

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Spring 2-22-2017

### Senate Meeting, February 22, 2017

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

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



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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 22, 2017" (2017). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 946.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/946>

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](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

**Academic Senate Minutes**  
**Wednesday, February 22, 2017**  
**(Approved)**

***Call to Order***

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

***Roll Call***

Senate Vice Chairperson Kyle Walsh called the roll and declared a quorum.

***Election of Academic Senate Secretary***

The Senate elected Martha Horst as Senate Secretary by acclamation, following the closing of nominations with no additional nominations from the floor.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Welcome! Thank you for serving, and we'll give you the roll call next time.

***Presentation on ISU Civic Action Plan (Jan Paterson, Director of Civic Engagement; Dr. Noha Shawki, Faculty Co-Chair, American Democracy Project)***

Senator Kalter: We're actually not going to have a presentation tonight. It turned out that Jan Patterson and Noha Shawki could not make it, so we're going to do that item after administrator's remarks and give them some feedback there.

***Chairperson's Remarks***

Senator Kalter: While Illinois State was preparing last week to celebrate Founders' Day, Governor Rauner was giving his annual budget address. The governor and both parties in the legislature have deserved the opprobrium of the state's citizens and our disgust as university citizens and as legislators for this university at their not being able, over the last two years, to arrive at a budget compromise. However, I would like to give credit where it is due. I do applaud Governor Rauner, first of all, for taking a balanced approach to the budget which includes both revenue enhancement and cuts to efficiencies in and restructuring of spending. And I think we should also praise him for emphasizing strong schools and the need to create job opportunities and for urging criminal justice reform, for pledging to fund school transportation costs, wanting to increase funding for English learners in early childhood education, for calling for the building of technological infrastructure in schools, and of course for proposing a 10% increase to MAP grants over the FY15 appropriations. That increase could allow 12,000 more students to receive funding. And I also thank him for laying down the principle that a state should not raise taxes on groceries or medicine or retirement income.

But I do want to address one item on which we and the governor differ, which was the subject of our January 25th letter to him. He said last Wednesday, "Most Illinois families have seen their healthcare insurance premiums skyrocket. So imagine what Illinois families think when they hear our state employees get 'Cadillac platinum coverage' for barely more than bronze rates. We cannot continue to ask taxpayers to pay more to subsidize state employee healthcare when they are seeing their own premiums go up and coverage go down. Our state employees should have healthcare options just like everyone else, and it is reasonable that they pay for those options in line with everyone else. Bringing the state employee health insurance program more in line with the private sector would save our state half a billion dollars." So, I've heard this genre of complaint before. I've heard it from my own relatives in Chicago, as a matter of fact, with regard to pensions. They often don't realize or seem to take in that we won't be receiving federal Social Security when we retire. But I do see their concerns when the case is posed as it is, and I take them seriously. However, I would ask the governor, legislators, and also those taxpayers who are not state employees for three considerations:

First, to put the comparison of state employee benefits into a historical and comprehensive perspective, making sure that when such comparisons are made, salaries and other factors are also included. Historically, benefits

packages have been higher for state and university employees to compensate for lower pay and other deficits in comparison to private sector employment, to be competitive with the private sector in hiring good talent. We need holistic data-driven information transparently and independently provided to assess the narrow claim that the governor asserted to justify his plan to double our premiums. This is especially important when we heard on January 25th from a very good authority that the proposal to increase our premiums may instead be a way to make state employees pay for the years of state delinquency in its reimbursements to healthcare providers. As a result, it ultimately pays exorbitant interest rates upon payment.

Second, just as I would argue that it is unwise and indeed hostile to small business owners to double the minimum wage in a single year rather than, for example, having it indexed to inflation in the first place so that that adjustment is constant and gradual, it's highly unwise to double healthcare premiums in one fell swoop. It's simply bad policy to impoverish already strapped lower wage workers and families already struggling to make ends meet. Several ISU employees have also told me that their healthcare costs are already almost too much for their families.

But most importantly, I would like to see evidence that the governor and other representatives are thinking creatively and outside the box to solve this and other problems and are working not to raise our costs to accommodate increases to the state in health benefits but to lower the overall costs of healthcare and healthcare insurance industries that are driving this insanity. What is the governor doing, for example, to lobby our Congress for a rollback of the non-deductible 40% excised tax on high-value health plans that the ACA will impose in 2018 or 2020? What is he doing to work with other governors, with federal officials, and industry leaders to reduce the cost of healthcare? to implement structural changes to a system whose costs for decades have been out of control? What is he doing to make it less difficult to find out what portions of the healthcare platter actually cost? Where does the money go? Where and why are costs rising and on and on? Secrecy surrounds the industry. For decades, there has been mystery or mystification or insufficient reporting, and one suspects consumers are paying for much more overhead than x-rays and MRIs, doctors' time and attention, non-elective surgeries, medicines, and elder care might really merit.

Governor Rauner should take his own lesson. You cannot solve the healthcare cost problem simply by raising revenue from your state employees. You also have to work towards ways to cut costs, restructure healthcare spending, and force efficiencies into especially the insurance component and any other parts of the healthcare industry complex that do not provide direct services to patients. Too often, our public discourse encourages races to the bottom, vengeful policy making. This should not be a race to the bottom where the government forces state employees to have it as bad as the private sector, but an effort to diminish the burden on whoever is paying too much relative to others and to reduce costs for all: the state, its employees, and the private sector's businesses and employees also. So that's my soapbox. I just wanted to make that comment based on his address last week and I'm happy to yield for questions.

### ***Student Body President's Remarks***

Senator Walsh: No soapbox today. Just wanted to keep you updated on some of the things that Student Government is working on. Much to thank for all of our members, but in particular Senator Picciola has been working to guide the It's On Us Committee. They are planning our It's On Us week, which will take place in April, which is directed towards raising awareness for sexual assault as well as preventing it.

Also, the Student Elections Committee will begin to hold info sessions for students who are interested in running for the Student Government Association. If you have students of your own who may be interested in doing so and you think would do a good job serving on the Senate and also within the General Assembly, I encourage you to please encourage them to attend those informational sessions. Those start Friday, March 3, and I believe those can also be found online.

