

10-3-2017

October 3, 2017

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "October 3, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1102.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1102](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1102)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes  
3 October 2017 ▪ 2:00-3:50 p.m.  
Witters Conference Room 4440, Booth Library

The 2017-2018 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available at <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>.

*Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.*

Senators present: T. Abebe, S. Brantley, T. Bruns, E. Corrigan, S. Gosse, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young, R. Cash

Senators absent: S. Eckert, N. Hugo

Guests in attendance: Dr. David Glassman (EIU President), Jarad Jarmon (JG-TC), Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

*Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:02 p.m.*

#### I. University Update and Conversation with President David Glassman

GLASSMAN: New bill was submitted to the House by Rep. Brady [HB4103]; similar bill will be presented to the State Senate by Chapin Rose – bill is structured to higher education, systematic changes to how higher ed works in Illinois – a single common application for all universities; automatic admission for students with certain grades/scores, process coordinated by IBHE; each university would be reviewed for its academic programs, IBHE would recognize the top 8 schools for each program; students would be filtered into higher-ranked programs (reduce redundancy in programs) –

My interest in Springfield has been to continue advocacy to ensure FY19 budget –

Pleased about Governor's statement about higher ed –

SIU, EIU, Uofl were in Mt Carmel 3-4 weeks ago meeting with prospective students – common message to students: stay in state –

Marketing initiative will be kicking off in the next 2 weeks – we've signed contracts for theaters, TV stations, billboards, online, Spotify, Pandora to get message out – goal is awareness –

Compare application data from this day last year to today: freshmen applications up 52%, freshmen admits up 103%, transfer applications up 50%, transfer admits up 65%, graduate applications up 172%, graduate admits up 100% – these are students who have applied without the marketing –

We invited prospective students to come for a football game a couple weeks ago and to take a tour, 50 families came

Budgets unfrozen for some departments – takes a little while to load, way too long to my mindset – two weeks ago Business Office gave budgets to VPs, tweaked this week; next week VPs will have the full depth, budgets should be posted soon thereafter –

14 faculty positions approved for this year, also 2 Unit B to Unit A conversions – Provost Gatrell and I sat down with all the requests – 3-year plan: it will take 3 years to replace faculty, many years to replace the strength of departments – vitalization will help with rebuilding –

During state of the university address I mentioned retention – diverse students need diverse models/practices to ensure success – Provost will be forming a task force to help identify such practices; resources will come from the President's office as an investment –

Retention increased 4% from previous year – we used to have an 80% retention rate (around 75% now), goal is to bring it back up – no other peer institution has the graduation, retention, placement, alumni satisfaction rates that we have; but we should always strive to be better –

ROBERTSON: When will the call be issued for serving on the retention initiative?

GLASSMAN: Provost Gatrell is working on getting vitalization underway by staffing the Workgroups 8 & 9 Feedback Committee first, then we'll go to the retention piece

ROBERTSON: We discussed the retention initiative briefly at our last meeting, all in support

ABEBE: [to Glassman] I believe you've been a great spokesperson for EIU, I would like to acknowledge your role in the turnaround – also the Provost's willingness to delegate issues to us sends the right signals

GLASSMAN: I appreciate that – the good work taking place here is not just me, it's everybody on campus

STOWELL: For the Workgroups 8 & 9 Feedback Committee, Provost Gatrell wants "fresh eyes"; does that exclude those who have previously worked on those groups?

GLASSMAN: recommendations are all over the place, broad-based – I asked the workgroups to think wide and they did, now it's a question of what fits our history & heritage / our future & marketability – I can't (and shouldn't) do it by myself; recommendations should be vetted by faculty – I can't speak for Provost Gatrell but I think that he probably felt that the workgroups did their job, now we need somebody to come in to help address which recommendations are the jewels, is it a good idea for EIU, etc. – this is the process he wanted to start with but it may not be the final process, maybe take ideas to a town hall –  
Over the summer I asked the Chairs to take a look at it; I've heard clearly in my two years here that I haven't been utilizing the talents, expertise, experience of Faculty Senate enough, and the Chairs have expressed a similar sentiment in the area of academics, that I haven't brought them in enough to the discussion on issues that could affect – Chairs are included in this group, so that we can feel that we're all working together toward what's best for EIU

BRUNS: Where do library faculty fit in among the 5 Faculty Senate appointees?

