

Spring 4-9-2014

Senate Meeting, April 9, 2014

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, April 9, 2014" (2014). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 904.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/904>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Minutes
Wednesday, April 9, 2014
(Approved)

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Dan Holland called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary Susan Kalter called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of March 26, 2014

Motion XLV-58: By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Albo, to approve the minutes.

Senator Kalter: In the minutes, it says members of the Faculty Affairs Committee met with Lisa Huson, but then in Exec, it appears it was just the chair of the committee. Is that correct?

Senator Horst: And John Bauer. We were the members.

Senator Smudde: On page two, it refers to President Flanagan. That needs to be corrected.

The minutes, as amended, were unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Holland: I would like to congratulate Senate Smudde for his receipt of the College Researcher Award. We have a change in the Information Items this evening. It has been requested as our general policy of having as many eyes as possible look at things, the president's cabinet would like to discuss the Policy on Creation and Revisions of Policy before we bring it to the Senate. I have agreed to that. Effective July 1, I will be taking over as Chair of the Physics Department, so I will not be able to serve as Senate Chair. That means that somebody here needs to think very seriously about serving as Senate Chair next year. There are some nice perks that go along with it, such as half release time and a month summer salary. You also get to go and pick on the president and the provost every now and then and more committees than you can shake a stick at. You will learn more about the university than you would ever think possible. If anyone is interested, I would be happy to talk to them about it.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Alvarado: This Friday, we will be hosting the State Your Idea Campaign. That is an opportunity for members of the ISU community to come and meet their representing senators, both old and new. That's going to be in the Circus Room at 3:00 p.m. In addition, we just had our elections announcement last Wednesday, so if this person could stand for me, it is my privilege to welcome next year's Student Body President, Mr. Connor Joyce.

Senator Fazel: Earlier, you mentioned that the student body is going to do something about communicating to students that smoking is not allowed on the quad or south of the quad. I see many people who are smoking south of the College of Business. Is there any plan or is it already too late for this semester?

Senator Alvarado: I had a meeting with the Office of Health Promotion and Wellness and we were going to look at new and different ideas. One thing we did run into is we couldn't do the posters on the quad. There is a new policy that says we couldn't put them on the quad. So in the last email, it was mentioned; however, we are aware and so is Health Promotion that ever since the smoking policy came into effect, there has been heavier traffic outside of the quad next to Schroeder and the College of Business. That is something we are still looking at and figuring out what new ideas we can use to reach out to those students. We are still in the planning process.

Administrators' Remarks

- *President Larry Dietz*

President Dietz: Last week, I was on the road for three days. I was in Springfield for two of those days—one day meeting with legislators and individuals who are important to the university, but also particularly the Chair of the House Appropriations Committee, who I was going to appear before the next day. The day before that, I had a meeting in Grey's Lake up near Chicago with the Illinois Board of Higher Education. It also gave me an opportunity to meet the presidents and chancellors of all of the public universities in the state. They have a morning meeting before the IBHE meeting and all of that was terrifically helpful to put some names and faces and institutions together. They were very warmly welcoming to me. The bulk of those conversations, including the testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, was about the budget. We went down with the same team as we had before—Senator Alt, Jonathan Rosenthal, Sandy Cavi from the budget was also there. Jay Groves went with me those two days in Springfield.

The governor's budget, if the tax increase is not passed on a permanent basis, suggests a 12.4% cut in general revenue funding. At the last meeting, I think I mentioned that at one time we were given a 27% reduction and then a 20% and now a 12.4%. We are going in the right direction and I would fully expect that it is not going to be that high, but I am always a proponent for planning for the worst and hoping for the best. So the final hearing gave us an opportunity to emphasize how Illinois State stands out among the other institutions and all of that is about our retention rate, our graduation rate, the academic profile of our student body and received terrific kudos on really all of your hard work as the faculty, staff and students that result in that stellar graduation rate performance.

I was the third person to testify that morning, and I won't mention the institution that went before me, but the chair, in his last question of the person that went before me, was simply "Why can't your institution be more like Illinois State University?" That is heavy praise for this institution. We have positioned ourselves very well with the positive things that are coming out of here.