Also, our Secretary of Sustainability, Dana Cichon, who is a former Senator from the College of Arts and Sciences last year, she has been working with real estate companies that lease apartments to students – so like SAMI, Young America, Walk2Class, and The Edge – and they're working on a two-year implementation plan to implement off-campus recycling. So, with that I yield for questions.

### ***Administrator's Remarks***

#### **• *President Larry Dietz***

President Dietz: Thank you very much. Senator Kalter, I would echo many of the observations and comments that you made in your opening remarks. Founders' Day was a terrific success. I want to say, once again, congratulations to all the faculty, staff, and students who received awards at that event, the various events around Founders' Day. It was very, very well attended and a highlight, obviously, was the honoring of Jane Lynch, and she was gratified to be honored in that way and promises to come back and help us in many ways. So I thought that the Founders' Day events of last week were really terrific, and thanks to those of you who participated in that. Last Friday was a relatively brief Board of Trustees meeting. The main thing that happened at that is that there was the official swearing in of trustees Rossmark, Jones, and Rauschenberger. I have had an opportunity to interact with those new individuals on the Board not only last Friday but in a on-boarding session that we had previously and then talked with them on the phone a number of times and I think that they're really going to do a terrific job, so it's great to have a complete Board and to have people that have passion for the university. So I was very thrilled about that.

A couple of issues. I was on a couple of conference calls today, one with a working group on capital budget, which sounds like something that's really more of a wish list than something that might happen because we don't have an operating budget. You usually have an operating budget before you have a capital budget. But nevertheless, the Illinois Board of Higher Education formed this working group on capital and there are some needs that are beginning to sort themselves out. No decisions were made today, but we're working on different categories of capital. It appears that based upon us not having a budget and having difficulty with deferred maintenance across the entire public university system that some campuses have boilers that are about to blow, water that's polluted, a variety of issues that are pretty critical in nature. So IBHE is wanting to re-develop the list of capital requests along the lines of having a category of emergency and critical needs, a second category of capital renewal (which has been with us for some time), a new category of capital requests for programs that have already been approved (and indeed some work has begun, but they've been stopped because of the budget impasse and the new College of Fine Arts would fit into that category), and then the last is simply new capital requests, and there are 31 projects that have been on that list. I don't see a time in the near future where those 31 projects are going to be addressed, but perhaps some of these earlier things about emergency, critical needs, capital renewal, and this new category about programs that have been approved but have been stopped because of the budget impasse, perhaps we can make some progress on that. So we had a meeting about that today.

Another issue that's brewing in the legislature, and I fully expect that we'll see a bill perhaps even later this week, and that's the community colleges wanting to offer four-year degrees in nursing. That's been with us for a while. It's been an issue for a long time, and that probably will be introduced in legislation later this week. The four-year public universities are opposed to that for a lot of reasons, but some of the reasons are that the need that the community colleges have said exists for nursing across the state is really not a need across the state. It's a need in specific geographic areas, and as we would potentially add nursing programs throughout the state at these community colleges, the issue for them is going to be accreditation. You need PhD faculty to be accredited, and there's a shortage of those faculty. That's why we have a PhD program in Nursing. And the second issue is that there's a shortage of clinical sites for those individuals to be involved with. So you may very well create more students in a queue, but at the bottom of the queue you're not going to have the clinical sites to handle all those folks. So we're trying to figure out how we address this in a diplomatic way without offending our community college colleagues, but they're really pushing this very much and some of them have already said that if they get the nursing it's just a start, that perhaps they should be offering other four-year programs, too, which is something that we obviously would be concerned about.

Lastly, I'd just like to say congratulations to the men's basketball team. I want to say when we win tonight, not if, but when we win tonight, they will set a record of being undefeated for the first time since the arena was built. So they've really done a great job, as have all of athletics, but we hope that they're going to be successful tonight and help celebrate with them. That ends my remarks. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to take them.

- ***Interim Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: Good evening. There are a few items that Jana Albrecht from Enrollment Management and I could not answer at the last meeting, so I thought I'd start with that information. So the first were a few admission questions that you had that we did a little homework on. Someone asked a question on average ACT and GPA of our first time in college students. So we think about this past fall of 2016. Really the trend has been very stable for both. So this past fall of 2016 the average ACT for first time in college students, our freshmen, the average ACT was 23.6, which was exactly what it was the previous fall of 2015, and it has ranged between 23.6 and 24 for the past six years, so we're really stable in terms of that average ACT. Then when you think of the average high school GPA for that same group, first time in college, it has ranged between 3.35 and 3.41 over the last six years and this past fall it was 3.36. One of the questions was the retention and graduation rates for our veteran students, and we do not track this information for this specific group. In the past we could not get that from the mainframe, but we are able to pull that now from Campus Solutions, so that is a piece of data that we will be able to have in the future. So that's a good thing. We were asked, do we ask for tribal affiliation on the admissions application? And no, our current Campus Solutions application does not allow for that unless we ask a stand-alone question of all applicants. So we would have to ask that for all applicants. It can't be a subset of any question. However, we are looking into the possibility of building our own admissions application, so Jana's office and then Charlie Edamala and Mark Walbert, their offices are all trying to... What we're really trying to do is figure out how much time it would take to develop another application, and you would be surprised how many hours it will take to develop a new application that can be used for all students. But if we do, if we are able to do that, then that is a question that we're going to be able to do that, if we design our own application form. And that goes along with the next question we were asked - if we could separate out Hispanic versus Latina/Latino students on the admission application. And so now students are asked if they are, one question, are you Latino/Latina or Hispanic? And the Campus Solutions, that's that canned application that we used as part of Campus Solutions, that admission application form is set up to mirror standard IPEDS reporting data which all universities are required to report. Again, if we find that we are able to build our own application over the next year, that's a question that then we can separate out and ask and get that data. So those were some admission questions. There was also a question about bridge programs, and I want to confirm that we do not currently have any formal bridge programs, although we have many first time in college students who begin taking classes in the summer rather than waiting until fall, so that is an option for students but we don't have any formal bridge programs right now. Any questions at all about things that I meant to ask... I think I did pretty good notes, so I think those were the main questions.

Two quick informational items, then. You should have received an e-mail from Educating Illinois Task Force asking you to take the Educating Illinois survey. I strongly encourage you to do so, and that survey remains open until Friday the 24th. Just a second reminder that the Three-Minute Thesis Competition is scheduled for tomorrow evening at 6 p.m. at the Normal theater. I think it should be really fun. It should be a great venue, but you have to bring your own Junior Mints. Any questions at all?

