

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2015-2016

December 3, 2015

3:30pm, HMSU Dede III

Final Minutes

Members Present: A. Kummerow, K. Berlin, L. Brown, B. Bunnett, J. Conant, E. Gallatin, R. Guell, D. Hantzis, M. Harmon, T. Hawkins, J. Kuhlman, K. Lee, C. MacDonald, S. McCaskey, C. Paterson, J. Pommier, V. Sheets, E. Southard, S. Stofferahn, H. Tapley, P. Bro, E. Hampton, S. Lamb, D. Malooley, M. Schafer, B. Corcoran, N. Goswami, J. Kinne, K. Bolinger, I. Land

Members Absent: K. Bolinsky, A. Anderson, C. Ball, M. Harmon

Ex-Officio Present: D. Bradley, M. Licari

Ex-Officio Absent:

Guests: L. Spence, R. Peters, R. Perrin, K. Butwin

1) Memorial Resolutions

a) R. Crumrin:

Dr. Janet Elizabeth Sulzer Horton, 87, of Terre Haute, IN, passed away October 17, 2015 in Indianapolis, Indiana.

She was born on January 22, 1928 in Lexington, Kentucky to Elmer Griffith Sulzer and Dorothea Kent Barnes Sulzer. She began her education at the University of Kentucky where she was a cheerleader for her beloved Wildcats and a member of the Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority. Janet completed her undergraduate work at Indiana University-Bloomington where she also earned her PhD in Library Science and achieved honorary membership in Phi Beta Kappa. While at IU, she served as Director of the Undergraduate Library.

Janet was an Assistant Professor of Library Science at Indiana State University from September 1, 1971 until May 5, 1990. She retired with 19 years of service.

Janet was an ardent bridge player and earned the coveted Life Master recognition for her excellent play. She was an enthusiastic member and supporter of the Terre Haute

Bridge Center. Janet, who began playing bridge at age 14, joined the Terre Haute club in 1971. A diamond life master with more than 6,600 master points, she served for many years as both a director and an instructor at the club.

Horton has the distinction of winning the THBC Women's Player of the Year for 20 consecutive years. In 2014, the club renamed the award as the Janet Horton Woman of the Year Award in her honor.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to her family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to the University. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

b) R. Peters:

Dr. William Gene Turner was a long-time professor of the College of Technology at Indiana State University. Dr. Turner graduated from Glenn School in 1948. He received his bachelors in Industrial Arts Education (1952) and masters' degrees in Industrial Education and Administration from Indiana State University (1955), and his Ed.D. in Industrial Education and Secondary Education from Arizona State University (1973). While at Indiana State Teachers College, he majored in Industrial Education. He was a member of the industrial Arts Club and the Mu Chapter of Epsilon Pi Tau. Bill started as an instructor and worked his way up to Full Professor in 1977. He retired in 1995. He passed away on August 26th, 2015.

He was inducted into the U.S. Army on September 16, 1952. His hope was that he would gain additional education and experiences in the Army which would help him in his teaching career. It was always his lifelong dream to teach, and be really good at it. Everyone in the College of Technology had a deep respect for him.

Bill spent his lifetime in service to public education, and was a creative and innovative educator. Bill and his wife, Carole A. Gibbs Turner, served as friends and partners, to the community. Bill was an elder of the Eastside Church of Christ for 37 years after serving as a deacon for a number of years. He was involved with the I.S.U. campus ministry during the 1980's. He participated in mission trips to Sweden in 1973 and India in 1998. He was a member of the Society of Automotive Engineers, lifetime member of India State Industrial Arts association, Epsilon Pi Tau Honor Society Fraternity, a member of the advisory board of Ivy Tech State College for Automotive Technology, a member of the Exchange Club, involved with Bikes for Tykes, a Camp Wabashi Youth Camp support, and a Kids' Hope mentor at De

Vaney Elementary School. Bill taught at Mechanical Arts School in Evansville and worked throughout the Midwestern states. Bill also served as an advisor to many students, both undergraduate and graduate.

Bill retired from Indiana State in 1995, but he remained active, attending many university functions, supporting the Department, and serving as a mentor to faculty and staff. Bill loved sports and anything involving automobiles. He was well known for his keen wit and sharp sense of humor. In spite of his recent health issues, he remained active with his family and friends, serving as an inspiration to all.

