

Rutgers University Libraries Faculty Meeting
October 27, 2017, 9:15 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.
Pane Room, Alexander Library

Minutes

Present: Stephanie Bartz, Jeanne Boyle, Leslin Charles, Janet Croft, Melissa De Fino, Kayo Denda, Peggy Dreker, Bart Everts, Roberta Fitzpatrick, Bonnie Fong, Tom Frusciano, Mina Ghajar, Tom Glynn, Erika Gorder, Karen Hartman, Sarah Jewell, Amy Kimura, Triveni Kuchi, Angela Lawrence, Me Ling Lo, Megan Lotts, Tara Maharjan, Rhonda Marker, Krisellen Maloney, Kevin Mulcahy, Laura Mullen, Jill Nathanson, Jordan Nielsen, Jane Otto, Julie Peters, Janice Pilch, John Powell, Jon Saucedo, Ela Sosnowska, Elizabeth Surlles, Roberta Tipton, Lily Todorinova, Bob Vietrogoski, Victoria Wagner, Minglu Wang, Judit Ward, Ann Watkins, Mary Beth Weber, Zara Wilkinson, Ryan Womack, Yingting Zhang

- 1) Adoption of the agenda
The agenda was adopted as distributed.

- 2) Introduction of new Faculty and Guests – Maloney
Two new faculty members were introduced, Dee Magnoni, Assistant Vice President for Information Services and Director of New Brunswick Libraries (in absentia) and Amy Kimura, Web Services Librarian, Shared User Services.

- 3) Unfinished Business
 - a) Mentoring report – Weber
Weber reviewed highlights of the “Proposal for the Faculty Mentoring Program” (see Appendix A) submitted by the Mentoring Task Force. There was a discussion of the mechanism for terminating an unsuccessful match, as stated in the Program Administration section of the proposal. Opinions varied on the optimal length of a mentoring relationship and methods for changing mentors/mentees. No changes to the document were suggested, but it was stressed that it should be easy for both mentors and mentees to transition out of the program. The units, and faculty in general, also have a responsibility to mentor new faculty, in particular those on the tenure track.

The faculty voted to support the mentoring report as written. (Yes – 70%; No – 8%; Abstain – 22%)

 - b) Bylaws update – Maloney (30 minutes)
The Rutgers University Libraries Faculty has shared governance. The Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian (VP/UL) is the presiding officer and is a member of the faculty; the primary role of the faculty body is to act in an advisory capacity. Changes to the bylaws require the approval of the VP/UL.

The two most recent major changes to the bylaws violate university policy and raise issues related to collective bargaining. The bylaws will need to be revised. Suggested

language will be provided by the Office of Academic Labor Relations. Current practices do not need to change at this time.

i) Discussion of Units

Establishment of faculty units falls to the VP/UL rather than to the faculty body, although the intent is to make such decisions in consultation with the faculty. The current faculty units essentially mirror the administrative/organizational structure of the libraries, but units could change. The bylaws should not include issues outside the purview of the faculty, like the organization of the faculty units within the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process.

The current “Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions for University Library Faculty” identify the units as New Brunswick Libraries (NBL), Special Collections & University Archives (SCUA), Technical & Automated Services, Paul Robeson Library, and John Cotton Dana Library and branches. This is largely a carryover from previous years, as it does not clearly include all of the libraries administrative areas. Shared User Services is not specified. Since the organizational structure and instructions differ related to SCUA and New Brunswick, Maloney will consult with relevant units to determine the best way to proceed.

4) New Business

a) Tenure Track Faculty statement – Glynn

Glynn provided background for the “RUL Faculty Statement on Tenure” (see Appendix B) submitted by the Planning Committee. The statement is meant to inform discussions about new positions, not as a procedure or rule.

An amendment to paragraph two of the statement was offered. The faculty voted to change the fourth sentence to read “Moreover, the Libraries are an integral part of a leading research institution, and we therefore have an obligation to contribute to the advancement of scholarship, especially in library and information science.” (Yes – 75%; No – 6%; Abstain – 19%)

In a subsequent ballot, the faculty voted to endorse the statement with the amendment. (Yes – 67%; No – 17%; Abstain – 17%)

5) Report of the Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian – Maloney

Maloney reported on the process for setting priorities within the libraries. The process begins with the library directors and in the units (i.e., RBHS, NBL, Robeson, and Dana). The units are responsible for determining their local process. It is expected that the process will begin with environmental scans, which would lead to lists of priorities based on current needs that align with local priorities.