There were also some questions about the payout and I fielded as best I could that information about the payout. There is an article in the *Vidette* today that did a pretty good job of describing what really can be said about that. We have agreed that the payout will not come from the 18% general revenue—18% of our budget comes from the state and we have decided that this payout will not come from state appropriations. Nor will it come from mandatory tuition and fees paid by students and parents. Nor will it be paid for out of private donations going through the Foundation. You might say what is left out of all of this. I really want to credit Senator Alt with his creativity on this. He and I had a great deal of conversation about that and we have a number of what we call locally generated revenue accounts. Those are accounts that generate revenue from transaction charges at the Subway, late fees for different fee structures, interest income that we are able to generate and if you have more questions about that, I will ask Senator Alt to talk about that. Basically, I think it is important for people to know that if they are contributing to this university that their private donations are not going for this kind of expenditure. If you are paying tuition and fees, those dollars are not going for this kind of expenditure, and for the legislators to know that the dollars that they are appropriating for us are also not going for this kind of one-time expenditure.

At this point, we are looking at many different budget scenarios for next year and we hope to know something about the budget by the end of May. This could mean a delay in a number of things on the campus and might be a delay in the time that the board might act on tuition and fees because we are in such an uncertain situation with the budget that, frankly, it doesn't make a lot of sense for us to take proposals before the board not knowing where we are going to be. So normally, we like to have decisions about tuition and fees made as early as March if at all possible, but historically it has been in May. But I think the budget is really going to determine when we take that before the board.

I would like to talk briefly about the meeting with the IBHE. That was a productive meeting. I got to meet the new Executive Director, who has the dubious honor of not only chairing the IBHE, but also the SURS Board. I

was very impressed with her. She is a very articulate, bright, young lady who really did a good job of chairing those meetings. Some of the issues that came up, obviously the budget—that kind of trumps everything, transfer policies, articulation agreements, MAP funding and the list went on. It was a good meeting and I look forward to continuing to attend those and participate.

Another item you might be interested in is the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. I have just finished talking to everyone who expressed interest in that position and who meet the criteria. I really appreciate the suggestions that came from some of you. A decision on that will be made in the very near future—possibly next week with the idea that they will be in the interim position probably for up to the end of the next fiscal year, so June 30, 2015. As I mentioned earlier, we will probably start a search on that sometime in the fall and all of you will have your regular role with those kinds of searches.

There was a question I received from this group the last time we met and it was related to search firms and search firm policy. I appreciate Melanie Schaafsma from Human Resources; she is the director of academic employment. There was a state law that went into effect July 1 of last year that governs the use of search firms. The required procedures are outlined in ISU policy 3.4.13. There is a website that goes with that, but the policy states that the hiring department, in conjunction with Human Resources, must make the request to use an external search firm in writing to the president. The request should establish that there is justifiable need for guidance from an individual or firm with specific expertise in the field of hiring. The policy details the criteria to be used in the request and then it asks that these guidelines be followed to make the request and forward it to her. HR then reviews the request and forwards it on to the president to request approval. Once presidential approval has happened, Purchasing makes a copy of the approval and a requisition for the services before the services begin. If you have more questions, I would be happy to answer those or get the answer from Melanie.

- ***Provost Sheri Everts – Absent***

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Brent Paterson***

Vice President Paterson: Thank you for the very warm welcome last week. I wanted to share with you some of the changes in organization that are happening in Student Affairs. President Dietz suggested that as I became Interim Vice President for Student Affairs, I just continue to carry on the roles I had as Associate Vice President of Student Affairs. I said that is not going to work. We are working on what that interim structure will look like. I have appointed Dr. Danielle Miller Schuster as the Interim Associate Vice President for Student Affairs. She is going to be supervising the Bone Student Center, Career Center, Student Fitness Center and Campus Recreation. She was previously Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs and will continue in some of those roles concerning division-wide planning, some of the assessment that our division is involved in as well as helping to coordinate our division development efforts. I will continue to supervise Campus Dining Services, University Housing Services and University Police, in addition to other duties. We have initiated a search for a new Assistant Vice President/Dean of Students. I have a relationship with the Dean of Students. She happens to be my wife and so that was problematic in moving forward in the role. Jan does not report to me at work. We hope to have someone in place by the end of the summer. Jan will be continuing in that role on an interim basis until we are able to fill that and she is now reporting to Jay Groves. We are also conducting a search for a Director of University Housing Services. Maureen Blair, who has been in that role for about 15 years, is retiring. We will have candidates on campus within the next couple of weeks.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Greg Alt***