Bill was a loving husband, father, grandfather, friend, and mentor. He touched many lives and influenced many careers with his wit and wisdom.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to his students, the College of Technology, and Indiana State University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

c) R. Perrin:

James Hatch completed a Bachelor of Arts in Communications and English at the University of California—Los Angeles in 1958. While completing a Masters of Arts in English at the University of Michigan, a collection of his plays received the prestigious Avery Hopwood Award for Drama. He taught for three years at Kellogg Community College while completing post-graduate work at Exeter College, Oxford, and the University of Michigan.

Hatch joined the Indiana State University faculty in 1964. During his thirty-nine years at ISU, he served on a wide range of committees—from Undergraduate Curriculum to Policy, from Creative Writing to Personnel. An advocate of film and theater, Hatch also chaired ISU's International Film Series, sponsored the ISU Film Club, produced a number of films promoting ISU, and served on the Community Theater Board.

Hatch's teaching was widely varied, including courses in folklore, poetry, drama, American literature, and composition. In an era when print materials made primary claims on scholarship, Hatch pioneered the use of film and television in the study of drama and developed innovative courses on film as literature and photojournalism.

Hatch's notable film work received wide recognition. His 1979 documentary film *Tor House: Lines from Robinson Jeffers*, narrated by Burgess Meredith, was a Red Ribbon winner at the American Film Festival in 1979 and the Best Language and Literature Film at the Birmingham International Educational Film Festival, also in 1979. In spring 1980, *Tor House* aired on PBS stations across the country, and the film received a Certificate of Merit at the Chicago International Film Festival. Another of his films, *Jack London: Sailor on Horseback*, was also recognized at the American Film Festival in 1984.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to his family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the service, care, and dedication which he gave to his students, the Department of English, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to his family.

d) P. Bro:

Stella Virginia Tatlock, aged 94, passed away on July 30, 2015 in Bloomington, Indiana. She is survived by her nephew, Donald Z. Rogers; and her niece, Janet L. Rogers.

Stella received her Bachelor's degree at Indiana State University in 1942. After graduating, she worked for the federal government but then returned to Terre Haute to teach music in the elementary schools. After earning her Masters of Music from Northwestern University in 1948, she taught at Wesleyan Conservatory in Macon, Georgia. She then came to Indiana State University in 1955.

While at ISU, Stella she served as associate director of the Wesley Foundation. In 1956, she joined the faculty of the Music Department where she taught for 27 years. She served briefly as interim chairwoman of the department, and her keen memory of departmental actions and events could always be counted upon when others were a bit "foggy." During this time, she was also a member of the Terre Haute Symphony, and was the soloist in a number of the Symphony's programs.

After retiring from ISU in 1983, she moved to Bloomington, Indiana, where she was active in the First United Methodist Church, the United Methodist Women, the Bloomington Alumnae Chapter of Sigma Alpha Iota, the Alpha Chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma Society International, and the Bloomington Chapter of the National Society of Arts and Letters.

Throughout her career, Stella was devoted to piano pedagogy, or the study of how to teach piano effectively. She faithfully attended workshops, conferences of the Music Teachers National Association, and was a founding member of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy in 1980. At the time of her retirement, the Stella Tatlock Fund for Piano Pedagogy was established through the ISU Foundation. Two years following her retirement, the Certificate in Piano Pedagogy Program at Indiana State University was created, a program that still thrives today, and was the impetus for the evolution of what is now the highly successful Indiana State University Community School of the Arts.

Stella was devoted to her students, and to the arts of piano performance and pedagogy. She also generously mentored faculty members that were new to the department. She was authentic, warm, and compassionate, and still remembered by the musical community of Terre Haute.

The School of Music acknowledges Stella Tatlock's dedication to enriching the lives of many and bringing out the best in those whose lives she touched.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of Indiana State University express to Stella Tatlock's family its sincere sympathy and condolences, and that it further express its appreciation for the years of service and dedication to her students, her department, the School of Music, and the University.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this testimonial be placed in the minutes of the Faculty Senate and that a copy be transmitted to her family.

