INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2014-2015

**Executive Committee**

February 3, 2015 3:30pm, HMSU 227

**Minutes**

Members Present: R. Guell, C. MacDonald, A. Anderson, K. Bolinger, E. Hampton, C. Olsen, K. Yousif.

Members Absent: S. Lamb, V. Sheets

Ex-Officio Present: President D. Bradley, Provost J. Maynard

Guests: L. Hall, D. Hantzis, J. Turman, K. Wilkinson

1. Administrative Reports:
   1. D. Bradley:
      1. J. Maynard will be here late today.
      2. I’m not sure I’ve been here with you since I met with the House Ways and Means Committee; we asked for $4.7 million in a special appropriation to deal with student success issues, and we hope that when the House budget comes out we will see some of that money. We have asked for a special appropriation, and it is not unheard of for universities to get those. Other universities in the state have received them, and they were rolled into their base budgets the next year.
      3. We recently had ISU Day at the state capitol. Today is the 150th anniversary of the bill that enabled us to form. It was initially passed by the House, but not the Senate, and the Senate was called back into a special session in December of that year—most likely for ratification of the 13th Amendment—and our bill got through at that time. The students did a wonderful job. Over 50 legislators came by and talked to students, and the Governor was here as well.
      4. Enrollment numbers are up 6 percent in the spring semester. Graduate studies was up about 11 percent, and undergraduate enrollment was up by 3 percent. The admissions numbers continue to look good. If you happened to be involved in interviews for Presidential Scholars, you know we couldn’t be prouder of our current students. They are incredible young adults and have made very good progress.
   2. Provost J. Maynard: No Report.
2. Chair Report:
   1. R. Guell:
      1. Regarding the budget, D. McKee put out an email last week essentially saying that we wouldn’t be talking again for a while until we knew more, but she had been instructed by the President to make a list of all the regularly-approved non-budgeted items in order to fold them into the budget. These include, for example, stipends for Faculty Senate officers, money spent on temporary faculty who are here each year, etc. I have taken this instruction from the President to D. McKee as at least an acknowledgement that they may go to what the officers are asking them to do, which is to honestly budget both expenses and revenues, as well as create the reserve needed for unexpected contingencies. I consider that to be progress.
      2. The next meeting we have will include the new general counsel K. Butwin. There are many, many things we will discuss with her, but I want to list them for you so you can think about them. We are getting today and discussing with a representative of FAC the Amorous and Familial Relationships Policy recommendations, we will soon get from FAC the Extraordinary Circumstances Personnel Action recommendations, and the President is withdrawing his change to the Whistleblower Policy—but has proposed procedures that I am not particularly excited by, nor are the other officers. I am asking FAC to look at them. I am inclined now to not view them as a problem because the President is looking to note that the Whistleblower Policy is would be very narrow in its interpretation. I am not as concerned about the procedures that apply to almost no one as I am about others being considered. K. Butwin will be drafting that and will be consulting with FAC.
      3. What I heard today from the President’s Advisory Council, was that fact that the Department of Education has interpreted Title IX’s reference to sexual discrimination as including sexual assault and its non-progressive treatment also as a form of sexual discrimination. The requirement to now receive Title IX resources includes a new look at the Sexual Assault Policies, and today K. Butwin went through all of them.
      4. The Provost Search Committee narrowed the list of candidates from the 10 or 11 they did at the airport or through Skype to 4 or 5, and D. McKee stated that list could be out by this afternoon.
         1. D. Bradley: They are struggling to slot them in for February interviews at this time; candidates are trying to figure out when it would be in their best interest to come, and some are trying to push into March.
3. Approval of the Minutes of January 20, 2014. A. Anderson, K. Yousif. Vote: 7-0-0
4. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion
   1. K. Yousif: I sent a question…I didn’t know if we had talked about indexing pay to adjuncts so that an across-the-board raise would impact their pay as well.
      1. J. Maynard: It doesn’t go into effect until fall 2015. I sat with M. Green and went through how we treat Lecturers as well as Instructors. There was no disagreement.
5. CAAC Item
   1. Creation of the School of Nursing within the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services
   2. Renaming the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services to the College of Health and Human Services
      1. R. Guell: I wish for these to be viewed as tied together. Motion: A. Anderson, K. Bolinger. Vote: 7-0-0
         1. D. Bradley: I think the Administration agrees that we shouldn’t have a School of Nursing unless we change the name of the College to the College of Health and Human Services.
