

11-14-2017

November 14, 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, "November 14, 2017" (2017). *Minutes*. 1099.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/1099](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1099)

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  
14 November 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. Eckert, S. Gosse, N. Hugo, K. Hung, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, J. Williams, B. Young, R. Cash

Senators absent: C. Wharram

Guests in attendance: David Glassman (President), Jay Gatrell (Provost), Jon Blitz (UPI), Jarad Jarmon (JG-TC), Brooke Schwartz (DEN)

Session called to order by Chair J. Robertson at 2:01 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes from October 31, 2017**

*Motion to approve by Abebe, seconded by Sterling*

*Discussion: none*

*Vote: 9 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions (Gosse, Williams) – motion carried*

### **Follow-Up Conversation with President Glassman**

GLASSMAN: I met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and discussed one major question related to sports; they shared your thoughts with me – no action item re: Intercollegiate Athletics at Board of Trustees meeting this week; they asked me to provide recommendation by end of semester – I invite anybody to see me to talk about it – it's a complex question, with parameters; what's best for the university is my sole focus – this is two and a half years in the making, although circumstances have changed dramatically based on enrollment and other factors –

I was in Springfield last week – there's a mixed feeling as to whether there will be a budget on May 31 or a stopgap (the other key date is November [election]), there's a suggestion we may get half a year in May – nobody is saying impasse or no budget, but it's how the money will come forward – most say it would be difficult not to pass a budget during an election year – our institution has to be conservative with expenses to make sure there's no stop in our operations, but that means holding firm on restrictions –

14 faculty searches going on; one position in Psychology has been altered from Unit B to Unit A –

Legislators in Springfield are off until January – I'll still go back a couple of times to meet with chiefs of staff, continue to advocate for importance of higher education and its funding –

Locally a second Republican candidate [for State Representative] will be announcing tomorrow night (Terry Davis, small business owner [Towne Square Jewelers]); Chris Miller from Oakland has already announced – one Democratic challenger, Dr. [Shirley] Bell – I don't endorse / university doesn't endorse but you should be aware of who's running for [House] District 110, what their platform is –

MEI diversity workshop was held recently, well attended; we'll continue with inclusion and diversity activities on campus – moving to student success initiatives, Provost Gatrell has a committee up and running –

Vitalization continues, concentrating on Workgroups 8 and 9; also the Technology workgroup, which wanted to consolidate into a centralized ITS system –

Recruitment and marketing efforts showing positive trends right now – EWork numbers for today versus last year on the same day: new first-time full-time applicants [freshmen] up 47% (more than 5300, compared to 3600); new freshman admits up 73% (more than 2500, compared to less than 1500); deposits are already up 106%; transfer applicants up 53%; transfer admits up 47%; graduate applicants up 88%; graduate admits up 58%; international undergraduate applications up 114%; international graduate applications up 128% – this is due to what we've all been doing; the marketing (deployed three weeks ago) is to drive interest in exploring EIU, but it's us who will get them to enroll – faculty is the second biggest reason why students choose a campus or not (tour guides are 1st) –

Marketing: prior to new implementations we had 2 billboards in Illinois [local in Charleston/Coles County], now we have 109 billboards across the state placed strategically in zip codes with high schools we've been successful

or want to be successful in bringing students from, close to the schools not the freeway – Chicago and suburbs, Effingham, Champaign, Peoria, East St. Louis/Alton; we're getting good exposure – starting in December when the end of year blockbusters come out, we'll have a 30-second video in 40 theaters (averaging 8 screens each) across the state; some of you may have seen it during the late night news in Springfield, Decatur, Champaign – we're monitoring Internet clicks right now, see how many click to go to our form page (asks for name, phone number); we attempt to get back to them within an hour (marketing group says it should be 15 minutes) – we have commercials on Spotify (ages 16-25) and Pandora (ages 25+, the influencers) by zip code where phone is IP registered – we have a banner on YouTube – this is EIU's largest marketing initiative ever, we have to continue this to keep awareness going; D214 district in dual credit program (1,200 high school students), they didn't know we existed; EIU is not a well-known institution outside our area – positive buzz about EIU right now in our region and beyond, Danville Community College president commented on it; it's the aura of this place extending itself outward to tell our story

ABEBE: I'd like to thank you for the calmness you've brought to campus; our Provost is also sending the right signals to all of us – we sent a resolution to you; could you share [your thoughts]?