Vice President Alt: I don't have a lot of substantive new information to share other than to update the status on some previous issues. Moody's affirmed our credit rating at -A3, which is what we hoped for given the state's situation. To piggyback on what President Dietz said on the success of the university, these credit ratings are not just a matter of dollars and cents, even though that is an important component of it. The one thing that supports our credit rating is our success as an institution in enrollment, graduation, retention and all those things. Those are the factors that help us to maintain our credit rating. Our hope is our next rating release will be from S&P by Friday and we hope to retain our +A rating as well. The state payments have been keeping on schedule. The

state, even though they are behind, has been keeping to a very consistent schedule. When we talked about the decommissioning and demolition of the south campus residence halls, initially it was anticipated that that would occur this summer. Due to the complexity of the asbestos abatement, we have engaged an engineer to design a plan for the abatement. That will take a period of a few months even to just design, create specs in order to bring in an abatement contractor, which will take a few months to take out the asbestos. That will take us well into the fall so our actual demolition of that building may not occur until May of 15. You have to remember that these buildings were built early in the 1960s and asbestos is a very complicated matter.

Senator Kalter: I wanted to ask a couple of questions about the way in which the Flanagan payout will occur. I think I know where we pay interest, but I am not sure what kinds of accounts we have that give us interest. Can you clarify that?

Vice President Alt: The interest income?

Senator Kalter: Yes.

Vice President Alt: We have various reserve funds. For example, when we collect tuition early in the year and we invest that money on behalf of the university and that is retained in the income fund to supplement tuition. The same way with these with these miscellaneous, locally-generated funds, we do retain a reserve there. We don't let that cash stay idle; we invest it. We invest in treasury bills and such and we make interest income off of that.

Senator Kalter: The other part of that question is the inflow in terms of what do we usually use these funds for. The question in the public sphere is that we are taking almost \$500,000 away from the academic side and I think this response to that is an attempt to clear that up—that we are attempting to make sure that the students are held harmless, that we are not using tuition dollars, we are not using tax dollars. We must have some use for these funds usually.

Vice President Alt: It depends on the type of fund. Many of these funds have certain restrictions. Let me give an example. It is not one of these funds, but another locally-generated fund would be a parking fine. A parking fine is restricted to where we can only use it for the parking enterprise. These particular fees that we are using to offset this payment are not restricted in that manner. They are such things as the transaction fee we would charge Subway, Barnes and Noble pays it; the Alamo does to participate in using our redbird ID system. That is not restricted, so we use it actually to try to supplement either longer term needs or unexpected issues. I can give you an unexpected issue that the university might have to fund with this kind of unrestricted money. Occasionally, the IRS will do an audit of the university and occasionally not everything is perfect. Maybe there was a withholding or something turned in late and we might get a penalty; we would use it for something like that. There are a lot of little things like that that add up. Typically, it would be reserved for something unexpected or something longer term.

Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee:

Senator Stewart: At our last meeting, we went through our task list and determined that any other business that our committee had would have to wait until next year, so we did not meet tonight. They were a hard working group.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee:

Senator Smudde: The committee had Senator Paterson and the Director of Campus Dining Services, Arlene Hosea, as guests. We talked about the Sale or Distribution of Food Policy. Senator Paterson and Ms. Hosea gave us a good amount of background about the policy and ultimately we decided that we would like to see a revision to the policy for clarity and we will look at it by the next meeting, which will be the last meeting of the year. After that, we considered items for the task list and it looks like the Sale or Distribution of Food Policy

may be held over until next fall. We ran out of time to do anymore discussion in Executive Session about the deans' survey results.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Senator Horst: The committee met with Sam Catanzaro. We went over our response to the draft of the Suspension/Dismissal Policy. We started a conversation that I am sure we will continue next year regarding that policy. I believe this is our last committee meeting because the student senators change. Is that correct?

Senator Holland: At the next meeting, the time reserved for committee meetings would be used for the nomination of Senate officers in the Faculty Caucus.

Planning and Finance Committee:

Senator Rich: We have an item later on the agenda so I will yield my time to my future self.