2) Administrative Reports:

a) President D. Bradley

- i) After some discussion with the Staff Council, we are not going to have Flex scheduling or four-day workweeks in the summer. Overall workload has picked up substantially. It became a problem of equity.
- ii) We had our first petition with regard to the Graduation Guarantee, and it has been approved. A student in Technology will be attending for free next fall. The student was required to take courses that were not necessary. The advisor did not use MySam or any equivalent. The faculty member is no longer employed by ISU.
- iii) The Board of Trustees meets next Friday. The agenda is light. Commencement is next Saturday. Cheryl Robeson is the Alumni speaker. Martha Reed is our student speaker.
- iv) I would also like to wish you a happy holidays, a restful break, and a happy New Year.

- b) Provost M. Licari
 - i) As the year comes to a close, my listening tour is coming to an end. I have gotten to visit almost every department this fall. I have a few left to visit this week and next, and then I will be done. I want to say thank you to everybody for allowing me to use up some of your meeting time. I have certainly learned a lot and found the experiences valuable.
 - ii) We are making progress on the 2016 Strategic Plan. The twenty key-question committees are hard at work. Their initial progress reports have been submitted and can be found on the Strategic Planning website in PDF form. I encourage you and your colleagues to review them. Final reports will be due on 11 January and will be posted to the website soon after. In the spring, we will begin having campus town hall events. The current schedule of those is on the 2016 Strategic Plan website, so you can put those on your calendars. Obviously I want to encourage as much participation as possible. We need participation if the next strategic plan will be successful.

- 3) Chair Report: C. MacDonald
 - a) I want to talk about File Three and why we are talking about it again this week. This is a constitutional change which requires a first reading and then a vote at the next Senate meeting. It should not have been voted on in November—we will consider that to be the required reading. Today’s vote is the one that counts as the Senate vote. In January we will send it to the faculty as the Constitution requires.
 - b) I hope to see everyone at Commencement.

- 4) Support Staff Report: None.

- 5) SGA Report: None.

- 6) Temporary Faculty Advocate: None.

- 7) Approval of November 12, 2015 Minutes
 - a) Motion: (C. Paterson, A. Kummerow). Vote: 25-0-4.

- 8) Fifteen Minute Open Discussion
 - a) K. Bolinger: Will we have a final report on the Biennial Review process?
 - i) D. Bradley: I don’t see any reason why we can’t do that.
 - ii) K. Bolinger: Will there be any analysis of the process? In the first go-around there were glitches. I was curious if we were revisiting that.
 - iii) R. Guell: Part of the process is a requirement for FAC review. We will start that in January.
 - iv) D. Bradley: The plan/hope is that whatever changes are needed will be made by May.

- v) C. MacDonald: I am also compiling a list of changes that I will send to FAC.
 - vi) D. Bradley: I don't see why we can't make available a chart or table displaying how many placed into each category.
 - b) S. Lamb: I would like to comment briefly on the change in attitude towards those serving as instructors. I think I have seen in the College of Business a much healthier attitude among instructors. They have always been extremely hard working, but now since the move to regular faculty status it's really a completely different attitude. They are more willing to participate. They feel more empowered to voice their opinions. I also think it has helped to have the Senior Instructor rank. We are not granting tenure—the criteria is not the same. But, there is a significant pay grade increase and recognition of the quality of service. I know from several comments how much this is appreciated and how much positive impact there is. I was not initially on board with this move, but I am now. I appreciate the President pushing this.
 - c) B. Bunnett: I read several weeks ago in the Chronicle about the Faculty Senate at American University condemning trigger warnings. Are students talking about that here?
 - i) D. Bradley: Does that mean if you find it offensive you shouldn't talk about it ahead of time?
 - ii) R. Guell: As a mandate or suggested practice? I tell my students ahead of time about certain topics I raise in class on purpose. One refers to sexual assault and another is a certain racial epithet. It is incumbent on people just in good taste not to surprise students or create a fear or concern that cause them to ignore the lecture.
 - iii) B. Bunnett: That is something you initiated. Has anyone heard of trigger warnings being used in class?
 - iv) D. Hantzis: This may be something we want to talk about in the spring. Yale University also just came out with a strong statement against trigger warnings. This was prompted by some national debate over free-speech on campus. I haven't heard from my students any concerns about a hostile environment here. Faculty might be interested in talking about this as part of a larger conversation. I would see using a script in the classroom as a violation. It is important to pay attention to what people are talking about at a national level. I support what R. Guell does in his classroom.
 - v) R. Guell: To D. Bradley's point, they are individual. When my son was at Ball State his first year, his room-mate died while texting and driving. Afterwards, the first Health and Wellness class he attended was about this issue—including photographs. He left the classroom very upset. We need to be sensitive to this.
- 9) Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee report
- a) H. Chait: I would like to thank the chair and the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to talk about PTOC, a group that by its nature does its work very quietly. We don't seek out publicity or customers. I have been chair of PTOC for the last four years or so. This is the first opportunity I have had to address the Senate. Before I arrived, PTOC reviewed all