Senator Kalter: Questions for Senator Murphy? I'm just going to make a comment. The Data Stewardship & IT Council, I think is what they're called, just approved the creation of that new admissions software, or build your own system is what we were calling it, a couple days ago. And I don't know whether it has to go through another set of approvals, but I think, if I'm remembering correctly (Sam is right behind you sort of nodding his head), I think the number of hours to build the system was something like 900.

Associate Vice President Catanzaro: More than 900. I want to say in the vicinity of 1,200 hours.

Senator Kalter: In the vicinity of 1,200 hours, which of course is parceled out among various different kinds of people who work on it. So we're hopefully on our way.

Provost Murphy: Right. And that becomes the question of all the priorities we have for technology. Is that pretty massive project, you know, is it worth the 1,200 hours versus other priorities that the university has? We think so, but there are lots of things competing for the time of all of our AT folks.

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***

Vice President Johnson: Just two quick updates. One regarding the Greek Task Force. We have completed two meetings of that group, laying the foundation as relates to information sharing and all being on the same page as relates to factors involving the Greek system here on campus as well as what's happening nationally.

Tomorrow we begin our work to roll up our sleeves and actually begin making recommendations and formulating some thoughts about how to move forward. So we're excited about going into that phase of our work. The second thing I want to provide an update on, again, is the Climate Task Force Implementation Team. That group has met, and myself along with the Provost chairing that group. We have gone through each one of the short-term recommendations, vetted those. We have assigned areas and individuals to serve as champions for each one of the recommendations and are going into a phase now of sharing that back to the work group to make sure that we've got that correct, and then we'll move forward and pretty much pushing those out to those areas in order to start the good work of making things happen. So we're very excited about that piece. I want to thank the President for his continued support of the work taking place with the Climate Task Force as well as the Implementation Team as well as the work of the Implementation Team and the Climate Task Force group as well. And then the last item, there is a policy that's being reviewed related to flags and raising of flags on campus, of which that's been passed on to Student Affairs for us to provide some feedback on to bring back to this group then. That would conclude my report.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Any questions for Senator Johnson? Do you find the Display of Flags Policy scintillating?

Vice President Johnson: It is so deep. I can't wait to sink my teeth into it.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. We aim to serve in that way. Terrific.

Senator Blum: I have, not necessarily related to your particular remarks or maybe your class for the climate, but I was just reading in the news about change in policy regarding transgender students and I was just wondering in terms of the university, how are we making sure that we, you know, regardless of whatever is going on in national politics, that we make sure that we're addressing the needs of this group?

Vice President Johnson: Yeah. I would be remiss if I didn't share and make sure everyone knows that, as many of you all on a daily basis, practically hourly basis, that we are following and trying to keep up with the massive changes that are taking place, or the anticipated changes that might take place with federal policies or their stances and so forth. I think our stance and our approach is going to be as long as we're staying within the law and we're doing the things that are right for this campus, we're going to continue to push forward in making changes. Whether that's gender neutral restrooms throughout the campus community or supporting our students, be that transgender students, be that international students, be that students of color and so forth, we will maintain our commitment to those individuals and are trying to make sure that they know and understand that as well.

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

Senator Kalter: Senator Alt is not here, but he did send some comments so I'll just read those out. He sends a few pieces of information. "Student Accounts plans to activate an enhancement to the e-billing service for student bills within the next few weeks. Currently students and parents have the ability to access their student account for billing information and to make payments electronically. However, an electronic copy of the actual billing statement received in the mail will now be available. Viewing the actual billing statement may make it easier when discussing any billing questions with the Student Accounts office." So that's the first announcement. And the second one is, "As required by the Affordable Care Act, payroll will be sending 2016 1095-C forms to employees by March 2. This form provides health coverage information to the IRS and is not required for tax filing." I think he means now required for tax filing, actually, perhaps. "Information required for filing 2016 tax returns was provided in the W2 forms mailed in January and available online through iPeople." So I can take any questions in for him. I obviously can't answer them because these are not my areas of expertise.

***Advisory Items***

***02.14.17.05 – Email from Dr. Noha Shawki on ISU Civic Action Plan***

***02.14.17.06 - ISU Civic Action Plan***

***02.14.17.07 - Outcomes Tables for Admin Review***

***02.14.17.08 - Action Plan Appendix***

Senator Kalter: We've got two advisory items. The first one is from Dr. Noha Shawki of Politics and Government. As you read in her letter: "The president has signed on to Campus Compact, a coalition of colleges and universities that advance the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility." So they are showing us the draft version of ISU's Civic Action Plan, and this was originally (as you may have noticed from reading it) supposed to go only to the Executive Committee, but I felt that it was important for the whole Senate to see and to make comments on it. So we put it on the agenda sort of quickly because they have a quick timeline. So we have, I think, three different pieces. We have the actual plan itself, the outcomes tables, and the appendix. Does anybody have any comments, observations, questions? We may not be able to answer all of the questions if there are questions, but things that you want to, feedback that you want to give to this action plan?

Senator Cox: I have just a couple questions that I don't know if you want to pass along if you're not able to answer. I saw from the report that they had been in touch with a number of stakeholders in the process of drafting the Civic Action Plan, and I wondered if, before the plan is finalized and approved and implemented, if there would be an opportunity for other stakeholders, such as faculty as a whole or students, perhaps in an open forum, to provide input. Particularly, I think there might be interest in different perspectives about the priorities of the Civic Action Plan. For example, we've got a list of activities and outcomes and so on, and there doesn't seem to be any wait, but we know that resources, including time, will have to be parsed out so there should be some probably emphasis here and there. And some areas might be on social justice issues. Others might be on prioritizing social justice issues versus participation by faculty and staff, cultivating more of that and other such kinds of activities and aspirations. So I just wondered if there would be some kind of public forum, I guess is the best word, because my colleagues haven't heard anything about this at all. Noha Shawki is in my department, so except for little anecdotal passing through the hall kind of conversation, I didn't know any of the details at all. So I thought that perhaps the action plan might be improved with some different perspectives added to it. I noticed that, because I'm a little familiar with the Campus Compact program, it includes maybe a thousand and some universities and colleges, it's very visible and well known, that universities have adopted different priorities. And so I didn't know if we were modeling our Civic Action Plan, which is supposed to be sent off to Compact, if we're modeling it after some of our sister universities or our own particularities. So I was kind of curious about a little more detail. So that was one issue about whether or not they would be seeking more feedback. Because of that timeline, it looks like March 1<sup>st</sup> the President is going to approve it and then it's implemented right away, and I think something of this magnitude with such long-reaching consequences for ISU should be something shared. The plan should be shared with a broader base of stakeholders.