Rules Committee:

Senator Bushell: We did a double check on the External Committee assignments, which we will vote on in caucus tonight. We have been trying to get to the AFEGC Policy for the past several meetings and we were able to get a semi-good conversation on it even though it is the last meeting for this particular group. At least we have some notes and we can turn that into an agenda item in the fall. We took one last look at the Athletics Council's bylaws. We have been working on that for the past several meetings and it has been back with Athletics and they have cleaned up the document and given it back to us for one final review. Essentially, we approved it tonight in our committee and want to bring it to the Senate as an Information Item next Senate meeting. I wanted to prep everyone to a proposal that that Information Item might turn into an Action Item at the next Senate meeting. So I would like to put everyone on task to really look at the document in case we are able to act on it. The Rules Committee has been working on this throughout the semester, as well as Athletics, and it would be a shame to let it sit over the summer and come back later in October in some meeting.

Information Items:

04.02.14.01 — Policy on Creation and Revision of Policies (Rules Committee)
(Removed at the Request of the President)

Senator Holland: We will be looking at this policy at a later time.

03.28.14.01 Academic Impact Fund Recommendations (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Smudde: During the year, we looked at the Academic Impact Fund and the report that we generated is the result of the meetings that we had that included Sheri Everts, Dan Layzell and Mardell Wilson. On the committee, Dan Layzell and Mardell Wilson are ex-officio members. Their help in revealing what is in these data was very valuable and very much appreciated. The report that we created is really the result of our wanting to help the university as a whole understand what is behind the numbers. So what you see in the document are a lot of recommendations that could be done to help further communicate and clarify why the Academic Impact Fund is so vital and so important. The AIF works as a kind of best practice for other universities. That is why you see the kind of recommendations that are there, beginning with the recognition of the many steps the Provost's Office goes through to communicate already what the AIF is and why it works and what it's for. Then we have more specific things that we are hopeful will add value to the Provost's Office and how that office explains the Academic Impact Fund and what it does for us.

Senator Kalter: I thought that this was an excellent set of recommendations and great work by the committee. For number 5, I was wondering if the thinking of the committee could come out a little bit more because I was having some trouble with the second sentence. You say "The Provost's Office has several times provided cogent explanations for why the AIF mechanism remains valuable to the university even though original circumstances that prompted its creation no longer apply so heavily". The second sentence says "We recommend the Provost's Office explain the substance and management of the AIF shifting to account for new circumstances the university faces as driven by instructional programs and external forces". I have the feeling I am putting the wrong emphasis somewhere in that sentence.

Senator Lessoff: The import of that is that the Provost's Office, just by the nature of the fund, has to treat the allocation of positions with something of a discretionary fashion. Their job is to make the call. Over the last several years on the committee, there has been a hope that the provost could articulate some of the rationale behind the way in which tenure-track lines are allocated from the AIF. That is what is meant by 'is driven by instructional programming' because that is often what people from the Provost's Office say when this comes up. 'We need to be able to move things around because of changes in curriculum and instruction needs.' The hope is that over time, the Provost's Office could articulate 'this is our strategy'.

Senator Kalter: My other question is somewhat related to that. I was looking at the other handout and the Provost's Office provides us with a cash flow on page 3. It's called Fiscal Year 13 Year End Summary. One of the things that is somewhat new is the strategic budget carryover in the temporary part. I was wondering if Dr. Wilson could give us some examples of what colleges ask for to use for the strategic budget carryover (SBC) and what has been approved.

Dr. Mardell Wilson, Associate Provost: The AIF SBC is a mechanism that allows us to carry money from one fiscal year to the other. In the AIF, we only use it for instructional-based requests. So, this particular year, and I had given the committee this evening where we are at year-to-date because you see a relatively large number for the end of fiscal year 13. However, in calendar year 13, we only had 28 retirements and resignations, but we had 46 hires, so therefore, the temporary variance, which is really the variance from that balance of the AIF, which is about \$5 million is utilized to fund things such as your instructional capacity, as well as sick and vacation payouts, etc. So currently year-to-date, we only have of that \$898,000, \$295,000 remaining. So we had to actually use some of those monies because of the much higher number of tenure-track faculty compared to what we had in retirements and resignations, which was a much lower year than has ever traditionally been experienced. In years before we had SBC and there were things in the AIF, we put them toward various academic-related requests, such as travel funds, supervision expenses, things such as that.

Senator Kalter: That is what I was going to ask because you do have a separate line for instructional capacity and General Ed. As I have always read this, instructional capacity is usually for hiring people for classroom instruction, whereas I think most of the strategic budget carryover requests were somewhat outside the traditional...