college and department-produced documents. Primarily, we heard promotion, tenure, and reappointment appeals. If you have served on the committee, you know that each case is very individual and handled individually, despite the Handbook impression that it is all rather cookie cutter. We deal with these cases when they are brought to us. They are professionally important. We try to treat everyone with dignity, thoroughness, and fairness. One thing we also do is look beyond each individual case. We try to look at all of the circumstances around the decision to identify broader issues and problems. Some of these could be dealt with by Senate action and policy changes which we send to the Provost. But, many have to do with idiosyncratic issues in particular departments. We talk with both the President and Provost after making a decision.

- b) H. Chait: This year, following changes to the Handbook, we have additional responsibilities. We are now charged with reviewing all promotion and tenure documents. We have met three times since November 1st on that issue. We have spent some time building a rubric for our evaluations. We have completed evaluations of Teaching and Learning in the College of Education and also reviewed CAS and COB. At the last meeting, we assigned people to an additional three reviews. We will be going through these thoroughly and expeditiously and will provide feedback to the Provost.
- c) H. Chait: Questions?
- i) D. Hantzis: Thank you, I appreciate hearing from PTOC. When I was chair of FAC, a fairly strong concern we had was that most colleges have not reviewed and updated their documents regarding the review of instructors and lecturers.
(1) H. Chait: We have made this a priority. It is an important part of our rubric.
- ii) D. Hantzis: I understand the priority. We made provisions that absent such language, departments would use college language. If colleges do not do these, then what?
(1) H. Chait: Without going too far into the weeds, our original approach was to look at a model department to study. We have changed our approach and started looking at college documents first. We then look at the department documents.
- iii) R. Guell: In the presence of the Provost and the deans... If the Board passes the Senior Instructor window, we need Senior Instructor standards in all of the colleges and departments no later than May.
(1) H. Chait: I'm glad you brought that up.
- iv) N. Goswami: I have two questions. What is the diversity make-up of the appeal committee?
(1) H. Chait: It varies. This time around, there is diversity in regards to gender but not in ethnicity. In the past there has been diversity of gender, race, and ethnicity.
(2) R. Guell: As clarification, PTOC representative are chosen by college election. Diversity is a result of chance. We may want to reconsider this.
- v) N. Goswami: How do you differentiate between idiosyncratic and institutional bias?
(1) H. Chait: I will avoid the word discriminatory. An example of a systemic effect: a department that is compound, that may consist of more than one discipline or a

variety of sub disciplines where there might be a question of expertise. How do you deal with different disciplinary standards? That would be more systemic. Now for idiosyncratic: without providing details, we dealt with a case of an individual who was hired by one dean and that dean had recommended that this individual take credit for the maximum number of years. By the next fall, however, the dean had changed. Things happened, and it became clear that what the individual was told at the time of hire by the former dean was now not the case. The previous dean may not have given the right advice. That is idiosyncratic. I don't know if D. Bradley remembers that case, but it was handled very nicely.

vi) N. Goswami: What kind of training do committee members have that would enable them to recognize structural racism or sexism versus what can be considered idiosyncratic, given our institutional emphasis on retaining faculty of color? Things that appear structural in fact reveal something more, but training is required to see it.

(1) H. Chait: I think we need to start off with some facts. One, the Handbook is very explicit about the grounds on which we can make decisions. Even when we see situations that might be unfair, we are bound by the criteria of the Handbook. The scope of what we look at in an individual decision is limited. That's not to say we don't carefully look into matters, but there are certain grounds. Two, in the time I have been on the committee, I haven't seen anything that suggests racism or sexism. Do we get training in that? No. On the other hand, as on any committee, we don't get training in anything. I don't know that any of the other committees get training in their particular area. I do know that the people on PTOC are very conscientious about what they do. We read documents and portfolios very carefully. We always hold hearings. We hear from the appellant, deans, department chairs, and P&T committees. We cast a wide net for information. That catches two kinds of fish: 1. it catches information that deals specifically with the appeal and whether it is sustainable or not; 2. it establishes whether there are other kinds of issues that we should call to people's attention. Dr. MacDonald and Dr. Guell remember that we had a long list of suggestions last year. I will say our appellants have been a diverse group, men and women from diverse nationalities. That question has not ever been raised.

vii) N. Goswami: In a room that is mostly white, I find it problematic that my question regarding training in recognizing structural issues that affect faculty of color should be met like this. I am a faculty member of color myself. The burden of representation and the issues that they face cannot be rendered equivalent with everything else.