Four sets of often very different and competing lists of priorities are brought to Cabinet in the spring. The lists are reviewed for overlap, obvious win-win options, and other considerations that facilitate winnowing the requests. Consideration is given to what the central infrastructure units can accommodate and

what cannot be done. Once a final list is compiled, a follow-up meeting is held to determine if additional funding should be requested to cover priorities that could not be met with existing resources and what budget amount will need to be asked for. The budget request is made in October.

In the event that something unexpected comes up after priorities have already been set, Cabinet will revisit the priorities list to determine which existing priorities can be postponed to accommodate the new activities.

There was additional discussion of SOAR and other university initiatives such as OAT and ORCID and how they fit into libraries priorities.

6) Report of the Faculty Chair – Hartman

The Planning Committee has been focusing on the mentoring report, which was begun last year, and the statement on tenure track faculty.

The first faculty forum was held on September 15. It was a good meeting with many issues raised. A committee was subsequently formed to look at the libraries guidelines and documentation related to promotion and tenure. The committee will include representatives from the Planning Committee and members of the Personnel Policy and Affirmative Action Committee, and will be chaired by Kevin Mulcahy.

Anything on the faculty web pages needs to be approved by Maloney. The current content will remain, but the page is considered to be under construction.

7) Communications-All

None

8) Reports of Members Serving on University Bodies (5 minutes)

See Appendix C.

9) Reports of Standing Committees (5 minutes)

See Appendix D.

10) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Submitted by,

Stephanie Bartz, Faculty Secretary Pro Tem

Appendix A
Proposal for the Faculty Mentoring Program
Submitted by the Mentoring Task Force:
Leslin Charles, Kayo Denda, Christie Lutz and Mary Beth Weber
September 14, 2017

Background

The Planning Committee charged the Mentoring Task Force with evaluating the existing mentoring program and proposing a new model that more effectively meets the needs of Rutgers University Libraries (RUL) tenure track faculty librarians. The existing mentoring program was launched in 2006 and was subsequently revised. The Task Force also examined the Future Groups program, which was initiated by New Brunswick Libraries, and later offered broadly to librarians system wide.

Introduction

The RUL Faculty Mentoring Program was designed to help new tenure-track faculty members understand the institution and what is needed to fulfill the criteria required for promotion and tenure. Mentors assist new faculty in becoming familiar with the culture of RUL and the university, while helping to foster their professional development and involvement within the university. Mentors supplement the unit director and peer group's guidance, offering a complementary perspective on faculty matters and professional guidance.

Method

The Task Force began by reviewing the existing documentation on the RUL website.¹ The original mentoring report was written in 2006. An update lacking a date or attribution is also on the mentoring portion of the faculty section on the RUL website. Various forms for the mentorship program, including mentee and mentor evaluation forms, are available.

The Task Force recommends that these reports and forms be archived and advises that new guidelines and forms be prepared as appropriate.

The Task Force also conducted a survey and analyzed results. The survey addressed both the mentoring program and the Futures Group. A number of themes emerged from the survey responses. First, it appeared that the majority of respondents were in favor of a mentoring program. Those who had participated in a mentoring program at RUL or elsewhere cited their experience as positive.

Survey responses regarding the Futures Group noted that it tended to be New Brunswick centric in its focus. Respondents stated that the content provided in the Futures Group is necessary to provide a baseline of consistent information for both mentors and mentees.

¹ *The Faculty Mentoring Program*

https://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/lib_fac/word/Mentoring_Program.doc; *Mentoring Program Report*
<https://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/lib_fac/pdfs/mentoring_program_report.pdf>

The Task Force recommends providing an onboarding program in lieu of the Futures Group that offers programs geared towards tenure track faculty, but open to anyone. Programs would be offered multiple times during the year on a cyclical basis since new faculty are hired at different times, and schedule conflicts might prevent people from attending a specific meeting.

Additionally, the Task Force reviewed other mentoring program models for ideas that could perhaps be adopted for RUL's Faculty Mentoring Program. These programs include the Society for American Archivists, the Association of College and Research Libraries-NY Chapter, the Rutgers Connection Network Faculty to Faculty Mentoring Program, and Big Ten Academic Alliance member libraries (see the Appendix).