GLASSMAN: three issues in the resolution are the name change, how to deal with names as a general policy, and presidential sponsorship of annual diversity/inclusion program – I have since met with the Executive Committees of the Student Senate, Staff Senate, Latin American Student Organization, Black Student Union, NAACP [RSO], and an open session in Douglas Hall – most discussions migrated from the residence hall name to bigger issues of inclusion, diversity, respect, activities on campus – students have mixed feelings about the possible name change, bringing up the same elements on both sides of the issue in each group – I have not determined whether I will move to the Naming Committee at this time, but these have been some of the most fruitful discussions I've had – I'm making some basic changes, looking at the Cultural Center house; for some students the condition of the Cultural Center trumps the building name – when I met with the first group (LASO) we had to talk a lot about the history; by the time I met with the next group, they knew the whole history, and that happened with every group thereafter; they were intelligent, thoughtful in their comments – sponsoring a diversity program seems easy, though I don't know exactly what that would look at – I haven't reviewed the Yale report yet – these are in progress; any resolution brought to me is going to be thoughtfully considered, carefully examined, and an informed decision made to the best of my ability

BRANTLEY: Can you comment more about the Rose-Brady bills?

GLASSMAN: There are two bills, one in the House and one in the Senate; right now there's nothing going on because they're not in session – when I'm asked in Springfield I talk about EIU being an autonomous institution, regional universities have a purpose – I've talked to Chapin [Rose]; he keeps saying it's a starting talking point, he does not expect the bill to be supported in its entirety but there needs to be discussion; he says he's committed to all universities continuing but the bill makes it sound like IBHE is placing students – it's a very detailed bill, a heavy load proposition – I don't oppose the other part of the bill, that there be a common application for all Illinois high school students and that students with a 3.0 GPA or higher be admitted to a public university; universities would still have their own admissions standards, but we do have some open access public universities in Illinois (not EIU); it makes easier for students to apply to multiple schools, and I believe that if they visit EIU they'll end up here; U of I has a problem with that, they're still trying to get their compact reintroduced

HUNG: When State Senator Rose explained the bill as a discussion starting point, did he indicate the topic of discussion? What is he trying to achieve?

GLASSMAN: He didn't indicate to me but the assumption is to reduce redundancy, and to find a way for some schools to be resourced highly in a finite number of areas and move students around the state; but I don't think students really want to move, they want to go where they want to go

ABEBE: It's a business agenda

OLIVER: Regarding the admissions data you shared, have we adjusted our standards at all?

GLASSMAN: Our standards have not changed, aside from one change made by CAA for one group

OLIVER: Investment in a multifaceted marketing campaign is a change from years past; what is the price tag?

GLASSMAN: Prior to my coming here, investment in marketing was at a maximum of \$200,000; usually 1-2% of budget for higher education institutions, so our competitors are probably spending \$1.5 million – last year with a generous request provided from the EIU Foundation, we spent about \$300,000; the Thorburn Group coming in was a couple hundred thousand – for this year we're in the neighborhood of \$600,000 – we have a media buyer through the Thorburn Group (buy more, pay less) – we don't have \$1 million right now, though I still have a gift from the Foundation to help with this

BRUNS: Are website changes recommended by Workgroup 9 underway?

GLASSMAN: I rehired Nate Atkinson, he started two weeks ago; Josh Norman brought to President's Council yesterday a list of what [Nate] has already accomplished – another reason for bringing Nate back is as we start the online RN to BSN nursing program ... our program has about 50 students, that number's been flat; the outside market is thousands of students looking for this degree, BSN soon to be a requirement to work as a nurse – we don't have a means to get to these students, but a vendor will bring the students to us; it's our classes and instructors and program – the volume should grow high, 300-400 students in a couple of years – it's a tuition cost-sharing model with the vendor; we have a seven-year contract with them

GATRELL: Faculty approached it with the notion of curricular innovation, compressed format in terms of delivery; process had been ongoing for 1.5-2 years

GOSSE: We're going to tandem our courses so that students can take two courses per semester (8-week period); it's a compressed timeline, so this will accelerate their progress

GATRELL: The timeframe and marketing mechanism makes a difference; admits are entirely by the department

HUNG: Are we restricted geographically for licensing and accreditation?