(1) H. Chait: If the members of the committee need training in anything, it is in legal procedure. We are functioning in a judicial role. These individuals have no background in law or burden of proof. If there is any failing, I would put that as a first priority.

viii) D. Bradley: I appreciate this whole dialogue. Two things: first, there is a very high-level need to have university policies in regard to promotion and tenure, plus a variety of other things, that would stand in place of department policies that don't exist or are not appropriate—I would suggest that the policy for Senior Instructors could be first; second, the university has not made the progress it wants nor should regarding diversity, though it has made some. This body has not made progress either. In the spring, I would suggest that you seek diverse candidates to run for Senate, so that the Senate can more accurately reflect the faculty body.

(1) C. MacDonald: I support that.

ix) D. Hantzis: I have participated in personnel review at many levels. I am currently serving my second stint on the CAS committee. We need to recognize that faculty service on faculty review is perhaps the most important service we provide to our peers. Many enter into this service not ready. In fact, if you go in knowing you will need extra training or professional development, you may have second thoughts about serving. It's complex. I know service on these committees should include some training about due diligence and reading files. I am less concerned about PTOC than with what is going on at the college level. That's an enormous amount of work. It probably should be supported in some nature. It is also hard to work with out-of-date documents from departments. It's not okay not to do our best in this area.

x) S. Lamb: I am also very uncomfortable when those on personnel committees are unaware of P&T expectations and substitute their own criteria or biases. A question for H. Chait: in the COB we are preparing changes for our constitution regarding instructors serving on personnel committees and designing documents that speak to the criteria about evaluating instructors. Does that go to your committee?

(1) H. Chait: That sounds like the Expectations document. While changes to the constitution would not go to us, I would say changes to the Expectations document—to the extent it is coupled with P&T—would go to our committee.

xi) S. Lamb: It deals specifically with instructors. The Expectations document deals with tenure-track faculty.

(1) H. Chait: I think we may need to talk about that.

xii) N. Goswami: I do appreciate that this is not a laughing matter. I would like to give a concrete example, since I am here on the Senate and a woman of color. The problem is structural when it goes to supporting people. Situations arise and are then evaluated. I have been dinged twice for not attending Senate meetings. C. MacDonald followed the rules and was right for calling my attention to it. The first time was a result of my service on the Biennial Review committee in my department—I am the only one of color and woman on that committee. The second time I was at an international conference where I served as a co-chair. I already know I will miss one meeting in the spring. I will take my ding and will be removed from the Senate, and then the Senate will look worse than it does now. So what are we supposed to do

when people of color are pulled in so many different directions? We have representation to provide. Indiana State has a selling point, because it is a place that supports women in philosophy.

xiii) D. Bradley: I would like to compliment H. Chait and the committee's work. The problem with promotion and tenure on this campus is that it is rooted in the departments and colleges. When they don't agree, that means more work for PTOC. They have done a great job in untangling things. I want to apologize for the snicker I made in regards to the training. I think it was more of a nervous giggle. We all need more training in some way.

xiv) L. Maule: I appreciate that we are focusing on faculty review and professional development. We have to stop thinking that our documents come down from the Mount and that they have no values or hidden benefits and disadvantages. I think this has been a productive conversation. We are talking about something that substantively matters to this university, faculty, and students. I hope we take the time to review our P&T documents to see how they reify systemic bias. This is an excellent opportunity to look at our documents to see what they reward and discourage. If we are a teaching institution and we're looking at student success, do our documents even support that?

xv) R. Guell: There are many places in the Handbook that privilege college autonomy and the elections of individuals rather than the communal make-up of bodies. It is even possible to have an all-white Diversity Council. If we decide to value something else, the solution to it is to examine places in the Handbook like 305.10.3.