GLASSMAN: That's a great question to ask Jay, for the sake of inclusion

ROBERTSON: I appreciate your continuing to follow up on vitalization...

GLASSMAN: What we create right now will be the model for EIU for the next 20 years – student interests, methods of learning are changing quickly – what we offer has to create sustainability of students, we have to be future-looking

ABEBE: Would you like to comment on the resolution in front of us?

GLASSMAN: There's not just one issue being discussed but at least 3 things you're talking about: specific naming of a specific hall; bigger picture of how to improve inclusion, cultural change on campus (greatest importance); process of naming facilities in the future – what do we do with Douglas Hall? I've researched the 2010 discussion... – everybody in this room understands that the naming was intended to commemorate the debate, but not everybody who comes to campus has the same impression – I'm trying to figure out how I could perhaps alleviate this so we can move to the bigger question of bettering our university culture; my only suggestion is to put historical markers explaining the names and the significance of the debate on both buildings, so everybody can see – I want to use it as an educational tool, a dialogue tool rather than having the historians say you can't change history, another side saying we don't want to commemorate someone we don't believe should be commemorated – I understand both sides, both have strong reasoning – I've received several emails from legislators and others asking why are you taking up this debate? Because of the importance of inclusion, respecting all backgrounds and all people – people lose sight of that because they zero in on wanting to change the name of a building; I would love to take that off the table and go to the bigger question: what do we do to improve inclusion and change our culture on this campus, to become a model of inclusion that could be emulated to other universities, to the Charleston community, that we value all of humanity – any resolution you give me I will take thoughtfully, I value your input, but as the resolution stands I'm not sure of your objective [*advises being clear about objective by giving examples*]

## II. Approval of Minutes from September 19, 2017

Motion to approve by Wharram, seconded by Sterling

Discussion: none

*Vote: 12 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstention (Hung) – motion carried*

## III. Renaming Proposal Discussion and Vote

ROBERTSON: Before we segue into the vote, we have several things to accomplish today: prioritize Norman discussion topics, Provost report on staffing, conversation under Nominations re: moving forward with WG8&9 feedback, Textbook Advisory committee

STOWELL: We also have an election item

ROBERTSON: Let's proceed to discussion of the resolution – I move that we vote on the resolution

ABEBE: I second

BRUNS: I appreciate President Glassman's comments that the bigger discussion is about campus climate, but the naming of the building is part of that discussion – not to dismiss his suggestion but I don't know that a plaque will take the building out of the discussion

STOWELL: 1) Do we need to establish a separate mechanism for having these types of lectures, or is faculty forum sufficient? – 2) one of the “whereas” clauses talks about revising the name to Lincoln-Douglas Debate Halls, which I would support, but the resolution is not specific enough for me to be comfortable – I would be more comfortable if we included what we think is appropriate in the “resolved” part

HUNG: If our recommendation is for the President to start the naming review process, we should hold off on our input until that’s resolved – in the second-to-last “whereas” clause, the final sentence seems out of place against the resolution – name recommendation is premature

ROBERTSON: I decided to include a proposed name change to alleviate concern we were erasing history, but I stopped short of repeating the exact wording in the “resolved” section so Faculty Senate wouldn’t be prescribing a name, just saying that this [name] is an example of a compromise that would be appropriate, agreeable to most of our body without completely removing the name

HUNG: I’m happy with everything except that one piece – having heard the rationale, I suggest an additional “whereas” clause so that it reads as intended (examples such as) instead of endorsing one option

WILLIAMS: Given his comments I’m not sure President Glassman will take this, he wants a firmer statement – the only way to prevent the building name issue from continually coming back is not plaques on the building wings, it has to be more generic – if we were to make a stronger statement as to what we see as appropriate, but take the time for others to provide input before we do that, so I’m not sure submitting this now is a good plan

BRUNS: If this needs to go to the naming committee and they come up with a suggestion, then what are we doing besides asking President Glassman to convene it? We could be clearer about what we’re telling him...