Dr. Wilson: My explanation there is just how we manage SBC in the Academic Impact Fund only. In terms of the campus-wide SBC requests, if, for example, you have a position that results from a non-reappointment, tenure denial or death, those dollars are retained in the units. They are not returned to the AIF and you may have had variance on that position as you searched. Let's say the position was \$80,000 and you had replacement costs at \$50,000. A dean might request that \$30,000 be SBC'd for next year's hire or hires from a variety of places to be used as startup costs. That's one example of where SBC has really been able to help with startup packages, purchasing equipment; that's another area. So if you have a way that you can save money to buy your \$45,000 spectrophotometer two budget years later, you might be able to save some variance, roll that to the next year and actually pay for a piece of equipment your operating budget could not otherwise afford in a given year.

03.28.14.02 Institutional Priorities Report (Planning and Finance Committee)

Senator Rich: Much of our focus this year in information sessions and discussions has been on financial concerns, particularly long-range financial concerns, and prospects for diversifying revenue. When we think about what this document is as an institutional priorities report, one way to think about it is it is part of a continuing conversation between the various constituencies of the Senate with the administration and an opportunity in the document to underline certain strengths, note areas of concern and to exchange ideas. So even with the existence of a clear vision through *Educating Illinois*, I think this serves a very valuable role.

In section A, the one new item of strengths to build on would be that we wanted to highlight ISU's ranking on value in some of the national rankings on value and that is a multidimensional measure. It is not tuition level; it's a variety of things including graduation and retention rates, etc. In section B, you will see a continued

emphasis on resources at the department level as a very important frontline place where a lot of what we do gets implemented. Also, there is a continued emphasis on human capital investments and support for research. In Section C, on infrastructure, including focus on classroom technology, as well as a new item, which is an inquiry on course management systems and some of the ongoing changes. Section D on financial sustainability is a new section this year. The long-range financial plan could lose momentum with the change in leadership, especially at the vice president level. If we approve this Institutional Priorities Report with this new section, the Academic Senate is going on record as encouraging continued progress on that effort. It is somewhat generally stated now, but as the conversation continues and as the long-range financial plan takes more tangible shape, then this place in the document becomes a place for that conversation to continue. The final request is for administrative action. The usual chain of events following this is upon adoption by the Senate, this goes to the president who asks all four of the vice presidents to work on detailed reports, which the committee receives in the fall, reviews, discusses and moves forward the future document.

Senator Kalter: I was drawn to A.3.1. because somebody in my department made a comment that the university spends more on housing than it does on academics. What I understood from the Executive Committee conversation was that the numbering is not supposed to be in any necessary order of priority, but I also wonder if the committee might consider rearranging 3.1 so that a document that can be public doesn't appear to be putting academic advising, for example, second to co-curricular kinds of activities.

Senator Rich: It is not in priority order and how it all reads together is part of the discussion. You mentioned advisement. In last year's document, one of the changes is that last year we put a lot of time and effort into a rather lengthy and itemized list and got a lengthy and detailed response and had a very good discussion over the past two years on that and what is here is vastly trimmed down to a kind of conclusion of this year's committee of where to go next. We spent a lot more time talking about advisement than anything else in item 3.

Senator Kalter: I will just leave my question on the table. If the committee could have a brief conversation about whether it might be a good idea to reorder those, I'd appreciate that.

Senator Rich: I will with that and any other thoughts and comments people have, I will circulate in writing and get feedback so that when we are debating I will have the feedback of the committee.

Senator Horst: Each year, the vice presidents come in the fall and they address these specific points to you in a report. Have you ever thought about combining their responses into some sort of document that the Senate could see evidence of this back and forth process? Also, could you explain full cost recovery in B.1.2?

Senator Rich: On the vice president reports, that's a good idea. I think we should discuss that some. The nature of their answers might be affected by what they think the distribution of that is. I will note that now it becomes official policy when they are saying something. Their responses are about 35 pages, so be prepared for additional reading.

Senator Horst: Executive summaries?

Senator Rich: That is something I will pass along in my notes to next year's committee. The full cost recovery, maybe Vice President Alt would be helpful on this one.

Vice President Alt: The practice is that we are required by statute that any fees we collect for credit hours go into the Income Fund. There are some exceptions that we permit that we call full cost recovery programs. If I am thinking correctly, that would be distance education and I think an online nursing program might be one other where we permit those funds to go to the department that does that.

Senator Horst: What does the term mean?

Vice President Alt: It's those programs that have that special exception to the funds generated from the tuition that go directly back into the program as opposed to the overall general university Income Fund.