And then one is just a very tiny little thing that caught my attention on the outcomes matrix. The chart here. One of the measures for number 4, the outcome is to coordinate the programs and to gauge partnership and to determine how many faculty and students are engaged in researching social inequity and democratic processes, and one of the measures is Faculty Productivity Reports. So I wonder how they're going to audit, who's going to audit, what information from that, and if names are going to be attached to Productivity Reports. In other words, I am curious about how they're going to use our annual reports for measuring and for accountability reasons. I imagine this will be publicized, too, in terms of an indication for developing their mission.

Senator Kalter: Thank you, Senator Cox. I think both of those are really excellent questions. One of them was on my list, the Faculty Productivity Reports, and what you said about enlarging the number of stakeholders was why I thought that it should go to the full Senate, right? In that same spirit. That this is, indeed, I'm trying to remember how you put it, but it's a significant initiative. "Something of this magnitude with this long of a reach..." is what I wrote down, "... ought to be shared with a broader base," and I couldn't agree more. I think that's a really, really good point. Provost Murphy, did you have information about that?

Provost Murphy: I have at least partial answers for that. The decision to join Campus Compact was done fairly recently, and that date of when this is due is not our date; it's the Campus Compact's date. And this format is Campus Compact format, so I think that answers one question. That is not our decision on format. This is their format of how we have to lay out our plan. And when you look at that first column, those commitments, those are what Campus Compact nationwide has determined are the five commitments. So those are not our priorities but those are Campus Compact. But I would agree. I'm not disagreeing with the idea of getting this out campus-wide and asking for more input. I think they were running against a pretty tight timeline between the time the president decided to move forward with this, and this report is due to Campus Compact on March 1<sup>st</sup>. The other piece of that, I do know in terms of Faculty Productivity, actually Jeff and Ani and I have talked a little bit about that. Jan will be meeting with Jeff and Ani and talking to them and really looking for advice on how to gather that information. But the idea is not that they are going to be looking at Faculty Productivity Reports themselves, but rather is there a way to kind of gather that information from departments without it being too intrusive on department chairs. And you're right, though. It's not their place to go look through Faculty Productivity forms by any means. But how do we collect, kind of in a whole, information about what are faculty already doing that makes sense for Compact. So those are some partial answers. That's not a whole answer.

Senator Cox: So self-reporting might not be adequate.

Provost Murphy: I think self-reporting could work if we could capture fully all the things that our faculty are doing without it being too burdensome on faculty, really. Again, what they're really wanting to do, and Jeff and Ani and I talked a little bit about that, is to think, the other measures there were things like is there a way to capture what's already going on in classes by looking at syllabi. So, again we don't have to go back and try to... I think they're trying to find ways to gather data without being too burdensome on departments and chairs and faculty, truly. And they're looking maybe as a first line of question with the university Chairs' and Directors' Council, so I think they're a little bit open on that, but they'll look for guidance on how best to gather that information.

Senator Cox: Just a quick follow-up, if we don't meet that first deadline, is application possible or submission possible next year? Is it a cyclical, a yearly process?

Provost Murphy: Yeah. I definitely think it would push this off a full year. I'm not sure if that's...

Senator Cox: It would be a full year? I don't know.



Provost Murphy: Oh yeah. It would definitely push this off a full year, so I'm not sure how appropriate that would be. The other piece of that is that I believe this is a plan that can be updated annually, and so that might be another option too. Again, I'm not disagreeing with your concern. I don't mean to underestimate that concern.

Senator Kalter: What I understood you to be saying first was, while we may be meeting this March 1<sup>st</sup> deadline with only the stakeholders here and on the plan, that because it is a revisable plan we could gather in more stakeholders and get more feedback and continue to form it. So it's not a work in progress, but it's a document like *Educating Illinois* that can live and change.

Provost Murphy: That's how I feel. I feel like it's our plan, and so I think for them... I think, to me, we submit a plan on March 1<sup>st</sup> that shows we are an institution that plans and that we have the ability to plan forward. But I think, like any plan, this plan belongs to us. It doesn't belong to Campus Compact. But let me confirm that. I'm sort of answering on behalf of Jan, and I want to be a little bit careful about that and, between Senator Kalter and I, we'll certainly convey the concerns which are appropriate.

Senator Kalter: I want to second and echo what you said also about the Faculty Productivity Reports. To me, those are confidential personnel documents that really shouldn't be going outside of the ASPT process without somebody giving their express permission. And having us being compared to one another and all of that kind of stuff? But if there is a way to collect pertinent data about what we're doing, that's great. But I think that that needs to be taken off of this chart and replaced with something else. Maybe just say faculty activities or something like that. Reports of faculty activities. Are there other comments/observations?

Senator Haugo: I had a question or a concern about commitment 2 on the second page. If we look under indicators. The spirit of this, of the indicators, seems to be increased, increased, increased. But there is the statement, "at least one course in every major designated as community engagement." And, at a time when most of our programs are low on faculty, that seems perhaps too prescriptive and I'm questioning why it doesn't just say, "an increased number of courses designated as community engagement" rather than prescribing that, you know, every department needs to have one.

Senator Kalter: Interestingly, you also echo one of my other observations on this which was actually on number 4. I had written under indicators, "Why increase? What is the current inventory of the number of courses that explore inequality?" The way it's worded assumes that we're not already offering many, which to me, from my perspective, didn't seem really accurate. I think we have quite a number of courses. Maybe we don't have enough, but we have a lot of courses that explore inequality in one way or another.

Senator Cox: It does also assume that we have some sort of quantitative data that we can compare it to in a collection in a year. And I don't know that for many of these we have quantitative... that we have data. That sounds like something that's going to need to be done so that we have comparators down the road.

