The Faculty Council on Educational Technology;
12. The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy;
13. The Faculty Council on Women in Academia;
15. The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.

B. Faculty Councils may be abolished and created only by amendment to the Faculty Code.

C. Faculty Councils are responsible to the Executive Committee of the Senate.


Section 42-42. Faculty Council on Instructional Quality

The Faculty Council on Instructional Quality shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to improvement of teaching and learning in the University.

S-A 72, March 1, 1982: with Presidential approval.
Section 42-43. Faculty Council on Educational Outreach

The Faculty Council on Educational Outreach shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy, academic and nonacademic, relating to distance learning, continuing education, UW Extension, and summer school programs.

S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 96, December 4, 1996: both with Presidential approval.

Section 42-45. Faculty Council on Educational Technology

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy, both academic and non-academic, relating to the introduction of educational technology in instruction.


Section 42-49. Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy, both academic and non-academic, relating to improvement of teaching and learning in the University; including distance learning, educational outreach and summer quarter, and the use of educational technology in instruction.

Submitted by:
Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
February 22, 2010

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
February 22, 2010

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
March 11, 2010
November 16, 2009 Senate Executive Committee  
Request for Code Interpretation  
David Lovell, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

In deliberations of the Special Committee to re-evaluate the salary policy, jointly appointed by the President and the Senate Chair, two primary considerations have emerged:

1. Emergency Class A legislation to change the Faculty Code should be avoided if possible;  
2. If any changes are needed in Executive Order #64, after the temporary suspension of parts of it expires, there should be sufficient time to deliberate in a problem-solving process that includes faculty and administration.

The request for interpretation of the Code responds to the first of these issues.

The possible need for changes in the Code arises from 24.70.B.1: A salary increase shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal-percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review . . .

The administration and the Board of Regents have evidently been advised that this provision may require a substantial equal merit increase, notwithstanding the provisions of any Executive Order, and that this requirement would take effect in July of 2010.

A further relevant provision is 24.71.A: The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and, each biennium, shall recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in 24.70. B . . .

As Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, I would like to request that the Senate Executive Committee address two questions of Faculty Code interpretation:

1. What is the range of an initial minimum equal-percentage increase that would satisfy the requirement of 24.70.B.1?  
2. The principles of this code are implemented by an Executive Order that prescribes an initial minimum equal percentage merit increase under normal circumstances. If severe decreases in the UW’s core educational budget lead to consideration of an initial equal merit increase lower than the percentage stipulated under normal circumstances:

   a. Do the references in 24.71.A to consultation and to “the allocation of available funds for salary increases” require that the Provost consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting on the amount of a minimum equal-percentage merit increase?  
   b. If so, what elements are required as necessary to achieve consultation on the amount of a minimum equal-percentage merit increase under extraordinary circumstances?
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY CODE AND REGULATIONS

The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations has been asked to render an advisory opinion on the interpretation of the initial minimum equal-percentage increase required by Section 24.70.B.1 of the Code, and the nature of any consultation required for determination of the minimum equal-percentage merit increase.

1. Section 24-70.B. 1 provides:

“A salary increase

“1. Shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review . . .”

The first question asked of the Committee is “What is the range of an initial minimum equal-percentage increase that would satisfy the requirement of 24.70.B.1?” Because the Code language itself gives no guidance on that question, we consulted the documented history of this provision and the corresponding Executive Order No. 64. In particular, we reviewed the Report and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Faculty Salaries, dated June 1998, and the minutes of meetings of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee where the report was considered and the revisions to the faculty salary policy were considered. As confirmed in SEC minutes of a meeting held March 1, 1999, and by the recollection of Miceal Vaughn, the Code provisions were purposefully not specific as to the minimum percentage, leaving that detail to the Executive Order, because “principles are to be enunciated in the Faculty Code and implementation mechanisms are to appear in an Executive Order, where they are more easily adapted to changing circumstances than through the laborious process of amending the Code.” (remarks of Provost Huntsman). Because omission of a specific percentage in the Code provision was intentional, the Code itself does not mandate the 2% figure found in the Executive Order. However, the equal percentage contemplated by the faculty in adopting this language was some figure that would reflect minimum salary progression over the course of a career for meritorious faculty. At the time, an acceptable minimum career progression for a meritorious faculty member was considered as a rise in salary over the course of a 30 year career to 2 to 2.5 times the entry level salary. When discussing various percentages, this multiple was considered as well as the average increases at peer institutions. Also considered was the fact that if the number was set too high, there could be insufficient funds to cover other needs. A 2% annual raise coupled with promotion increases would approach that figure. Two percent was considered a minimum as consideration for the additional merit review requirements that were being added to the Code as part of the same revision.