GOSSE: No

GLASSMAN: It's all about the price point; lowest price point for such a program is SIUE, ours is a little higher, but they have a large group already – no other public school in Illinois has a third-party partnership; the reason has been procurement, no one wants to touch our state, too many hoops

ECKERT: How did we get this company?

GLASSMAN: They saw this huge market, they know it's highly profitable, so they said we're going to stick it out

ROBERTSON: Thank you for your time

GLASSMAN: I thank you all for everything that you're doing

ROBERTSON: Please relay to Tom Michael our thanks, and congratulate him on the weekend before last, quite a good weekend for EIU [Athletics]

GLASSMAN: I extend my invitation to any department, individual, or group that wants to meet with me; feel that your President is accessible, willing to listen thoughtfully to every idea

### Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: Thank you all for your involvement in our conversation with President Glassman today, and also for the discussion by email – Dec. 5 is our next meeting, Larry White from the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council will be here – reminder that at our last meeting we voted to change the dates of our January sessions: Jan. 9 will be in the Witters Conference Room; we're looking for a space for Jan. 23 – we can pick up our discussion regarding reinitiating constituency reports

BRUNS: [*suggests the Edgar Room in Booth Library for the Jan. 23 meeting*]

ROBERTSON: I'll ask Christine Derrickson

### Provost's Report

GATRELL: Student success task force launched, comprised of 20 people from across campus including 3 students, 5 faculty members, Richard England as Dean representative; all colleges and divisions are represented – the focus is on things that are doable, that we can tackle in the near term – themes that have emerged: *living & learning communities* to promote social integration and student success, themed around majors or concepts – *structure*: what does a one-stop shop look like; how do we organize so we have a visible champion on campus known as the go-to person for student success; we have CASA for some students, but how do we identify a champion for all student success issues – *supplemental instruction*: how do we coordinate it; few such programs exist across campus, Business is the most robust; how can we create a supplemental instruction framework for all 1000/2000-level courses with high DWF rates – should we have a single *tutoring* center; right now student support tutoring activities are scattered, no single department has enough resources to support it all, so how can we pool those resources – *early alert* system: how can we improve the early alert system in our portal; we also have GradesFirst, which is the industry standard, used by our athletics advisors – we'll divide into subcommittees this week –

Other things happening in Academic Affairs: new undergraduate degree in Health Administration is on Friday's agenda for the Board of Trustees meeting

STOWELL: What was the rationale for CAA to move their minutes into a D2L course?

GATRELL: The minutes are actually posted on the website with the agenda

ROBERTSON: Prior to this month their minutes have been sent out as a link I could download, but for the first time I had to navigate to the CAA website

GATRELL: Academic Affairs is down one staff member, who we probably will not be replacing; part of the issue is we're trying to find most efficient, transparent, compliant way to do things

ROBERTSON: One discussion item for later in today's meeting is communication among our committees [university councils], coming up with streamlined way to share information

OLIVER: We have a Student Success Center on campus; is this new initiative taking it to the next level?

GATRELL: I didn't even know we had a center, neither did half the people on the committee, until someone mentioned it – there's CASA, then there's the Student Success Center under Student Affairs; how can we pull them together to create a unified, strategic, intentional partnership between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

OLIVER: So they've been recruited to participate as well?

GATRELL: Yes, the director of that center is on the committee

ABEBE: With regard to the early alert system, maybe 3-4 years ago I made sure I followed up and sent notices, but the feedback from students to me was negative, they didn't like me to report them, so I stopped doing that; I don't know how we can do that without sending a message to the students that a faculty member is watching them; I don't know what message the students got but it was not a positive one

GATRELL: I've received that feedback – the key is moving student success from a compliance framework to a student framework, abandoning language around revenue-based model, talking about the whole student and his/her outcome – part of the dialogue is to change that language

OLIVER: Is it OK to use the early alert system to send a late alert? [*receives several "yes" responses from around the table*] The message is still received, the outreach is still offered...