Senator Wortham: Mine has to do more with conceptualization. My reference point is the e-mail, the draft, the Civic Action Plan. And I would very much like to see a clear definition of terms that are used here. Two terms that show up quite a bit are social responsibility and social justice. Since there is a concept called self-responsibility and a concept called meritorious justice, I would like it to be much more clear as to exactly what they are referring to. And, similarly, with inequality, exactly how they intend to measure inequality. What are the characteristics of inequality they have in mind since inequality can also be indicated as either unjust or just inequality and it's not clear. The word inequality is used a lot in the appendix, and I'd just like it to be a little bit more clear about the usage of terminology.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. Thank you.

Senator Grzanich: Under Communications on the academic plan, for number 3 it says, "Staff and administrators will plan stories and interviews and student media outlets including..." and then they list student media outlets. Isn't the purpose of student media outlets to be ran by students?

Senator Kalter: Could you remind me where you are, exactly? I was trying to write down your comment.

Senator Grzanich: Communications in the ISU Civic Action Plan. Point 3.

Senator Horst: We were just discussing that the word request would be better than plan. That administrators don't plan, they should request to the students that they run stories.

Senator Kalter: Yours was much better than mine. I just said put dashes and parentheses in that section to clean it up a little bit. Anything else there? I think that's a really, really important point.

The other thing I had in that Civic Action Plan on the page before the one that Senator Grzanich was just referring to, it says "Administrative Groups including..." And, first of all, I don't consider the Academic Senate Executive Committee (not team - we don't have an executive team - we have a committee)... I don't really consider it an administrative group, so I would like them to say Administrative Groups and Governing Bodies because SGA also is not an administrative group. It's a governing body. So it would be nice to have that. But in any case, we need to cross out Executive Committee or Team because we actually decided to show it to the whole Senate anyway. So that part, I think, will need to be changed a little bit. Anybody else have any observations? Anything they see? Terrific. We will try to use our notes, Senator Murphy and I, and anyone else who took notes there, and also the recording to get that stuff back to them in time for them to submit this. Terrific.

We had indicated that we might put this up for endorsement. So one of the things we do with some advisory items such as these kinds of plans, strategic plans, those kinds of things, is the Senate will often endorse. Would we like to do that tonight? To endorse the direction of this Civic Action Plan? Senator Brauer is nodding. Senator Ward is nodding. Some other people are not so sure, it looked like. Senator Cox was, I'm not sure how I would describe that, but you were uncertain.

Senator Cox: Other than tweaking some of the items as we discussed earlier, for example, the Faculty Productivity and so on, I don't have a major concern except that related to the baseline information that we have about our current activities where it was pointed out everything says improve, improve, but the Civic Action Plan also states, the narrative portion states, that within this new office that's been created there is still a significant gap in our knowledge about civic engagement. So I wondered if there might not be a place to marry the two before the submission.

Provost Murphy: Senator Clark did remind me, and remember I took a little hiatus from administrative work and shut my brain off for a while, he did remind me that Jim Jawahar did a... We applied to be a Carnegie institution and he did a pretty massive data collection so they are starting from a baseline. I had just kind of forgotten that, really. So I'm looking back at Sam, and Sam is nodding. So I think actually they are starting at a bit of a baseline from the last time, and has it been maybe two years ago? A year? A couple years ago that we collected that data when we were applying to be a Carnegie – there's a name for it – civic engagement institution. So I think we actually do have some of that baseline data which might be what they're working from.

Senator Cox: Oh, and would it be possible, this is still a draft, to incorporate some more specific measures? Not necessarily to increase by 25%, but to target perhaps areas in which our current information shows that we need a boost in this or that, rather than everything being improved across the board. Improved levels. I'm thinking at

some point you're going to max out at how much civic engagement a department or a course can contribute. So it seems to me there ought to be some mention of target goals.

Provost Murphy: And perhaps our recommendation could be that for the on-campus document we could have them start to think about some target goals versus what we might send forward to the Compact. Would that make sense?

Senator Cox: If they don't require those target goals, yes.

Provost Murphy: Maybe as a partner document to this so that becomes more the on-campus working document. Do you think that might work?

Senator Cox: I think that sounds great.

Senator Blum: It seems like there's been a number of constructive feedback through various participants in the Senate. Would it make sense to have that feedback incorporated? I mean, I realize some of it is varying degrees. I think the principle of the document is fine. Let the feedback be incorporated, then the document come back, and then we can endorse it.

Senator Kalter: That seems reasonable to me, I think, actually, to wait on the endorsement because some of it was serious, so to speak. So that seems like a good idea to me. So why don't we do that? We may not make the March 1 deadline. We will not make the March 1 deadline for that, but we can do it after the fact and endorse the document itself, not necessarily the submission of the document to the Compact. Okay, great. Let's do that then.

***02.09.17.10 - Cover Letter UCC Annual Report 2015-2016 (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.09.17.11 - Annual Report 2015-2016 UCC to Academic Senate Complete w-Four & Out Course Deletion (Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: The next thing we're looking at is simply the University Curriculum Committee annual report. That's coming to us through Academic Affairs Committee. So, Senator Pancrazio, do you want to say anything about that? Is it pretty straightforward?

Senator Pancrazio: Not necessarily. It's a document that comes. It's a collection of the minutes from the University Curriculum Committee. As many of us know, it is one of the most busy committees on campus and they also keep very good minutes. We reviewed those on the Academic Affairs Committee, and we passed them onto the Executive Committee as they are. We believe they are completely in order.

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Anybody have any observations on those?

***Action Item:***

***01.26.17.07 - Academic Impact Fund (AIF) Annual Report to the Senate February 2017 (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

***01.26.17.08 - FY16 – Final Comprehensive Summary (AIF) (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Now we're going to move on to our action item, which is the Academic Impact Fund annual report and summary.

Senator Hoelscher: Last meeting we had it as an information item and we covered it in some thoroughness, so I'm going to just lay it in front of you. We have both the Academic Impact Fund report from Dr. Lacy and we also have our summation of that Academic Impact Fund report review that we did, all from the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, and I think at this point I would move to approve those and move them forward.

Motion, by Senator Hoelscher on behalf of Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee, to approve the AIF report.