GOSSE: [IGP\[148\]](#) says all recommendations regarding naming are made to the President, any member of the university community may recommend a naming or renaming of a campus facility – *[reads off membership of Naming Committee: 5 designated, 2 presidential appointees]*

HUNG: *[clarifies that anyone can make a recommendation, but the committee makes the recommendation to the President]*

ABEBE: We have had wonderful discussions on this topic – when we worked on this resolution we tried to address the multiple needs and interests that we heard in this room – what we’re doing, as always, is making a recommendation; the President can say no – in the recommendation we’re calling upon him to convene a naming committee; he can appoint anybody he wants – the naming committee can leave things as they are, or they can change it to a new name; we have included a suggestion for a name in the recommendation as part of the response to the question that was raised – the naming committee could make a recommendation and the Board could say no to changing the name, or they might question why Faculty Senate didn’t give a suggestion as to what that name ought to be – we have tried to address things as completely as possible – I would like to hear Sen. Young’s opinion

YOUNG: The resolution is carefully, responsibly, temperately framed; it brings together the different strands of our discussion – I support it

HUNG: Faculty Senate doesn’t have the authority to name, the most we can do is recommend; pointing out to the President that there’s a need at this time to form this committee to tackle this issue seems to be the most appropriate response that Senate can put forth

YOUNG: I don’t want to put the building issue behind us forever, it deserves to be reexamined – I welcome expansion of the conversation – next year is the 160th anniversary of the Lincoln-Douglas debate, appropriate time to come to a resolution after a great discussion; it would fit in with dynamization of reformulating [EIU’s] identity

BRUNS: I wish the resolution included Sen. Williams’s spot-on suggestion of Lincoln-Douglas Debate Halls East-West; I would propose sending that up to the President but then we’re suggesting something specifically and we may not all agree on that suggestion, it just seemed like a perfect solution to me

ROBERTSON: I’m not opposed to that – I tried to find a way to include that without suggesting that we’re also revising the name of Lincoln Hall

BRUNS: But if the buildings commemorate the debate then it should be Lincoln-Douglas Debate Halls

STOWELL: That’s what the museum in Charleston is called: Lincoln-Douglas Debate Museum

WILLIAMS: It prevents any future complaint about either gentleman’s name

BRUNS: I move that we add that specific recommendation to the resolution

ROBERTSON: *[consults Hung as parliamentarian on accepting friendly amendments]*

HUNG: You can propose a friendly amendment, and if the authors accept it, then it’s done; if it’s not accepted, then we vote on the amendment first before we vote on the proposed resolution

BRUNS: I propose it as a friendly amendment

STERLING: As an amendment to the “whereas” clause or to “therefore, be it resolved”?

HUNG: If the intent is to give concrete examples for Dr. Glassman to review, then it should be in the “resolved” clause – if we’re just throwing out possibilities to stave off the presumption that we’re doing away with the names altogether, it can fall under the “whereas” clause

BRUNS: My intention is to say “this is our suggestion”

HUNG: Then it should fall under the “be it resolved” portion

[wordsmithing]

HUNG: That would follow well in the sentence that reads “... and task the University Naming Committee ...” – we’re saying empanel the naming committee to consider the revision, and here’s our suggestion for you to consider

BRUNS: Which is how it works according to the IGP, there’s a suggestion made and the naming committee then reviews it

WILLIAMS: We need to say Douglas and Lincoln Hall because we want both to be changed as a single two-winged structure

[more wordsmithing]

BRUNS: Have the authors of the resolution accepted the friendly amendment?