Goals

The Task Force proposes the following goals for the RUL Faculty Mentoring Program:

- To assist newly hired tenure track faculty at RUL to become familiar with and involved in the libraries and the university.
- To assist in providing a support system that is welcoming and safe, leading to productive professional paths.
- To support the professional development of new tenure-track faculty. This in turn will help them to successfully meet the requirements and be successful for promotion and tenure.

Process

The Task Force recommends the following:

- *Appointment:* The Planning Committee in collaboration with the Vice President for Information Services/University Librarian (VPI/UL) will appoint the members of the Mentoring Program Committee (2-3 people). These individuals will serve a three-year term and are eligible to be reappointed for an additional two-year term. Members of the Mentoring Program Committee will be chosen from the tenured library faculty, and do not need to be members of the Planning Committee. Mentors should ideally be from outside a tenure track faculty member's unit, but there may be exceptions and appointments will be made on a case by case basis.
- *Program Administration:* The Mentoring Program Committee will be responsible for the overall administration of the program and will
 - Issue a call for volunteers for mentors as needed.
 - Selects mentors based on current needs and matching interest with mentees.
 - Assign mentors prior to a new hire's start date to enable mentors to participate in the mentee's orientation and onboarding.
 - Ensure the total number of mentors will match the number of mentees.

- Ensure there is a mechanism for discretely terminating an unsuccessful match, or for assigning a new mentor in the event a mentor leaves RUL.
 - Organize an annual kick-off meeting with VPI/UL, relevant unit director/AUL, mentors and mentees to communicate expectations clearly and inform the enrichment program calendar.
 - Assess the program three times during the three-year period: after six months, one year, and at the end of the three-year program. The results of this assessment will be shared with the VPI/UL and the Planning Committee.
 - Hold a “graduation” ceremony for mentees when each group of matched pairs has concluded its relationship, and provide both parties with a certificate of completion.
 - Create an enrichment program on topics germane to new library faculty, including reappointment/promotion basics, time management and making time for research, writing and publication, the role of the Ad Hoc Personnel Chair and peer groups, and compiling a reappointment or tenure packet. This program will replace the Futures Group.
- *Duration:* The official Mentoring Program relationship will be for three years. After this period, matched pairs are free to continue the relationship on an informal basis.
 - *Mentoring Resources:* The Mentoring Program Committee will create and maintain a resources page with the program overview and guidelines and opportunities for new faculty.
 - *Mentors:*
 - Participate in the program voluntarily. Librarians selected to participate are required to commit for the duration of the program (three years).
 - Need to remain current regarding the university’s promotion and tenure process, including attending relevant meetings conducted by the VPI/UL, AAUP, etc.
 - Must be available to meet the mentee on a regular basis to address concerns, answer questions, and provide overall guidance. The matched pairs will set the frequency of these meetings and how they take place (in person, via Skype, email, etc.). It is suggested that matched pairs meet at least twice a semester.
 - *Mentees:*
 - Mandatory participation in the Mentoring Program.
 - Required to attend the enrichment programs.

Conclusion

In summary, the Task Force recommends

- Revising the RUL Faculty Mentoring Program
- Repurposing the Futures Group to serve as an onboarding group
- Examining and updating the existing documentation on the mentoring portion of the RUL website

- Assessing the program to gauge its effectiveness and areas of improvement three times during the three-year period: after six months, one year, and at the end of the three year program.

Coordination of the mentoring program and selection of mentors will be handled by the VPI/UL in conjunction with a small committee of members selected by the Planning Committee. The Task Force recommends implementing these changes since there are new hires and there will be more in the near future.