Senator Kalter: Yes. In general we approve the one coming out of committee and the other one is sort of simply a report. But coming from committee, that does not need a second. So do we have any debate about that? All right. Before I say seeing none, etc., I'm just going to make a couple very brief notes. On the one that's coming out of the Provost's office, on page 6 there is a very, very small typo right underneath where it says "permanent funds with AIF distribution." You'll notice that right after it lists the numbers out of the College of Applied Science and Technology. There's a 20 and then an 18 coming from CAST, so it looks to me like that's supposed to be an 18. In other words, 18 positions came out of CAST, and I think they probably put down 20, but the totals actually add up for that to be 18. Then a couple weeks ago we noticed on page 9, the total on page 9 at the very bottom of the FY17 AIF amount funded column, right now it says \$2,633,805. It turns out that that's an incorrect calculation, so that should be \$2,777,805. So I just wanted to let people know that. There wasn't a really good place to say that, but there you go. Those numbers have been corrected in that report, but just not in the version that you may have. Any debate on that at all before we have a vote? All right.

The motion to approve the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee's annual report to the Senate on the Academic Impact Fund, passed unanimously.

***Information Items:***

***02.15.17.01 - Proposal for consent agenda for minor policy changes (Executive Committee)***

Senator Kalter: The first information item, Senator Gizzi is not here, but this originated from Senator Gizzi. It is a proposal for a consent agenda for minor policy changes. So I won't read the whole thing to you. I'll just make a statement about this and then we can talk about it as information. I don't really have, personally, a strong position on this proposal. I can kind of see both the pros and cons of doing this. I think the pros are pretty well articulated by Senator Gizzi. First of all, there are policies that we get that we look at, we review, we don't revise. Do we really need to spend the full Senate's time on them or could we do them by consent agenda? Sometimes we do have revisions, but they're so minor, again, as to sort of beg the question whether we need to put them on the agenda. And then, he articulates that this would reserve time for the 62 or so people who sit in this room so that we could talk about serious or contentious issues, discuss critical factors affecting us as an institution, have presentations, and simply engage in conversations with the administration.

Some of the cons that might come up, one of the reasons I think that a Senate exists is to ensure that many eyes are on a policy before it's revised, and occasionally, or maybe even often over the years, unexpected questions and discussion arises in a large group that wouldn't arise if it hadn't come to a large group. It doesn't necessarily occur to you in the quiet of your office. So sometimes it's not even anticipated by the Executive Committee. So that's potentially a con to moving to a consent agenda. Sometimes what one person sees as a minor change or uncontroversial, another person might recognize as very major or significant. And, of course, the Executive Committee and the internal committee never represent all of the colleges or department or student perspectives. So that's another possibility for that. Also, unlike the curriculum consent agenda, which goes through the department level curriculum committee, the college level one, and then the university level one, these kinds of policies usually are only seen by an internal committee and that's it, so that's another possibility.

The only other thing that I noted down is that it does cause a little bit of additional work for the Senate clerk to be kind of keeping track, initiating and tracking items that are going in several different directions. One way that we could accommodate that, potentially, is if we had a consent agenda, instead of putting it out there in the e-mail land, we could have it actually on our agenda each Wednesday night and then just have a time when we ask people, do you want to pull anything off the consent agenda. That way, you would get the materials that night, you could read through them before the night happens, and then if there's nothing that you see, you don't pull it off. But if somebody sees something, then we would pull it off. It's kind of like... I think the Peoria

City Council does it that way. So those are just some prefatory comments, pros and cons. Why don't we discuss this one? Anybody have any thoughts about this one?

Senator Horst: As Chair of the Rules Committee, we are going to be looking at the Senate bylaws and, although it is true that we do have a consent agenda for items that come from the Curriculum Committee, for instance, we don't really have anything in the bylaws currently that state that we can do that. I think this would really shift our behavior in how we treat items, and I think it is appropriate for us to consider this kind of change and how we do business when we address the Senate bylaws as a group next year. So if we are going to change the way we handle items, I'd like to do it via our document as opposed to just enacting this and then changing the bylaws. I'd rather change the bylaws.

Senator Kalter: All right. Other people have thoughts about that?

Senator Blum: I would just concur. Also, one of the things that's a little confusing to me is how do you decide what meets the threshold for consent agenda and what doesn't. So I think parsing that out, as you kind of stated in your opening remarks about it, can get a little bit complicated.

Senator Kalter: Are you referring to the part where I said what one person considers major, another one considers minor?

Senator Blum: Yes, exactly. It's my first year on the Senate and I'm on Rules and I've actually gained quite a good appreciation for the need for rules, right?

Senator Kalter: Other thoughts? I read somewhere a long time ago, and it served me well, that when you have a rule you have less conflict. Or presumably less conflict, which is interesting because there's already a lot of conflict. But that if you can follow a rule, it makes things less conflict-ridden because everybody knows what's supposed to happen, at least. Presumably.

Senator Horst: One of the rules we try to go by, and Senator Gizzi is always reminding us about, is that we have information items and action items and we try not to mix and match those, although we have tried that in the past. So that's something that we might consider when we're doing the bylaw review, whether or not we want to create some sort of vehicle that we can move things quickly from information to action item if we feel that there's not much debate happening. But that is one of our rules, and this just seems to go against some of the ways that we work currently, and it goes against what the bylaws say.

Senator Kalter: So are you saying, Senator Horst, that this is not one that we would want to move from information to action in one night?

Senator Horst: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Is that what you're saying? All right.

Senator Horst: Yes, I am saying that. I would actually like to just make a motion to table this and have us consider this proposal when we are looking at the Senate bylaws.

Senator Kalter: I was just about to ask if we need a second, but I already got one. Senator Walsh is seconding.

Motion, by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Walsh, to table the discussion.

Senator Kalter: Let's debate that, I guess is what we should do? Or no? Senator Powers, always my go-to person for rules. So we just vote on it? All right. Let's vote on that. Should we table this proposal and, how did you put it, have it go to Rules?

Senator Horst: No, reconsider it when we are considering the bylaws.

Senator Kalter: Okay, thank you.

The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Kalter: All right. We will table this until the bylaws have been considered, and we'll probably consider it with the bylaws. Wonderful. Thank you.