10) FAC items:

a) Interpretation of the Handbook (Constitutional Change)

i) Motion to approve: (K. Bolinger, M. Schafer). Vote: 30-0-0

b) Study Week Policy

i) Motion to approve: (C. Paterson, L. Brown). Vote: 30-0-0

ii) R. Guell: This charge came to FAC when D. Hantzis noticed that the Registrar's definition of study week did not align with the Handbook. When we investigated, we noticed that a 2003 Senate vote was not acted upon by the Board. FAC essentially would like to adopt the language from 2003. This is what the Registrar has on the website. The Executive Committee amended it in a couple of ways.

iii) C. MacDonald: The important amendment concerned online courses. The previous policy said nothing. And, we are more specific about what is exempt.

iv) K. Bolinger: I understand the rationale for capping the percentage. Where did the number come from?

v) R. Guell: Somewhere dark.

vi) D. Bradley: Less than 1/15 of the semester.

- vii) D. Hantzis: I am happy to see this reconciled. The 4% replaced draft language that was vague. I think it came from nowhere. Are you suggesting that it should be adjusted?
- viii) K. Bolinger: I assumed it would be closer to 7%. It was merely curiosity.
- ix) B. Corcoran: Has it always been called “study week”? I came from a university where you had no classes. It remains confusing as to what the point is.
- x) D. Hantzis: We can eliminate it altogether.
- xi) R. Guell: The idea is that you can’t require any big papers or tests that aren’t in the syllabus.
- xii) B. Corcoran: You can be as cruel and unusual as you want to as long as it is in the syllabus....
- xiii) R. Guell: You can have a paper worth more than 4% but not a big paper or test that is not in the syllabus.
- xiv) D. Bradley: This is not just for the students. It also helps you keep things balanced.
- xv) L. Maule: From my own practice, and from my students’ experiences, they are not studying, they are preparing, presenting, and submitting papers. It’s work intensive. If you don’t want that, then make it a real “study week”. Right now, they have everything *but* tests going on.
- xvi) D. Hantzis: Part of what L. Maule is pointing to is faculty compliance. I think we have always had the concern that some faculty allow students to turn in papers early and then do not meet during Final Exam time. If the faculty are not complying with Study Week or the Final-Exam policy, maybe the Faculty Senate needs to find out why. Then, we might consider amending the policies to fit the pedagogy. In the intern, I hope we can pass this because people are suffering in the absence of a policy.
- xvii) C. Paterson: When will this go into effect?
- xviii) C. MacDonald: when it approved by the Board.

c) All University Committees

- i) Motion to approve: (E. Southard, T. Hawkins). Vote: 30-0-0.
- ii) R. Guell: This is something we did not get to last year. The president directed T. Exline to take a look at the all-university committees, as opposed to standing committees. They cover a wide variety of things. Our work cleans up the all-university committees so that they have a common form: what it is, who leads it, where their report goes, etc. All these issues are now aligned and consistent with actual practice. Two practical issues: first, regarding the University Budget Committee, budgets had been under the advisory authority of AAC. As it is described now, this is what the president has implemented since he has been here. Second, Health Benefits is now defined as a university activity. The rest are self-explanatory.
- iii) C. MacDonald: Executive Committee’s changes were in 270.2 and 270.11.

- iv) A. Kummerow: There is a typo in 270.9.3. The extra section needs to be struck. Can we clarify 270.11.1? Do we want to include the University College and Graduate School?
- v) R. Guell: In some places we want to include it. In other places we want to exclude it. We reached out to a number of people regarding the Athletics Committee.
- vi) P. Bro: Regarding the Performing Arts Series committee, why was it reduced? Why are there no performing arts members on the committee?
- vii) R. Guell: All of these changes are a result of communications between T. Exline and current and past committee chairs. We did not question her analysis of any particular changes.
- viii) D. Bradley: I would guess that twenty-two was a terrible number to work with.
- ix) P. Bro: I know that music faculty have served on there in the past.
- x) D. Bradley: When they want to serve, there will be room.
- xi) R. Guell: We can only go based off of volunteers.
- xii) C. MacDonald: We do our best. If no one volunteers....
- xiii) V. Sheets: On these committees, you often don't have enough volunteers.
- xiv) D. Collins: It looks like there is a mixed bag of information on the Teacher's Education committee. In the proposed information there is old information.
- xv) D. Bradley: That could fall under the policy for minor changes and typos.
- xvi) C. MacDonald: If you could send me the correct format of the information, we can get it adjusted.

11) Adjournment: 4:58pm.