Appendix

Mentoring Programs

ACRL/NY (<http://acrlny.org/about2/mentoring-program/>)

- Mentors must have 5+ years of experience or an exceptional knowledge base in a specific area (administration, research and writing, project management, etc.)
- Must be a member of ACRL/NY
- Mentors must agree to participate in relevant discussion groups (New Members DG, for example) and/or other ACRL/NY committees
- Mentees are library school students, new librarians, or those with less than 5 years of professional library experience
- All mentees must participate in the ACRL/NY New Librarians DG
- Program runs for an academic year
- Mentors/mentees complete an application
- Accepted mentors/mentees **agree** to
 - complete the term of service
 - maintain regular contact
 - agree to meetings and/or stay in contact with the Mentoring Program Coordinator
 - notify the Mentoring Coordinator of any problems
- The program guidelines state that mentors will not be held accountable for any personnel actions involving mentees, including tenure, promotion, etc.
- Mentors/mentees have the option of signing up for the ACRL/NY Writing Accountability Program
 - Must be a member to participate
 - Connects individuals interested in or in the midst of research and writing who want a partner to share goals, set deadlines, discuss strategies, provide tips and advice, and to help find publication/presentation opportunities
 - Not a mentoring relationship
 - Agreement to connect on a regular basis
 - Hold each other accountable
 - Participants aren't expected to edit, proofread, or critique partners' work
 - Relationship and amount of effort expended are defined by the partners

Society of American Archivists (<https://www2.archivists.org/membership/mentoring>)

- In its 20th year
- Intended to bring together members with shared interest in various aspects of the archival profession
- Coordinated by SAA's Mentoring Program Subcommittee

- Goal is to cultivate career development and communication
- Every SAA member is eligible (student, educators, working archivists, records manager, retirees)
- Interested individuals complete an application form
- Members participate as mentors or protégés
- Matches made based on subject interests or geographic location
- When a match is made, a committee member notifies mentor and protégé, and provides contact information and suggested guidelines
- Participants determine expectations to stay involved for one year
- Participants can extend length of relationship if mutually agreed upon
- Mentors
 - Suggest CE opportunities
 - Introduce protégés to other professional colleagues
 - Serve as a resource person
- Protégés
 - Request guidance about resumes, career goals, or CE
 - Seek advice about sessions at the SAA Annual Meeting or how to become involved in SAA
- Mentoring opportunities are provided at the SAA Annual Meeting
 - Mentoring Program Meet and Greet for mentors/protégés to meet in person
 - Annual Meeting Career Center to discuss career options or discuss resume

Rutgers Connection Network Faculty to Faculty (<http://academicaffairs.rutgers.edu/rcn>)

- Intent is to increase the engagement and scholarly productivity of Rutgers faculty by providing the infrastructure, training and facilitation that enable faculty to participate in effective and collaborative mentoring partnerships with faculty outside their departments
- Interested parties submit an application
- Mentoring Executive Committee review applications, match pairs, check in with partners throughout the year
- Mentors/mentees agree to dedicate 2-3 hours per month for duration of program and to participate in the required orientation
- Yearlong mentoring partnership
- Two types of mentoring provided
 - Traditional mentor/mentee partnership
 - Peer-to-peer partnership
- Program activities include
 - Orientation
 - Pairs get acquainted and meet others in the network
 - Establish ground rules, expectations
 - Clarify goals for the year
 - Required Mentoring Skills Workshop
 - Two-Day Writing Retreat
 - Provides quiet time and space to get things done
 - Tips and tricks to become an effective writer
 - Consult with a coach and writing experts from grants administration, publishing, etc.

- Recognition Luncheon
Final program event
Contributions to the program and partnerships formally recognized
Participants are honored by deans, chairs, senior leadership
- Monthly one-on-one meetings with assigned partner
 - Check-in calls each semester from a member of the Mentoring Executive Committee to make sure partnership is on track, goals are being met, and to address any issues

BTAA Institutions

- Ohio State
 - Provide both an onboarding program and a mentoring program for librarians
 - Parallel, but slightly different programs for non-librarian staff members
 - Onboarding program assigns a designated onboarding buddy that's not the librarian's supervisor. Provides informal support and information/acclulturation
 - All untenured faculty are offered mentors to advise on promotion/tenure/governance
 - Mentors not required but are strongly encouraged for untenured librarians
 - No formal program, but more advice and the nature of the relationship is determined by partners
- University of Wisconsin
 - General Library System Mentorship Program
Recently restructured program from a "Senior Colleague" program handled by a governance unit of academic staff to a program more integrated into the library's administration unit
Provides a way to introduce and encourage experienced librarians and other library personnel to work together, network, and to create a supportive organization.
Open to anyone with 50% or greater year appointments
Designed to help library staff to succeed, to empower them within the organization, and to promote a sense of belonging.
Focus is on integrating people into the system and ensuring exposure to other parts of a decentralized library system.
UWM librarians are academic staff, not faculty. Have reviews, but not promotion and tenure.
Voluntary
Mentors and mentees develop goals, objectives, and guidelines for their mentorship year
Coordinated by a committee to ensure consistency in the program.
Toolkit to support program that provides reading resources, goals worksheet, activity ideas, organization chart, new employee orientation handbook, evaluation and advancement resources.
- Michigan State University
 - Library-wide mentoring program
Not limited to new librarians or just librarians.
Education Librarian serves as program organizer