04.01.14.01 General Education/Graduation Requirements - UCC Procedures Revisions (Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Stewart: After passing changes to the General Education Program, questions came up about the standard operating procedures for making changes in General Education and graduation requirements. Our detail person, Senator Kalter, volunteered to take this on. Jonathan Rosenthal gave some feedback. It basically asks who, where and how. Who generates ideas about changing General Education and graduation requirements? Where does it go? How do you go about doing it? There are instructions for thoroughly vetting all parties and which committees it goes through before it is finally approved by the Academic Senate.

Senator Fazel: On the second page, procedures for changes to graduation requirements, it says a call for revisions may be initiated by the Provost, Academic Senate or other appropriate constituency. Could you give me examples of other appropriate constituencies?

Senator Stewart: I would say any faculty who is a member of a department. Department chairs may have a question about graduation requirements and they could call for changes.

Dr. Jonathan Rosenthal: The specific instance that brought this about was the General Education Taskforce having some thoughts about writing across the curriculum, which is not specifically in General Education, but it would be a graduation requirement. Hence, we wanted to be sensitive to the Senate's concern that we have a process for changing not only General Education, but graduation requirements. Senator Kalter modeled the changes for graduation requirements on the changes to General Education.

Senator Horst: Is the underlined text being added to a current procedure?

Senator Stewart: There was no procedure that was written. That's the reason this document exists.

Senator Horst: So it's all new?

Senator Stewart: These were things that were being done, but we could not find any place that it had actually been written down for future generations.

Senator Horst: On the second page, it says "If necessary, the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee of the Senate or the Academic Affairs Committee may also send the proposed structure back to the UCC". I am a little puzzled as to why the Executive Committee is receiving that sort of power that they could send a proposed structure back without having it go through the Academic Affairs Committee.

Senator Kalter: Earlier in the year, we approved the procedures for changes to General Education and you might notice in that one—I think that is the one you actually pointed out on page 2. For the new stuff, we just copied that same procedure. My understanding is that is something the Executive Committee has been able to do. If it is something that we don't want them to do, we should probably discuss that.

Senator Stewart: What the Executive Committee would be doing is sending it back to UCC for a second look. It is not tabling or getting rid of any action.

Senator Horst: So it would happen before it was assigned to Academic Affairs?

Senator Stewart: Right.

Senator Kalter: Sometimes the Executive Committee would send things back to the External Committee in order to save time because we knew it was something that needed to be looked at. I think that is open to debate and change if people want that.

Senator Horst: It makes sense; it would happen before...

Senator Stewart: Before it was assigned to Academic Affairs. UCC reports to Academic Affairs. The Executive Committee distributes to different committees and if they see that something is not quite ready to go to Academic Affairs, let's send it back to UCC so that we are not wasting our time in Academic Affairs.

Senator Horst: Maybe that could be spelled out a little more clearly. That mechanism makes sense to me. I was just a little bit puzzled about how it happened.

Advisory Item:

03.28.14.03 AFEGC Annual Report (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Holland: We now have an extraordinarily vague, intentionally vague, Advisory Item, the AFEGC Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Senator Horst: This is from the Chair of the AFEGC, Kim McCord. She is not able to be here, but I could forward your questions to her. Due to the confidential nature of this work, this report is typically vague.

Communications

Senator LaCasse: Coming up in Westoff Theatre is Shakespeare's *Pericles*, which will run April 17 through 19 and 22 through 26.

Senator Hoelscher: ISU, the College of Business and the Entrepreneurship Department had its first student team, Pack Back, go on *Shark Tank* and they won our startup competition three years ago and Mark Cuban agreed to finance them to the tune of \$350,000 for 20% of the company. I think that means they are worth \$1.25 million.

Senator Croker: There will be some noise happening on the quad next Friday evening. The Psi Chi and SPA Student Association—every year they do a spring social. Normally, they keep to themselves. This year, they will be out on the quad with some live music, tie dying of t-shirts, pizza and soda. Although the event is for the members of the society, the fact that we are on the quad means that anyone who happens to be bored on Friday night can come and learn about what psychology students like to do.

Senator Bushell: The south end of the quad is the Center for Visual Arts. The University Galleries are in there. The Student Annual is going up next week. The jurors were in today selecting all of the great work so the gallery staff will be hanging the show this week and in to next week.

Adjournment

Motion XLV-59: By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Stewart, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.