         2. R. Guell: I will ask J. Turman and L. Hall to speak to this…my understanding of when we created Schools was that they were simply departments. When I was on CAAC I thought that was the way it happened. In the Faculty Senate minutes of February 18, 2010 there was a floor amendment regarding allowing departments within Schools. The thing that happens when/if we pass this is we had just about gotten to the point where we were ready for Section 305 of the Handbook to be discussed. This will blow up 305, because 305 imagines Schools as equal to departments. There is no reference in 305 for what is required by accreditation bodies in Nursing, and that is the Administrator above department level be a nurse when evaluating P and T documents. There is nothing in 305 or the paperwork to route to the Executive Director of Nursing, and for the director’s opinions to be in the document. For example, if I am up for promotion I have the ability to rebut my Dean’s conclusion. There is no right to rebut something that doesn’t exist. FAC will need time after this to go back and look at certain discrete areas that need some work. I hope we will consider this on the merits on the issue and work on the P and T in particular.
         3. L. Hall: I think regardless of the proposition, those changes have to be made.
         4. J. Turman: This will help too. I hear what you’re saying. If Physical Therapy gets accredited they have to do the same things.
         5. R. Guell: I am prepared to believe this Section 305 fix needed to happen.
         6. L. Hall: The definition of the characteristics of a School that was approved in the February 18 minutes was there. We identified the characteristics. The Nursing Program did have a fall enrollment of 1400 students when it was first put through. Many of our staff and faculty are involved with pre-nursing students as well. There are multiple sources of external funding, and if you will look in Appendix C, there is a list of available scholarships. It also includes a state line-item budget of $204,000 designated for Nursing and used for adjunct faculty, faculty travel, development, etc. We have multiple academic programs—majors, minors, graduate, undergraduate, etc. We also have accelerated programs and various tracks within our graduate and undergraduate programs. A School is a common designation in our field. Table 1 in the document lists Schools of Nursing in Indiana within similar peer institutions. Those are either stand-alone Schools or stand-alone Colleges of Nursing. Table 2 is based on U.S. News and World Report’s Top 20 data; all those listed are either stand-alone Schools or Colleges. The biggest evidence that brings us to request a change is our external image. When I am speaking with stakeholders, a variety of accrediting bodies, alumni relations, and current and prospective students, it’s all about the image and judgment of our nursing program by these people. I know J. Turman gets questioned a lot about this. It is confusing to alumni and potential donors in particular as to our structure. We wish to simply give a name and identity to our structure. Appendix A is the current structure, and Appendix B is the proposed. Nothing changes except the Nursing unit simply gets a name.
         7. K. Bolinger: Regarding R. Guell’s statement, there is no structure for the P and T path.
         8. R. Guell: It has been an extra Handbook method of dealing with this. I did not realize until this week that they have been doing this for two years as instructed by their accreditors. I am disappointed the Administration did not point this out. This has been a lawsuit waiting to happen. FAC needs to fix this ASAP.
         9. K. Bolinger: I thought the change was necessitating that.
         10. L. Hall: Essentially our accreditors have said a nurse has to be over the entire Nursing unit. Their duties entail involvement in budgeting, hiring, reviews, everything. That was made very clear to us in 2011. We’re functioning as a School now—it’s literally just putting a name on it. Nothing changes. We want this identity, particularly for external reasons.
         11. D. Bradley: The title, “Executive Director of Nursing:” is this common?
         12. L. Hall: It is fairly common. I don’t foresee a change in that. It’s just applying an identity to what already exists. The College Constitution already supports this. The structure changed in 2012.
         13. J. Turman: I have been supportive of this as a Dean. When I first interviewed for this job my comment was, I don’t know how you do this. Nursing should be a recognized unit. Clearly accrediting bodies were saying that at the same time. I want faculty to be competitive for all types of funding awards and recognition that is based upon coming from a School of or College of Nursing. If someone wants to move up into Nursing Administration I want them to do that within the School of Nursing so they become competitive enough to become a Dean of Nursing. It’s very helpful externally because alums are always so confused about what is going on here. I think this will help faculty and attract even more students. We already have many, but it would help to have a formal identity.