Set “curriculum” for pairs to follow
Pairs are encouraged to work together on a project, perhaps write an article, develop a new workflow, plan an event, etc.
All participants take the DISC personality analysis in preparation for the kickoff event. Pairings are for one year.
Participation is not required
Serving as a mentor is credited as service Serving as a mentee is credited as part of their learning and scholarly activity criteria for evaluations

Mentoring Resources

- ALA Mentoring resources:
http://www.ala.org/educationcareers/mentoring/mentoring_and_recruitment_efforts
- Special Libraries Association Physics-Astronomy-Mathematics Division Mentoring Program: <http://pam.sla.org/projects/mentoring-services/mentoring-program/>
- Arizona State University Libraries, Academic Personnel: Online Resources for Mentoring: https://provost.asu.edu/academic_personnel/mentoring
- Steven Bell, “The next generation may not want your mentoring,” *Library Journal*, April 24, 2013, lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/04/opinion/leading-from-the-library/the-next-generation-may-not-want-your-mentoring-leading-from-the-library/#_
- Marta K. Lee, *Mentoring in the Library: Building for the Future* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2011).
- Audrey J. Murrell, “Five Key Steps for Effective Mentoring Relationships,” *Katz Quarterly* 1, no. 1 (2007).
- LibraryLinkNJ’s MentorNJ: <http://librarylinknj.org/MentorNJ>
- Julie Todaro, *Mentoring A to Z* (Chicago: ALA Editions, 2015)

Appendix B RUL Faculty Statement on Tenure Version D – October 27, 2017

In January of 2014, Rutgers and the AAUP-AFT signed a Memorandum of Agreement regarding Non-Tenure Track Faculty which set titles, minimum salaries, terms of appointment, and promotion pathways for non-tenure track faculty. The MOA was the result of a long series of negotiations and discussions stemming from the *2009 Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Task Force Final Report and Recommendations*² and the need to recognize and regularize the position of non-tenure-track faculty at Rutgers. While the Libraries have adopted the new titles and pathways set out for non-tenure-track library faculty, unlike other faculties³ we have never identified the circumstances under which it would be preferable to recruit an NTT or where we see the distinction between tenure-track and non-tenure-track library faculty. This statement attempts

² http://www.rutgersaaup.org/sites/default/files/images/NTT_Faculty_Task_Force_FinalReport_30April09.pdf

³ The New Brunswick School of Arts and Sciences, for example, states that "NTT Teaching Faculty appointments will be made in programs where student registration demand warrants full-time positions in addition to those in the tenure-track faculty" <<http://ooa.sas.rutgers.edu/documents/ooa/organizational-research-data-management/training-documents/non-tenure-track/867-sas-ntt-general-criteria-1/file>>.

to rectify these omissions. We hope it will be of use in making future decisions regarding new faculty positions.

What distinguishes a tenure-track or tenured librarian from an NTT colleague is the requirement for substantial, peer-reviewed scholarship and service to the profession or the scholarly community at the national or international level. Intensive, thoughtful research and writing, and collaboration with colleagues beyond Rutgers serve to hone our expertise and foster a more in-depth understanding of trends in the library profession. Tenure thus enables us to serve the Rutgers community more effectively. Moreover, the Libraries are an integral part of a leading research institution, and we therefore have a scholarly obligation to contribute to the advancement of scholarship, especially in library and information science. In addition, employment security after achieving tenure ensures a stable, experienced faculty with an intimate knowledge of the university and the needs of its faculty, staff, and students. It gives us credibility when working with our teaching colleagues. Tenure also safeguards the academic freedom of the Libraries faculty. As the *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians* affirms, academic freedom for librarians is vital to the mission of the University because “they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of ensuring the intellectual freedom of the academic community through the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial.”⁴

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, tenure-track positions attract and *retain* the most qualified, most highly motivated candidates.