GATRELL: My hope is that you as a faculty member would be looped into the intervention and communication stream

BRUNS: I've also heard that students consider it invasive – I wonder about the language we're using; would "Early Assistance System" make more sense with what we're trying to do, providing students with more support?

GATRELL: That's why I like the GradesFirst framework: the language, feedback loops, everybody engaged in the intervention in that environment knows what's going on, who has the concern and how to respond – right now you press send but may never know the outcome

OLIVER: I've tried to reach out to the student and keep it personal, but the advisor and I haven't heard anything back; it's late but I'm going to use the alert system – here's the last life preserver, I'm going to throw it to you, do you want to catch it or not

GATRELL: One of the ideas I put forward at the meeting was the notion of a "first week"; instead of doing EIU 1111 over the course of a semester, do it in one week before the rest of the student population comes to campus, make an intentional academic experience about resources, study skills, etc. and then community engagement with Student Affairs in the afternoon – then for those needing more support, the course we usually recommend in the Spring could be taken in the Fall after this first week experience – students in Panther Band have an intense social-academic experience together, then thrive and are retained; create an environment in which we can foster that type of experience for all students – everything's on the table, nothing will be implemented without further review and consultation; a lot is going to be practice-based, how we communicate message and prioritize responses

BRUNS: How does this tie in to the concept of a university college?

GATRELL: It may [tie in]; the college is the structural piece, there are lots of models out there, but I see those as independent initiatives

ROBERTSON: I'm pleased that you're looking at the GradesFirst model – [*discusses his experience with student-athletes in a large gen ed class*] – I've wondered if other students would have been retained with a similar support network

GATRELL: I don't know what the upsize would be for the entire FTE population, but we know it works

HUNG: I've worked with Gateway students; they have the same kind of support structure and they do better because they have a responsibility to report, they have required study hours – broaden the pieces we've done for subpopulations

GATRELL: I'm committed to a one-stop where all students can get their services in one location – proposal for Gateway has been paused; ensure the program continues and make sure those practices inform everybody's advising practices – we're investing in professional development for intrusive advising, moving toward one-stop for

other populations (STEP, autism center) – the goal is all student populations getting their resources in one location and also getting access to resources they currently don't have

ABEBE: The Gateway issue is a personnel issue, not a structural issue

GATRELL: I understand what you're saying, I was concerned with the one-stop issue

### **Executive Committee Report (cont.)**

ROBERTSON: No constituency report from Faculty Senate at Board of Trustees meeting this Friday

### **Committee Reports**

Elections Committee: no report

Nominations Committee: no report

Faculty-Student Relations Committee

CASH: We had senator elections [for student government] yesterday and today – we are pairing up with Alumni Affairs to co-sponsor a "goodbye to seniors week" the week after Thanksgiving

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: no report

Awards Committee: no report

Faculty Forum Committee

ABEBE: We have formalized Feb. 13 as the date of our forum – we have started communication with student group to co-sponsor with faculty; Provost has offered to help with this and future forums, so we will be approaching him – Tuesday, February 13 at 3:00 p.m. has now been confirmed

HUNG: Topic?

ABEBE: SB2234/HB4103 bills and related issues

YOUNG: The idea is what do we think the university should be doing, so we can put the ball back in their court

Budget Transparency Committee: no report

Ad Hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics: no report

### **Other Business**

ROBERTSON: Our last item (which is not listed on the agenda, but we did agree to continue discussing it, apologies for the omission) is the HLC site visit team report – begin a proposal to move forward; on Dec. 5 we will hear from our colleague who's the IBHE representative; leading up to that date, contact the leaders of these committees (CAA, CGS, COTE, CFR) and ask for a brief narrative update, also approach them about a regular constituency report beginning in January; as well as identifying nominated committees to hear from and setting up a schedule – propose, for the four Councils, a rotation of hearing from them once a semester, more often if there's an urgent agenda item

STOWELL: Yes, regular reports would be good – but secondly, as was mentioned earlier, how might the sharing of minutes be more accessible, maybe in one location; can we post minutes from multiple committees on the Faculty Senate website, or at least a single pointer to where the minutes are hosted – is the language clear enough in the Constitution that we own these committees?