         14. R. Guell: A principal objector to the whole concept of departments within a school came from the Registrar’s Office, who stated that Banner simply cannot handle three layers of administration for faculty. Did that technical glitch ever get resolved?
         15. L. Hall: I haven’t heard of it. We are currently functioning within it with no issues.
         16. J. Turman: I haven’t heard about that.
         17. R. Guell: There was a concern expressed, a definitive concern expressed, like that should be the end of the story. I dismissed the view that Banner was not going to dictate what we can and cannot do.
         18. D. Bradley: My understanding is that Ball State and Purdue both use Banner.
         19. D. Hantzis: I’m wondering, if there is a question of the title of Executive Director and you anticipate other decisions like this, that makes it easy to handle if it was the same title.
         20. L. Hall: We have no intention of changing the title.
         21. D. Hantzis: Is it coded as Associate Dean?
         22. D. Bradley: Human Resources undoubtedly should view this as equivalent to Associate Dean.
         23. R. Guell: It’s not really, because Associate Deans cannot insert an opinion directly into an assigned document.
         24. D. Bradley: The College Constitution was changed and you all approved it?
         25. R. Guell: Yes, but at the time they did not see—or the Constitution did not describe—the path of personnel evaluation.
         26. D. Hantzis: We didn’t catch it as a compliance issue. I was on FAC when we reviewed the last changes under R. Williams. We will have to check.
         27. R. Guell: We should pass this and then fix what needs to be fixed. This may not be the last of issues like these.
         28. L. Hall: As for the second part of this, just because it’s redundant to have “Nursing” within the College name, it just made sense to eliminate it from Health and Human Services.
6. AAC Recommendations
   1. K. Wilkinson: As a representative of AAC we approved the Fall 2016 plus calendar. We went over it handily and had many good discussions. Positives include: it was considered good pacing. We talked with our colleagues regarding changes of dates like Fall Break and how important that is for freshmen. As a retention issue, there is comment regarding that. Pedagogically, having a full week before Study Week is huge—I know all of us have suffered with that. We feel this makes it easier. The discussion also included the longer break between fall and spring semesters. It would allow for a more in-depth community engagement piece, and it’s also a nice beginning when you start the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day. Actually, there are many universities that do so. One concern is with the multi single-day breaks. Large courses with multiple sections, particularly labs, we wanted to be sensitive to. The other concern was about the closing dates for the residence halls. In the past there have been issues with the last day of finals. Students will take a final and then have an hour to get out of their dorms. We wanted to change that. There was some cleanup required in terms of grammar, punctuation, and consistent formatting. We are looking forward to seeing how students and faculty react to this. Initial comments were very positive.
      1. D. Bradley: My understanding is Administration sets the calendar.
      2. R. Guell: And we either endorse it or we don’t. We will move the voting on this until next week so you can all look over the changes.
7. Student Evaluation Questions
   1. R. Guell: I don’t want to vote on this today, but next week because the Student Affairs Committee is assembling comments for the final version of this. It will be on the February Senate agenda. I have notes from a Senate meeting, I don’t remember if it was E. Southard or someone else, who noted that the questions in traditional format could very well be used in distance-learning classes as well. There was that issue, there was the question of a truly open-ended question (“Any other comments?”), there was a concern expressed about specifically what the Likert scale would be, and there was the assertion that these weren’t questions but “items.” We also didn’t take up the paragraph FAC gave us in November. We dealt with their statements and thoughts. It was my oversight. We didn’t deal with the other things FAC said.
   2. R. Guell: Let’s start with whether we believe that the question, “My instructor demonstrates enthusiasm for the course” is an appropriate distance question.
      1. K. Bolinger: I think so, only because we discussed whether “NA” was an appropriate response. A responsible student needs an “out” to say they don’t have a reasonable gauge.
      2. C. MacDonald: The “NA” response is not available.
      3. A. Anderson: Why is “NA” not available?
      4. R. Guell: If common questions are truly common there is no such thing as “NA.”
      5. A. Anderson: At the departmental level the structure can be less traditional. What works for the average class doesn’t work for others. There are limited options.
      6. K. Bolinger: Don’t you also have the option of not just the administration of questions, but how they would be used? We have the option to develop a narrative around results, so if there are weird circumstances they could be explained. If it doesn’t seem to fit I have the option to develop a narrative to explain why that doesn’t seem valid.