A primary goal of the revisions was a change in the priority of allocating funds available for salary increases. As concluded in the opinion of the Committee issued on May 2, 2002, funds must first be allocated to the minimum equal percentage increase for meritorious faculty and for promotion and increase to minimum salary per rank, before allocation of funds for retention or other purposes.

In reviewing this history, the Committee concluded that while 2% was not mandated by the Code, any variation on the 2% must be based on a consideration of a minimum salary progression over the course of a career of a meritorious faculty member, and any percentage must support that progression. That percentage may very well be lower, considering that current economic conditions are interrupting salary progression at peer institutions and should also be taken into account here. However, to be in compliance with the Code language, an analysis must be undertaken of what normal salary progression should be currently in light of the changed economic circumstances. Please note that we have not been asked whether such reconsideration and redefinition of the percentage would satisfy the terms of Executive Order No. 64, and we do not address that here.

2. Section 24.71.A states:

“The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and, each biennium, shall subsequently recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in Section 24-70.B. The President
shall make the final decision on these allocations and shall report the decision to the Faculty Senate.”

The question asked is whether this consultation would be applicable to the reconsideration of the minimum percentage. The Committee believes that such consultation would be required if there were sufficient funds available for salary increases to meet the existing percentage but there was a recalculation of that percentage. For example, if the funds available for salary increases was sufficient to cover the 2% but would leave nothing for other purposes such as retention, any recalculation would require SCPB consultation. However, again, consultation and consideration necessary for recalculation of the percentage that would satisfy Executive Order No. 64 is a separate question from the one asked.

The Committee was also asked, if consultation was necessary, what elements would be required. The Committee concludes that, based on the history of these provisions, the SCPB must be consulted and allowed to give input on what would be a reasonable percentage based on normal salary progression during current economic conditions.

3. While the Committee was not asked to consider the requirements of any change to Executive Order No. 64, in our consideration of the history of these provisions we concluded that the structure of the 1999 changes to the policy indicate that the 2% mandated in the Executive Order can be re-evaluated, that such re-evaluation was contemplated for changing circumstances, but that any such re-evaluation must take into account the underlying factors used to determine the 2% figure in 1999. Therefore, reevaluation should consider the ultimate goal of providing a salary progression over the course of the career of a meritorious faculty member, as a first priority for any funds available for salary increases, and in light of salary progression at peer institutions.

Respectfully submitted this December 23, 2009,

Karen Boxx, Acting Chair
Sandra Silberstein
Vincent Gallucci
Richard Christie
Michael Townsend
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
THURSDAY, 22 April 2010
Gowen Hall, Room 301, 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Introductory Comments – Professor Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate.
   Student Public Service Recognition - Janice DeCosimo and Bruce Balick.


4. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting – Professor David Lovell,
   Committee Chair.

5. Legislative Report – Professor Jim Fridley, Faculty Legislative Representative.

6. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty – Professor Marcia Killien.

7. Nominations and Appointments.
   a. Remarks from 2010-11 Faculty Senate Vice Chair Nominees.
   b. Action: Approve Xheni Diko, ASUW representative ex-officio member on the Faculty Council on
      Tri-campus Policy for a term effective immediately and ending September 15, 2010, with voting
      rights to be determined by the SEC through the faculty council.
   c. Action: Confirm Jim Fridley as 2010-2011 Faculty Legislative Representative, for a term
      beginning August 1, 2010 and ending July 31, 2011.


10. Announcements.

11. Requests for Information.
    Activity Based Budgeting – Phyllis Wise, Provost & Executive Vice President.

12. Memorial Resolution.

    Class A Legislation – Final Consideration.
    Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.
    Title: Proposed Changes to the Faculty Council Structure – Volume Two, Part IV, Chapter 42.
    Action: Conduct final review of proposal to submit legislation to the faculty for approval or rejection.


15. Adjournment.

PREPARED BY: Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
APPROVED BY: Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary, it will be held on Thursday, April 29 at 2:30 p.m. in Gowen 301.