OLIVER: Having served as Recorder, the easiest part of the minutes is linking them to the website; because these are committees we manage elections for, it's not unreasonable as an option to ask the Recorders from these committees to pass along a PDF copy of their minutes; have a link or a page on the Faculty Senate site as a clearinghouse, for historical purposes as well

HUNG: Doesn't the library archive on a routine basis, or only when submitted?

BRUNS: We don't have an archivist, we haven't had one for three years, so what's been happening is anybody's guess; Bill Schultz is filling in one day a week (20% time), we don't have the manpower right now to keep up with that – who's doing records management on campus?

HUNG: I was thinking outsource it to Booth, but that's not feasible – I agree that a clearinghouse for information makes it easy for everyone to find – if we have links on the Faculty Senate page to those minutes from at least the big constituent committees under the Senate umbrella, that would be a reasonable organization method – I also noticed that SharePoint is designed for this purpose, to facilitate intra-institutional communication distribution; it

comes with Office 360; I don't know that we need to switch platforms but keep that option in mind for the future when we need to share; it's accessible to EIU logins

GOSSE: That's how we did curricular redesign, folders on SharePoint

HUNG: If [the Senate site] method becomes unwieldy, maybe we can start on the [SharePoint] platform so that in the future it's easier to facilitate uploads

STOWELL: Is it required for these bodies to have their minutes publicly available?

GATRELL: Yes, under the Open Meetings Act

*[brief exchange as to whether SharePoint can be made publicly accessible]*

ECKERT: Looking at the CAA bylaws, I find nowhere that they would feel that we do anything except populate their committee for them; do we actually have any language in our [documents] that specifically says we oversee them?

HUNG: But they report to the Provost

GATRELL: I have yet to figure out who they actually report to

STERLING: Article III, Section 4 of our Constitution says "Through a procedure that is outlined in Article VI, Section 7, the Faculty Senate may act as an appeal or review body for faculty councils and committees within the scope of this Constitution. Entry to such concerns may result from acts of commission or omission or in clarification of contemplated action. As established in Article VI, both members of the faculty at large by petition and Senate members on their own initiative may request the Senate to deliberate upon such matters."

Article VI, Section 7 says "Upon its own initiative, or upon petition by ten percent of the faculty, the Senate may review any recommendation made by any faculty committee or council when that recommendation falls within its jurisdictional responsibility" which basically means anything having to do with faculty other than collective bargaining

GATRELL: It's not required, you'd have to make a request to intervene

HUNG: It sounds like we have oversight, if we're requested to offer it

BRUNS: Or if we decide – it's come up before, Dr. Ashley raised some issues about something being done in CAA

GATRELL: HLC's concern, because of the advisory nature of CAA, is the absence of a direct hierarchy, which creates an interesting situation from a governance perspective – you have advisory groups, but because it's not hierarchical, they would reside at separate moments, as opposed to a position of the faculty

STOWELL: In other places you've been, how have you seen it work?

GATRELL: The senate has always approved all new programs and made a recommendation as well as any other curricular

ROBERTSON: Do you feel it would be appropriate or controversial for us to assert similar?

GATRELL: It would require a Constitutional rewrite – I'm in favor of oversight; having experts in curriculum etc. but then having a broader discussion about mission, institution, and values – CAA is a curriculum piece, CGS and COTE do the same thing but they operate in expert-oriented spheres – I look to the Senate for the mission, values, and institutional context, to provide me with that sort of advice and perspective – my sense is that HLC is also looking for a structure that has experts do the work in terms of the technical piece, and then have a deliberative body such as the Senate, so the advice piece would come through multiple lenses – but I defer to you on what you feel is appropriate

ROBERTSON: I appreciate the perspective from beyond the confines of our university

GATRELL: I've also worked with the faculty council at a small liberal arts college where all proposals went to the faculty as a whole at a semester meeting

ROBERTSON: If we were to undertake rewriting our Constitution, it would still have to be approved by our faculty colleagues as well as the President and the Board of Trustees; we did it a couple of years ago

HUNG: Those were relatively minor changes, this would be more substantial – can I ask those of you with a longer institutional memory, have CAA and Faculty Senate always worked this way or was there a divergence of practices?