      7. C. MacDonald: Again, I’m not confident in students’ ability to evaluate this 100 percent of the time in distance courses.
      8. R. Guell: How many think this belongs as a question that is truly uniform for everyone?
      9. K. Bolinger: You have loaded the question.
      10. R. Guell: How many think that this belongs in the list of questions asked of everyone? 2-4-0
      11. R. Guell: When we hear from SAC we will make that final determination. Do we want to direct what the Likert scale is?
      12. D. Hantzis: We put in we have to tell them what the scale is.
      13. D. Bradley: We don’t want it to change from question to question.
      14. R. Guell: Not within the common questions. Are we comfortable with the standard five responses within the common questions?
      15. K. Bolinger: Just looking at, for example, “I believe I can approach my instructor for help,” there’s “always” on one end and “never” on the other.
      16. K. Yousif: They usually use “strongly agree,” etc.
      17. R. Guell: Do we want a truly open question?
      18. D. Hantzis: When we served on the committee we realized the answers were going to live in a place we didn’t want them.
      19. D. Bradley: You don’t want them other than as input to the instructor. They shouldn’t even go to the chair.
      20. R. Guell: Open-ended or “Any comment?”
      21. D. Bradley: “Any comment.” Those should not go to the chair or anyone but the instructor. They are not of any value to anyone else.
      22. R. Guell: That brings us to other things FAC said in November I had caused us to overlook.
      23. D. Hantzis: We discussed these with the Taskforce too and reaffirmed that we wanted to suggest that it should not be optional for there to be questions below the line. We believe that in the best interest of the faculty more questions have to be asked that cannot go above the line. It should be up to the college to determine whether they are college or department questions. B. Balch is strong on this in FAC. Arts & Sciences, for example, could decide that departments could write their own. Education could write questions at the college level only. It’s not up to us to decide at what level they should be written.
      24. D. Bradley: We have had very little success getting forty departments to do the same thing. There needs to be a universal set—or a college set—of default questions.
      25. R. Guell: Does anyone here have language that you would suggest as motion-type language we could add an amendment to that would mandate that colleges have questions or ensure the creation of departmental ones, and would allow for the “Any other comment” questions to appear at every department level, but the results only go to the instructor?
      26. D. Hantzis: When we wrote additional related recommendations we hadn’t considered a “write whatever you want.” I agree that needs to go to instructors only. We could rewrite some of that language. We didn’t suggest that. The recommendation that says, “No set of 6-10 questions will provide useful data. FAC strongly recommends that the Senate work with Academic Affairs to ensure that the process of developing a viable instrument takes seriously the need for college/department/instructor level questions to be added, as provided for in the tool. If the only questions are the common questions, the data are nearly without value to faculty or to faculty review processes.” Part of that could be reworded into a motion from FAC.
      27. R. Guell: Between you and me we will come up with an action motion for next week.
      28. D. Hantzis: We had quite a conversation about the “Any comment” one. That would be below the second line.
      29. E. Hampton: For the same reason we are thinking about “Any other comment” should we have open-ended questions at the department or college level? They would be mandated to be part of the biennial review. How will we fit that?
      30. C. Olsen: I was thinking these in bold would not be go to everyone.
      31. D. Bradley: You could put them in as universal but I would have them still only go to instructors.
      32. C. Olsen: I thought S. Powers told us they couldn’t do that.
      33. D. Hantzis: Mandate that the college will develop five questions that will include at least these two.
      34. C. Olsen: As long as that will work for S. Powers.
8. FAC Items
   1. BCoE Constitution. R. Guell, K. Yousif. Vote: 7-0-0
      1. D. Hantzis: We presented the two constitutions for compliance. The change made in the BCoE Constitution was minor. They adjusted their calendar and assumption of offices in order to reconcile terms of service. Our review found no compliance issues.
   2. UCC Constitution R. Guell, C. Olsen. Vote: 7-0-0
      1. D. Hantzis: I didn’t participate as a reader but in the conversation, as I am one of the primary writers. The primary readers and the rest of the committee found no compliance issues, but of the list of observations, the majority are format or style issues, and there are two that must be addressed by the UC. They aren’t out of compliance with the Handbook. First is that by default, any chairperson is a member of the UC faculty. Second, the concern I thought was the most insightful was the UC is a different sort of college in that the staff is different staff. They are not mentioned in the constitution. I don’t know how that will be reconciled. The point of the review is we found no compliance concerns.