***02.14.17.02 - Policy 4.1.2 Course Proposals for Undergrad and Graduate Courses Clean Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.14.17.03 - Course Proposals for Undergrad and Graduate Courses Mark Up Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.10.17.09 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions Current Copy (Senate Clerk)***

***02.10.17.10 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions Mark Up Copy (Academic Affairs)***

***02.10.17.11 Policy 4.1.18 Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions Clean Copy (Academic Affairs)***

***02.10.17.12 Policy 7.7.4 Federal Perkins Loan Current Copy (Senate Clerk)***

***02.10.17.13 Policy 7.7.4 Federal Perkins Mark Up Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

***02.10.17.14 Policy 7.7.4 Federal Perkins Clean Copy (Academic Affairs Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Going onto the next information item, we've got coming out of Academic Affairs Committee, Policy 4.1.2, Course Proposals for Undergraduate and Graduate Courses. Senator Pancrazio, do you want to say anything about this one?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes. I'd like to present all three at the same time. For the most part, we have three different policies that we've reviewed as part of our normal policy review cycle. To begin the cycle, we sent these policies to the units that were overseeing and using the policies, asked them for their recommendations and how they wanted to update the policy to make sure that it was consistent with their current practices. It came back to the Academic Affairs Committee. We reviewed it ourselves. And in the case of the Perkins Loan, we did ask for additional clarifications because the language to our... We felt that the language was much too legalistic and in case someone had any difficulties with this, they needed to have that clarity. So we sent it back with our recommendations and two iterations later we had something that we were ready to pass on to the Executive Committee. As far as the Transfer for Credit from Other Institutions, that underwent substantial review to bring it up to our current practice with the credits coming in from community colleges, credit through examination, credit through military for our veterans and things like that, and also through some other state laws. There is now a new certificate of bi-literacy for students who speak more than one language at home and they are able to get that state seal. So we've updated all of those significantly and we present those for you and I'm ready to take questions.

Senator Kalter: Let's actually begin, even though we are doing all three at the same time, let's begin with any questions on the course proposals for undergraduate and graduate courses.

Anything on the transfer of credit from other institutions, 4.1.18?

And anything on the Federal Perkins Loan, 7.7.4? I'm tempted to ask whether you would like to move these from information to action on one night?

Senator Pancrazio: I'd like to place these for action items in our next Senate meeting, please.

Senator Kalter: In the next Senate meeting?

Senator Haugo: Or tonight?

Senator Pancrazio: Oh, tonight? Yeah, sure! Why not? (Laughter) I'm sorry. I can't hear you, Senator Kalter.

Senator Kalter: I believe in order to lift the rules, you need to have a two-thirds vote on that. So if you want to make the motion to move it from information to action, Senator Pancrazio?

Senator Pancrazio: Yes. I would like to make the motion to move these from informational items to action items so we can vote on those tonight with those two-thirds.

Motion, by Senator Pancrazio, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to move the policies from information item status to action item status.

Senator Kalter: Is there any debate on that motion? It does not need a second because it's coming from committee, essentially. All right. No debate.

Motion, by Senator Pancrazio, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, to approve revisions to the policies, Course Proposals for Undergrad and Graduate Courses, Transfer of Credit from Other Institutions, and Federal Perkins Loan

Senator Kalter: Excellent. And coming from committee, it does not need a second. So, is there any debate on approving these three policies?

Senator Cox: Just a quick question, and I don't know if I monkeyed with something and messed up the formatting, but on Policy 4.1.18, the Transfer From Other Institutions, on page 4, the second subheading, Illinois Transferable General Ed Core, the last sentence of the first paragraph begins with a T and then it looks like a hard return for "transfer students." I mean, it's just a format issue. Do you show that?

Senator Pancrazio: It could be.

Senator Kalter: Could you say, again, Senator Cox, what the heading was?

Senator Cox: It's on page 4. The heading is Illinois Transferable General Education. At the end of the first paragraph, there's a T, a capital T, instead of adjoining with the rest of the word which says "transfer," which is on the subsequent paragraph. It looks like a hard return was there.

Senator Pancrazio: It could be in the mark-up copy. Are you looking at the mark-up or the regular copy?

Senator Cox: I'm looking at the final copy. It's called current copy.

Senator Pancrazio: What is the subheading, please?

Senator Cox: The subheading is Illinois Transferable General Education Core Curriculum.

Senator Pancrazio: I see it.

Senator Kalter: That's the one that exists, not the one that we're revising to.

Senator Cox: But is it fixed on the draft copy?

Senator Pancrazio: It is fixed on the draft copy.

Senator Cox: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

Senator Kalter: All right. Any further debate, although that was, as we always loosely do Robert's Rules, that was more a question than debate. Any further debate?

The motion to approve revisions to the three policies passed unanimously.

***02.09.17.05 - AFEGC Description in Blue Book Current Copy (Rules Committee)***

***02.09.17.06 - AFEGC Description in Blue Book Proposed Inline Copy (Rules Committee: Information)***

***02.14.17.01 - AFEGC Description in Blue Book Proposed Copy (Rules Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. We have three revised policies. We'll move on to Rules Committee for the AFEGC description in the Blue Book, the changes to that.

Senator Horst: The AFEGC is a committee, and this is governed by the Policy 3.3.8, I believe, and the Faculty Caucus spent quite a lot of time revising this policy. In doing so, we changed the makeup of the committee and we changed some of the jurisdiction language. So, because that policy was changed by the Faculty Caucus, we need to change our description of this committee in the Senate Blue Book. All this language is basically coming straight from the AFEGC policy that Faculty Caucus worked on.

Senator Kalter: Are there any questions about the copy that you have in front of you? The process? This one, too, is very straightforward. So I'm also on this one, especially because we're beginning to prepare the Blue Book for orientation, I'm going to ask Senator Horst if you are interested in moving this from information to action this evening.

Senator Horst: I would like to make a motion that the Senate consider this as an action item since Gizzi is away.

Senator Kalter: Well, actually, Senator Gizzi is often seconded by me on the objection for moving things from information to action, so we won't blame it all on him. But I do think that this one can be taken care of tonight. So there has been a motion made that we move this from information to action. Do we have debate on that motion? Senator Walsh is saying we didn't officially make the motion. We don't need a second because it was coming from committee since you're the committee chair.

Senator Horst: I am making a motion that it be moved to an action item.

Senator Kalter: Okay. And I think we don't need a second on that, right, because it's coming from committee.