STERLING: It's been that way as long as I've been aware of it

BRUNS: By "that way" we mean [operating] separate[ly]

STERLING: I was vice-chair of CAA 10 or 12 years ago, it was certainly that way then

HUNG: So, Senate is responsible for populating CAA, and then once we figure out who's on it, they do their own thing

STERLING: They send the minutes

ROBERTSON: Well, actually they post them on their website

STERLING: They \*used to\* send us the minutes

ECKERT: Would we ask them to come talk about their relationship with us?

ROBERTSON: That could be a conversation with each of those groups when they visit, rather than us initiating a constitutional rewrite without talking to them

STOWELL: We do need to involve them, and we need to develop a draft of a constitutional change – having been on curricular issues for a long time, I just think ‘one more step before it’s finally approved’; if at any point it gets sent back, it could be an extremely lengthy and painful process for curricular approval – we need to be very clear about what comes to Faculty Senate; we don’t need to approve courses

GATRELL: It’s really major program revisions or new stuff

STOWELL: CAA gets program reports every three years from departments, based on IBHE – I’d be willing to work with the council chairs to begin a conversation about what their role is and how we might better work together, not just to satisfy the HLC but to make it a better process

HUNG: Part of the issue you raised about the procedural decisions in the process, we might take this opportunity to address some of those issues in the curricular approval pipeline; it’s a natural time to review the process and identify areas where we could improve

GATRELL: One of the things we’ve been talking about is staffing the rather large committees; if we created a slightly different structure, maybe those committees wouldn’t need to be so large – historically, based upon my understanding of my office’s role and the Graduate School’s role with CGS, it seems too engaged from a shared governance perspective, rather than faculty having primary authority over curriculum; innovation should come from the faculty

GOSSE: Well, we’re not ready to have the hard conversation about what the committee service requirements for faculty should be at a university this size

ROBERTSON: That could be part of this process – a few weeks ago Sen. Oliver mentioned that some departments don’t value university service equally to departmental service

GOSSE: It seems like some of these committees could be combined to be more efficient, if they have a similar mission

HUNG: I share your concern; we’ve been touching on this issue with the reduction in faculty numbers – academic committees tend to expand and contract through the years – the problem I see is that a lot of this comes from the DAC, how each department gives merit to service; it could be a root cause of differences in campus culture – how to raise the issue in a constructive and productive way – we don’t want to come across as dictating to the departments, they have departmental autonomy under the contract, but gently nudge our colleagues to recognize that shared governance is important, especially with contract negotiation coming up – after negotiation there’s usually a window of time to revise the DAC

STERLING: If we can convince our faculty colleagues that what happens in university-wide faculty committees makes a difference – there have been times when Senate has had important discussions, sent resolutions, and nothing happened, so faculty think ‘why should I bother’ – some committees (e.g., CAA) are perceived as merely checking off boxes – if we could clearly convey that shared governance really does matter and that these groups are doing important work that will make a difference in how things run, it would be more attractive to serve

HUNG: Communicate with our colleagues better about what we do at Faculty Senate – few read minutes of meetings they don’t attend – perception of committee functions makes a big difference

ROBERTSON: As we wrap up, I’d like to pose the question of how most efficiently can we begin this dialogue, how should we proceed from here

STOWELL: I volunteer to contact chairs to organize meetings – it’s going to take time to lay groundwork, look at other institutions, draft language for constitution change (probably the rest of the academic year) but if I can meet with them this semester, start the conversation; then by the time they come next semester we have something

HUNG: When those bodies’ representatives come to talk to Senate, we solicit their feedback about this process – inform them that this is a topic we wish to discuss so they’re prepared

*Motion to adjourn by Sterling, seconded by Eckert*

Session adjourned at 3:51 p.m.