      2. R. Guell: Did we have to do anything more with compliance questions?
      3. D. Hantzis: Exec shares what it chooses to share with representative colleges and says “this is fine” or “this needs work.”
      4. R. Guell: Motion that we accept the Constitution—that it is not out of compliance.
      5. D. Hantzis: FAC is only allowed to review anything new.
      6. R. Guell: BCoE are in compliance with the University Handbook. The Executive Committee accepts that finding by FAC.
      7. R. Guell: As for University College, their Constitution in its entirety is in compliance with the University Handbook
      8. R. Guell: I will communicate these things to the relevant bodies.
      9. D. Hantzis: Both readers are willing to have their documents looked at.
   3. Election of Temporary Faculty Advocate. A. Anderson, K. Bolinger. Vote: 7-0-0
      1. R. Guell: The meeting I held with any Temporary Faculty produced only one person, and that is M. Morahn. Are there any objections?
      2. K. Yousif: Is that going to go in the revision of Section 350?
      3. D. Hantzis: No, that’s the Constitution. They don’t elect their own representative. It’s still selection and not part of the previous revisions. We talked about this; I spoke with L. Henson about her sense of what a process might look like, and looked at other universities and shared everything with FAC. What you have is a process to allow temporary faculty who do not have voting rights a vehicle to vote for a representative on the Senate. They don’t exist as a governance body that way. We are recommending a couple of changes. The title should be changed from “Advocate” to “Representative.” This is intended to be a representative. We did a nomination process that we decided to make parallel to the Senate process, and it should say “10” not “15.” We considered making the requirement more stringent because they have to represent the University. I think that members of FAC said, quite wisely, that the voting process would be the way they participate. They need ten signatures of temporary faculty like Senators do. The point is the nomination would be precisely as Senators are nominated. The next process is selection. All names would be distributed via ballots, and the results shall be sent to Exec who will present recommendations of no fewer than three—probably will need an “if possible” clause—that will be sent to the President and Provost. We diverge from Senator elections in our suggestion about timing and selection. We are asking that it take place in August, not April. There are more temporary faculty employed in fall and not spring. The nominations will close the Friday of the second week of classes each fall. Voting shall commence within one week and they shall be given one week to vote.
      4. D. Bradley: Would they automatically miss the first two meetings of the Senate?
      5. D. Hantzis: The old representative would stay until the new took over.
      6. C. MacDonald: What if I’m employed this year and was elected to this position, and next year was not employed...
      7. D. Hantzis: The alternate representative would serve.
      8. K. Bolinger: Do we want to soften the language on that?
      9. R. Guell: Recommendation of no fewer than three if possible.
      10. J. Maynard: It may be difficult to get as many as three.
      11. D. Hantzis: I think that will change. I think there are temporary faculty who have no idea that they have representation in the Senate. L. Henson started the ball rolling.
      12. R. Guell: L. Henson got many more responses to her communications to them than I did to mine.
      13. D. Bradley: We have now given temporary faculty the title Lecturer. I would suggest we use that term.
      14. D. Hantzis: They call other faculty “regular faculty” for the process of election.
      15. R. Guell: There are also employees teaching a course.
      16. D. Bradley: I just don’t want conflict.
      17. R. Guell: Temporary faculty is defined in Section 305 and coincident with Lecturer. Because this is a constitutional thing it would again require a vote of the faculty and reading and the rest. Are there any other issues you would like to discuss?
   4. Response to Amorous and Familial Relationships Policy
      1. R. Guell: Before motions and discussions I actually would like to state clearly that in the document and first paragraph FAC is not excited about the language that exists but then goes on quite responsibly to deal with the language that does exist. We have until June. There is no rush on this. I would like to discuss this now and give FAC the freedom to come up with its own thoughts on what the policy should be. It asked us to abandon this and charge the appropriate committee. I believe FAC is the appropriate committee. My view is if FAC has a better idea on dealing with it and felt constrained then FAC should be able to consider its own motions and we will either vote on what FAC produced or on editing the document the way FAC didn’t.