We recognize that there are circumstances under which it may be preferable to recruit a non-tenure track librarian (NTT). However the decision to recruit an NTT should always be based on the specifics of that particular position; it should never be a decision based solely on financial considerations. For example, hiring an NTT may be appropriate if we require a specific set of skills or expertise, but expect that need will only exist for a limited time. It may be appropriate if there is a need for a librarian with a very limited focus; for example, someone recruited to spend almost all of their time at the Reference Desk, processing special collections, or managing metadata. Grant or contract funded positions are, by their nature, normally NTTs, since the funds are available only for a specified period. In some cases, it may be appropriate to hire an NTT while we are in the process of recruiting a tenure-track librarian or to serve as a temporary replacement while a colleague is on a long-term leave and we cannot replace him or her by “closing ranks.”

The faculty realize that we have in the past, for various reasons, recruited NTTs that do not meet the criteria outlined above. Our advice in this statement is forward looking. We hope in future to have a consistent policy towards NTTs that serves the best interests of the Libraries. However, we also strongly believe that there are clear, substantial benefits to the Libraries and our users in recruiting new librarians on the tenure track and remain committed to tenure status for librarians.

⁴ <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/jointstatementfaculty> Prepared by the Joint Committee on College Library Problems, a national committee representing the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities), and the American Association of University Professors in 1972; revised October 2012.

Appendix C
Reports of Members Serving on University Bodies
October 2017

- **University Senate** – Natalie Borisovets

The University Senate has met twice since the last Library Faculty meeting, on September 22 and October 20.

September 22, 2017

There was one action item on the agenda:

Academic Standards, Regulations and Admissions Committee (ASRAC) **presented their**
[Response to Charge S-1509 on Default 17-Year Academic Calendar](http://senate.rutgers.edu/ASRACOnS1509Default17YearAcademicCalendarSeptember2017.pdf)

<http://senate.rutgers.edu/ASRACOnS1509Default17YearAcademicCalendarSeptember2017.pdf>

The Report (and calendar) were approved unanimously.

Most of the meeting was devoted to President Barchi's Annual Report to the Senate; full report available at: <https://president.rutgers.edu/public-remarks/speeches-and-writings/president-s-2017-report-university-senate>

October 20, 2017

This year, it was decided to extend the Senate Committee meetings during the October meeting date in order to allow Committees to get a jump start on their charges. Therefore the full Senate meeting was an abbreviated one.

The main item at the meeting was an update on the 2018 Middle States Commission Reaccreditation Self Study Report presented by Ann Gould, Co-Chair of the Self-Study Steering Committee. The draft report is available at:

https://oirap.rutgers.edu/DataAccessControl/Self_Study/login.aspx

All are urged to read the report and send any questions, comments, issues to the Steering Committee.

Natalie Borisovets
University Senator

- **New Brunswick Faculty Council** – Triveni Kuchi and Ryan Womack
October 26, 2017

Colleagues,

New Brunswick Faculty Council (NBFC) had its first meeting on September 29, 2017. The new Chancellor Deba Dutta presented his vision of outreach to New Brunswick and the broader NJ community as a land grant institution. Barbara Lee, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs presented a summary regarding the *Proposal to Improve the Evaluation of Teaching at Rutgers University*. Martin Gliserman updated everyone about the timings and topic (Discussion of the *Proposal to Improve the Evaluation of Teaching at Rutgers University*) of the Teaching Conference to be held on October 27. Subsequent to the meeting, a call for participation was sent out to all faculty to participate in this conference.

This year NBFC committees include:

- **Academic Affairs** – Bob Boikess (chair)
- **Athletics** – Ken Mc Keever (chair)
- **Budget, Planning, & Infrastructure** (co-chairs Triveni Kuchi/Ryan Womack)
- **Faculty and Personnel Affairs** (co-chairs Karen Thompson/Tugrul Ozel)
- **Student Affairs** (chair Sue Shapses)

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Respectfully submitted by

Triveni Kuchi
Ryan Womack

Appendix D
Reports of Standing Committees
October 2017

Rules of Procedure Committee – Stephanie Bartz and Tom Glynn

Since the June 2017 faculty meeting, the Rules of Procedure Committee has consulted with members of the Planning Committee regarding the membership of that committee as well as other issues related to bylaws.