Motion, by Senator Horst, on behalf of Rules Committee, to move the revisions to the AFEGC description in the Blue Book from information item status to action item status. There was no debate. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: Okay, wonderful. Now we have it as an action item. Would you like to put the motion on the floor to change this description in the Blue Book?

Motion, by Senator Horst, on behalf of Rules Committee, to approve the revisions to the AFEGC description in the Blue Book.



Senator Kalter: All right. Is there any debate? Really? None at all? Okay.

The motion was unanimously approved.

***02.14.17.04 - Proposed edits to Senate bylaws, Art. III Sect. 6 – inline –(Rules Committee)***

Senator Kalter: Excellent. All right. This last one I'm not going to allow a motion to move it from information to action because it is part of the Senate bylaws. So let's just have Senator Horst describe it to us and we'll talk about any questions that we may have and then we'll see it again on another night.

Senator Horst: Well, as you heard, there is a task force that will be trying to come up with a new draft of the bylaws that the Rules Committee can work on next year. But before we consider the entire bylaws, Senator Kalter did alert me to the fact that our election procedures for external committees, our procedures for that in our bylaws, do not necessarily conform with how we do business in the Senate currently. And because we do have the external committee elections coming up, we thought it prudent to change this language on its own as opposed to waiting, as I just suggested on the other item. And so we are suggesting these edits to the bylaws so that it conforms with the way the Senate traditionally does this task.

Senator Kalter: Any observations, comments, questions? This is the information stage for this one. All right. Then I only have one question, and that is it's not my intention to delay the vote, so is it all right with everybody if we put it on in, it won't be two weeks, it will be a little bit after Spring Break because we're going to try to cancel the next Senate meeting, the one on March 8, so that we can have a Faculty Caucus meeting with the Educating Illinois Task Force. So it would wait a month but we wouldn't wait until the bylaws change. Does anyone feel uncomfortable if we put it on as an action item on March 29<sup>th</sup>? Looks like not. All right. We will do that, then. Thank you very much. And those are our big pieces of business for the night, so let's go to committee reports from Academic Affairs Committee.

***Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio***

Senator Pancrazio: We meet this evening. We circulated the minutes and then we'll get those back through the e-mail and we're finishing up one last item and we'll have Policy 2.1.1 to the Executive Committee this week.

***Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Hoelscher***

Senator Hoelscher: The Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee did meet, and we reviewed the work being done between ourselves and Senator Johnson on 6.1.16 that he referred to: Display of Flags on Campus. And then we continued our review of Policy 6.1.2: Laboratory Schools, and then finished our edits on that with input from Dr. Jeff Hill, the Superintendent of the Lab Schools, and got that passed onto committee, so we will be sending that to Exec. Then we finished our review of 3.3.1: Authorization of Faculty Tenure-Track Positions. We had input from Dr. Alan Lacy and we actually passed that out of committee. And that's the summation of what we got done tonight.

Senator Kalter: Super. Are there any questions for Senator Hoelscher? By the way, do we have a basketball score yet?

Senator Walsh: We won.

Senator Kalter: Yes! I'm so sorry. Condolences to Kyle, who couldn't be there. Excellent. Thank you. I'm glad I asked.

***Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Cox***

Senator Cox: This evening, Faculty Affairs picked up our review of Policy 1.8, Integrity in Research, and began additional review and will continue it in our next meeting.

***Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Marx***

Senator Marx: Yes. Planning and Finance met tonight and we discussed several items that will eventually be in the Institutional Priorities Report. It was really a wonderful discussion amongst the whole committee and I want to thank every member of the committee for their input.

***Rules Committee: Senator Horst***

Senator Horst: Rules Committee met, and we talked about information technology policies as a whole. We reviewed which ones we thought the Senate should have purview over, and we also are going to recommend that we examine Policy 9.1, and you would like us to send that to Executive Committee to agree with our decision. We look forward to meeting with the technology administrators to discuss these policies further.

***Communications***

Senator Hoelscher: We are about a week into our Presidential Commentary, and so far we've had 181 students respond to that request and 203 faculty. I would encourage all the students to get the word out and please respond to our Presidential Commentary and our faculty as well. We have got a really healthy start and it looks like we're going to get a really good response.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, I want to give some information on the Office of International Studies and Programs has the ongoing seminar series. Let me see. This afternoon Michael Gizzi gave a presentation on the "Arab-Israeli Conflict." The next one is on March 1<sup>st</sup> and the title of it is, "The Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations and the Role of the State Department." The guest speaker will be Thomas Hushek, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations - U.S. State Department, and that's held every Wednesday in the Prairie Room. Also I wanted to announce that the Office of International Studies and Programs has a request for proposals for the next round of speakers in the International Studies series and they have funding for that. One final item is that ongoing preparations are being made for a study abroad program in Panama, so if anyone is interested in that, please let me know.

Senator Muñoz: On April 2<sup>nd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup>, the Student Government Association will be hosting Diversity Week, so I would appreciate if faculty and staff members also come and show their support during Diversity Week.

Senator Haugo: We're in our second week of performance of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* in the School of Theater and Dance. Next week, we open the musical *1776*. I think it's appropriate to announce that at the Senate. It's the musical set at the meeting of the Continental Congress.

Senator Kalter: When is the next AMALI play? The next and last?

Senator Haugo: *Harvest* by Manjula Padmanabhan opens end of March/beginning of April.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. I'll ask you again later.

Senator Haugo: Around there. She will actually be on campus doing a number of events from March 19<sup>th</sup> to March 27<sup>th</sup> as well.

Senator McHale: I would just like to draw attention to achievement by one of our students. Jessi Brutton, who is an undergrad student in the School of Communication, won the Broadcast Education Association's National Best Feature-Length Screenplay Award. So that's just a big honor for us in the School of Communication and does bring good attention to the university. It came as a result of a new class that the university supported in the last five years, and then the last thing I would say about it is at [www.gofundme.com](http://www.gofundme.com), we're trying to raise money to be able to get her to the Broadcast Education Association convention in Las Vegas in April so that she

can collect her award. So kudos to Jessi, and if you see anywhere the link to [gofundme](#), please throw in a few dollars so she can celebrate that. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Thank you. Any further communications? All right. I think it's time to go celebrate the basketball game except for faculty who have to stay here for a very brief Caucus. So do we have a motion to adjourn?

***Adjournment***

**Motion:** By Senator Hoelscher, seconded by Senator Shurhay, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.