      2. D. Bradley: This is not simply a faculty policy.
      3. J. Maynard: We will also get Staff Council’s input. We have to allow time for that.
      4. D. Bradley: It was suggested to me that half the problem with this policy is the name. If we can think about other names—basically, it’s a Conflict of Interest Policy.
      5. D. Hantzis: Conflict of Personal Interest.
      6. R. Guell: D. Hantzis’ words express that very well. It’s not just people you love but people you hate with a fiery passion that you have a conflict of interest with. Whether it is teaching our children, significant other, or the person we would like to crucify it is about fair, unbiased evaluation and treatment.
      7. D. Bradley: First and foremost it is about disclosure. Once you explain that it’s happening that conversation’s over with unless someone doesn’t like it.
      8. J. Maynard: I don’t think disclosure is far enough on some relationships.
      9. D. Bradley: The one you disclose to has to be okay with it.
      10. R. Guell: My son was in my class in the fall and the spring. I told J. Conant about it, put the rubric and my son’s work in front of him, and gave him parallel work. We dealt with it.
      11. D. Bradley: The supervisor should have some flexibility.
      12. D. Hantzis: We have made substantial comments. The revision is good. Frankly it seemed at time that whoever drafted it was embarrassed. There’s an unwritten giggle throughout the document. Additionally, “sexual” and “amorous” are used as the same term. T. Hawkins said there are better ways to say this that are more simple. There should be disclosure and a consent agreement. I don’t discount the work that was done to rewrite it.
      13. D. Bradley: In the Financial Aid audit a mother had reviewed the FAFSA for the daughter. There was no problem other than there was a mistake in the FAFSA which was not detected, and that makes the employee vulnerable. It could have come out looking really badly. It is protection for the employee and the student both.
      14. K. Bolinger: We have two situations. One is an evaluation piece in which you may evaluate the work of a son or girlfriend, and the other is supervision. It doesn’t say, “I need to inform you that I am sleeping with a faculty member.” Do you want that distinction?
      15. D. Bradley: Those are just two ends of the spectrum. Often it is somewhat evaluative and somewhat supervisory.
      16. K. Bolinger: Should they be the same then? Inform my supervisor that the relationship exists or “I hate this faculty member” and tell them what steps I’m taking to make sure they are evaluated fairly? It seems here that I have to sever that relationship.
      17. D. Hantzis: You are right to raise that as a more complex point. Where a supervisor’s decision had to be made we would just have a substitute. Some decisions are not codified.
      18. K. Bolinger: It would include not just me having a familial relationship but maybe a longstanding grudge. I think language needs to be changed to allow for flexibility.
      19. D. Bradley: Broad language gives supervisors flexibility to adjust what changes need to be made.
      20. K. Bolinger: 912.2.1 needs to be changed.
      21. R. Guell: At the next FAC meeting, could you ask colleagues whether they really want what they asked for, and if they do, give it to them?
      22. D. Hantzis: Once we’re done with Section 305.
      23. R. Guell: I do agree with the excising of the entirety of the section which feels like it is largely justification that doesn’t need to be written.
      24. D. Hantzis: We say it’s overwritten.
      25. R. Guell: I’m not sure really that FAC will come up with anything better than what they edited this down to. They should be given the opportunity to do so. We would like to coordinate our input with Staff Council.
      26. D. Bradley: I have put K. Butwin on this too.
   5. Section 305
      1. D. Hantzis: I think we’re in good shape regarding Section 305. We’d also like to help Nursing move forward. We started drafting a statement of special provisions for independent reviewers and trying to identify titles, as well as situations in which it would be appropriate for another independent review to be a part of one’s own annual review portfolio. I have been charged with drafting the stipulation that this is never okay unless there is an accreditation mandate and that is verified. Sometimes they want the expert to write a review of your teaching. In some cases the faculty member has to ensure a PT person has reviewed his or her file like an external reviewer would. There’s that vs. the Executive Director of Nursing title which says they have to look at each and every one of them. I am less confident recommending whether we make the Executive Director on a level with department or college. The independent reviews should probably occur at the department level. I still think Dean is a superior position. These are programmatic requirements, not college requirements. I am less sure whether we can make changes in 350, 351, and 352.
      2. R. Guell: Those issues at least need to be identified and on to the next year’s group.
      3. D. Hantzis: We identified the problem. The problem is we have an entire section that defines a department. The “School” definition does not exist.
9. Adjournment 4:58pm