ABEBE/ROBERTSON: Yes

HUNG: Working on the language, then they can approve it

[more wordsmithing]

STOWELL: Are we asking them to review all the names on campus? That’s in the IGP, every ten years they’re supposed to look at every facility name

ROBERTSON: That’s in the next sentence

HUNG: Make clear we’re not saying we’re the only recommendation you should consider, but this is our recommendation

[more wordsmithing]

ROBERTSON: In line with President Glassman, I would like a university-wide dialogue, a more holistic approach about campus climate – where I might disagree is I feel that having dialogue about this name sets it up – the resolution leaves room for him to follow up without us prescribing

STERLING: First of all I am completely opposed to renaming Lincoln Hall; if people mistakenly believe that Douglas Hall was named to honor and commemorate Stephen A. Douglas, then presumably they also might mistakenly believe that Lincoln Hall was named to honor and commemorate Abraham Lincoln, and so we the Senate would be saying Lincoln is not worthy of having a hall named after him; I would vote against any proposal that renames Lincoln Hall – second of all, it seems strange to say that we recommend the university initiate principles governing the naming or renaming of facilities on campus as has been done at other institutions, citing Yale, and then we say here’s what the naming committee ought to rename it when we don’t have any naming principles in place to use; I’m not saying that we should adopt the Yale principles but it’s not clear to me that if we did, that we should favor renaming Douglas Hall according to those principles

ROBERTSON: Prior draft did recommend that the naming committee consider and refer to the Yale principles as a model; as we revised it, we thought not referring to another off-campus body might be more streamlined

STERLING: Socrates would think that we ought to come up with the principles first and then apply them to the case

BRUNS: Immediate and long-term issues to address: naming of the building versus how do we go about naming buildings

GOSSE: [reading from IGP guidelines on recommended names]: significance and meaning for constituencies, significance and meaning for the University as a whole

HUNG: Let’s resolve the friendly amendment; we’ve crafted the language, we should have a formal acceptance of the friendly amendment and then continue the debate before closure and vote

ROBERTSON: We accepted the friendly amendment to the first “whereas” [reads revised language]

HUNG: So that becomes the new proposed resolution; now we can continue our discussion about the amended resolution

WHARRAM: I have a couple of misgivings – this feels like it could be the resolution we create after we’ve had a robust conversation; not just the names, important to think of this as part of a larger conversation about the

campus climate and inclusion – sixth “whereas” clause: back in 2010 the Black Student Union objected that their voices were not heard in the dialogue; have we acted any differently now? I think we should, we can do that given a little bit more time – I understand the desire to put this issue to rest, but at the same time I feel like we don’t need to that quickly, we could continue to have a conversation about it within a larger framework – the other misgiving is we further encourage as an educational institution that the President’s Office establish a lecture series; we’re kind of passing the buck, we could do that, ask questions and get feedback first – the resolution is wonderfully written, and I will vote for it today because voting against it says something I don’t want to say; on the other hand I would suggest that we could wait and get more feedback and incorporate that into a resolution later this year

ROBERTSON: I feel moving forward with this resolution enables that conversation

BRUNS: Are we the body to ask BSU? Because we aren’t the body to make the naming decision – I agree that this resolution moves the process along, which should include additional dialogue

BRANTLEY: If we’re concerned about this conversation continuing, we need to provide action and structure beyond our vote – we’re passing it along to the appropriate body; we need to pay additional attention to it actively moving forward

ROBERTSON: What if we added a clause at the end about our willingness to continue to be involved in this process, as we view this spurring a larger campus-wide, community-wide conversation about inclusion; where we’re not just handing it off – on the other hand, the Naming Committee in the IGP is typically staffed by the Chair of Faculty Senate or a designee; I’d be happy to do it, but you know where I stand, so if you want a more neutral voice, that’s fine

STOWELL: How would you feel about splitting the resolution, taking the part about the lecture series and having that be a separate topic, because if we pass it to the President’s Office it’s out of our hands – do we want to say “President, take the lead” or do we want to say WE are going to do this, we’re going to have the conversation – being a data-driven decision-maker I’m curious about where would we get the data on how we’re doing as a campus on inclusion; there are sources of data we could consult – that’s a separate part of the resolution from let’s get the naming process started

ABEBE: Last Spring you said [as a Senate] we have been reactive – most institutions have lecture series emanating from the President’s Office, used to educate the campus on very important issues; this is one of the issues ... rather than responding or reacting, invite somebody to campus to talk about it, create a dialogue in that sort of forum – part of why we’re asking the President’s Office to do this is the gravitas coming out of that office, the resources this requires; faculty cannot do this, no other office on campus can lend credibility to a lecture series as much as the President’s Office

STOWELL: I guess the question is, where do we want the weight of responsibility to be?

GOSSE: I’ve presented at campus diversity conferences, maybe that’s the venue to go through (Mona Davenport, Minority Affairs)

STERLING: I move to close debate and call the question

YOUNG: I second

#### Vote by Roll Call

Abebe: yes; Brantley: yes; Bruns: yes; Corrigan: yes; Gosse: yes; Hung: yes; Oliver: yes; Robertson: yes;  
Stowell: yes; Sterling: yes; Wharram: yes; Williams: yes; Young: yes

*Motion passes unanimously*

Vote to adopt resolution as amended

#### Vote by Roll Call

Abebe: yes; Brantley: yes; Bruns: yes; Corrigan: abstain; Gosse: yes; Hung: yes; Oliver: yes; Robertson: yes;  
Stowell: yes; Sterling: no; Wharram: yes; Williams: yes; Young: yes

*Motion passes with 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention*

ROBERTSON: I will make the adjustments in the document this afternoon so that we can distribute it

#### IV. Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: IBHE meeting on campus Thursday, I will attend – on Friday CUPB will meet – diversity conference on October 13 (fall break) – Executive Committee meeting with President and Provost one week from today, let us know if there’s anything you’d like us to discuss

HUNG: Could you ask about any strategic plan they have in terms of staffing? I'd like to learn more about the 3-year plan: what is the vision behind this, anything more to reveal at this point?

WHARRAM: Is there an intention behind bringing Unit B positions into Unit A?

ROBERTSON: Will we have full national searches for those positions?

WHARRAM: Will Unit B be convertible into a Unit A hire? [*discusses Criminology as example*]

BRUNS: We have two Unit B positions in Library Services that were Unit A – is this part of the plan, that they will work on changing those back?

HUNG: A second point of discussion, if you could have a conversation with them about where the process is in the Gateway program, restructuring of the advisors?

ROBERTSON: At our last meeting President Glassman focused on the physical aspects of the move; he didn't elaborate on the current state but we will talk to him about it

HUNG: Part of the conversation about campus climate, minority students, retention

## V. Prioritization of Topics for Discussion with Josh Norman on Oct. 17

ROBERTSON: He has a 30-45 minute window (2:10-2:50), so he wants us to rank or prioritize some of these topics [*reads from list sent by email*]

BRUNS: All of these topics are important so I suggest that he summarize these and send it to us ahead of time, then we can compile Q&A based on summary

HUNG: By Friday before next Senate meeting, then we'll have 3-4 days to read over it

## VI. Committee Reports

1. Elections Committee (STOWELL): I received notification of a vacancy due to sabbatical on CAA next semester – in our Fall election the next highest vote-getter was Stu Sallehu (Business), I propose asking him to fill the one-semester vacancy

Motion by Stowell, seconded by Bruns

*Vote: 13 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried*

2. Nominations Committee (OLIVER): I circulated the results of our call to fill vacancies – used random method to identify candidate to fill position and the order of alternates – Grant-in-aid Appeals Committee currently has 4 members; we've had 5 to serve but I can't find explicit language stating that we need that number – Library Advisory Board 2nd year CEPS and 1st year LCBAS positions are still open; sent email to Deans to try to identify candidates – Provost Gatrell is looking to reactivate the Textbook Advisory Committee, we have a full roster ready to participate – we need 5 appointees for the Workgroups 8&9 Feedback Committee; circulate another call to faculty for nominations to serve; any suggestions on populating?

BRUNS: Proposed membership excludes Library Services faculty – ask Jay to clarify before a call is issued

ROBERTSON: I'll contact him about this

HUNG: Is he asking us to put out a call for volunteers and then hold a faculty vote, or just recommend names? Do we use the election mechanism, or do we solicit volunteers and then choose from among them?

BRUNS/ABEBE: He says "appoint"

HUNG: So we call for volunteers then, from those names received, Faculty Senate decides which to recommend to serve on the panel

ABEBE: Timeframe? How soon does he want this?

ROBERTSON: I'll follow up on this immediately but we should move toward making appointments at our next meeting

HUNG: After those issues are resolved, then Sen. Oliver can go ahead with the call

OLIVER: Is there a motion to accept the populated appointed committees?

ABEBE: So moved

WHARRAM: Second

*Vote: 13 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions – motion carried*

3. Faculty-Student Relations Committee (BRUNS): no report

4. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee (HUNG): Discussion after Staff Senate meeting about joint activities during

Homecoming week – Staff Senate is working on a kickoff event; Housing & Dining is donating food; they're seeking \$500 in donations to help with the cost – not clear if they're asking Faculty Senate to help with fundraising or to donate; we don't have a budget, so the best we can do is put out a call to faculty

STERLING: We have asked in the past for the President to give us money on various occasions

HUNG: If we want to participate, in light of this information from Sen. Sterling, maybe we can ask for an amount to match faculty donations? We might not need to come up with the entire \$500

BRUNS: So this is an activity that Staff Senate is doing

ROBERTSON: When is Homecoming weekend? Can we get clarification on exactly what they want and then finalize at our next meeting?

5. Awards Committee (ROBERTSON, on behalf of Hugo): The call for Mendez Award nominations was sent out again; deadline is Friday, October 13
6. Faculty Forum Committee (ABEBE): no report
7. Budget Transparency Committee (STERLING): no report
8. Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics: no report

*Session adjourned at 3:45 p.m.*

**APPENDIX: PROVOST'S REPORT**  
[submitted in advance by Dr. Jay Gatrell]

**STAFFING FOR 2018-2019**

On Wednesday September 27th, 14 searches were authorized and the deans notified. The authorized positions were the highest priority needs that could be supported from a pool of 41 requests that included four potential Unit-B conversions. The decisions were prioritized based on program needs, accreditation considerations, available resources, and the capacity for programs to deliver coursework. The 14 full-time searches include faculty across all Colleges and will provide support to both undergraduate and graduate programs. In addition to the searches, two Unit-B conversion requests were approved. The approval of 2018-2019 searches are part of a three-year plan to address critical instructional needs and invest in student success.

While the fiscal environment requires a conservative approach to budgets, the authorization underscore EIU's commitment to academic excellence and full-time faculty. Additionally, I will be working with President Glassman and the deans to address future staffing needs on a case-by-case basis as new opportunities emerge, additional resources are identified, and curricular needs arise.

The searches are outlined below:

**UNIT-A (n=7)**

Communication Studies  
Elementary Education-C&I  
Biology  
Chemistry—Year 1 of a 3 year build out  
Marketing  
Accounting  
Finance

**UNIT-B (n=7)**

Criminology  
Computer Science  
Art Education with the capacity to contribute in a strategic area to support UGRAD program  
Clinical Psychology (Spring 2018 forward—immediate need)  
Creative Writing  
Counseling (Spring 2018 forward—immediate need)  
School of Technology

**UNIT-B TO UNIT-A**

Graphic Design  
Dietetics

**WORKGROUPS 8 & 9**

I am respectfully requesting Senate support for a “fresh eyes” assessment of the recommendations outlined in Workgroups 8 & 9. As the attached PDF requests, I ask that the Senate appoint five faculty colleagues to serve. The review will consider the recommendations relative to mission, enrollment, feasibility and the overall sustainability of the University. More importantly, the opportunity to formally reflect on and prioritize the recommendations will permit EIU to strategically leverage the important and innovative work of the campus community vis-à-vis Vitalization.

As you know, enrollment is a critical priority as the fiscal environment continues to be challenging. For that reason, an implementation plan for both workgroups must be developed so that EIU will continue to thrive, innovate, and provide our students outstanding learning experiences.

**BUDGET**

The budget development process continues and the President's Council is collaboratively developing a plan to make appropriate adjustments given more limited resources (i.e., reduced tuition revenue), unfunded mandates (i.e., SURS contributions), and the realistic expectation that 5% may not be forthcoming pursuant to the governing legislation that authorized the current state budget. While resources continue to be limited, student success, on-time graduation, and quality instruction are the highest priorities.

[Attachment: WG8 and WG9 Charge.pdf]