

3-6-2018

March 6, 2018

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "March 6, 2018" (2018). *Minutes*. 1093.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1093

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.

EIU Faculty Senate Session Minutes
6 March 2018 ▪ 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, N. Hugo, J. Oliver, J. Robertson, G. Sterling, J. Stowell, C. Wharram, J. Williams, B. Young, R. Cash

Senators absent: S. Gosse, K. Hung

Guests in attendance: Jay Gatrell (Provost), Brooke Schwartz (DEN), Jeannie Ludlow (Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies), Luke Young (Student Government)

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

Approval of Minutes from February 20, 2018

Motion to approve by Stowell, seconded by Bruns

Discussion: none

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

Executive Committee Report

ROBERTSON: CUPB met on Friday, I have budget information to pass along to Sen. Sterling – Executive Committee met with the President and Provost yesterday, discussed the shared governance model and also the draft version of the Senate resolution [on the WG8&9 review committee report]

Shared Governance Visioning Committee Update

STOWELL: This is the first general draft we're sharing with the university – the chairs of the major university councils have been meeting, thinking about how to strengthen the integration of curriculum and assessment efforts, and potentially other faculty issues – we're gathering feedback on the draft from the major councils involved and the college curriculum committees – the model is to take the existing councils and add them to Faculty Senate; at-large membership of the Senate would be reduced to five, who would perform primary administrative functions of the Senate (elections, nominations, awards), but the larger Senate would be composed of all these individuals (up to 50); Senate would meet less frequently, maybe twice a semester, and would assume new curricular responsibility such as approval of new programs – courses, majors, executive actions would continue to be finalized at the CAA level, but anything in the curricular process that might impact the university as a whole would come to Senate for final approval; that could be perceived as slowing down or extending the approval timeline, but at the same time CAA is considering ways they might streamline their process – we're starting to see the effects of fewer faculty, especially Unit A, on campus; I'll interject here that the nomination deadline for elections has passed, we have people running for 14 of 30 open positions, only three of which are contested (CFR, Sanctions and Terminations, UPC COS seat); in my own department we're seeing fewer Unit A faculty retained, I've been here 18 years and only two tenure-track faculty are newer than me; we're seeing the increased burden, particularly on senior faculty, and a lack of junior faculty willing to volunteer for these types of positions; we're at a point where we have to consider our structure and numbers

ECKERT: There's a general education committee?

STOWELL: It's a subcommittee of CAA; it's in the draft as a potential separate committee that would handle only general education, as an equal body to CAA

ECKERT: Faculty Development is not a committee

STOWELL: There's an advisory committee

ECKERT: Why wouldn't ATAC become members? Or Library Advisory Board? Why only Faculty Development?

STOWELL: The focus of these committees [in the draft] is curriculum, assessment, research; Faculty Development supports those things – we are open to other thoughts

BRUNS: In our Bylaws, if you're serving on one of these councils, you can't serve on Senate – Faculty Senate meets every two weeks to look at issues that affect us as a campus; that focus on the macro issues would be watered down in this model

STOWELL: We've looked at other faculty senate models: we're unique in that 1) we have no representation [by college], we're all at large; 2) we meet more frequently than most

BRUNS: Already we meet every two weeks and we're not able to get through issues, we have to keep delaying things

STOWELL: We could create subcommittees that could manage those issues

HUGO: How do you see those meetings running? It seems like 50 people would be a huge challenge

STOWELL: We are the smallest faculty senate, other institutions have up to 200 faculty senators; voice ultimately comes through in the vote

B. YOUNG: 50 is a big number, that's going to change the tenor of the conduct of business – a lot of the value of Faculty Senate is the possibility of spontaneous interactions; if you're meeting with 50 people and an agenda with items that have to move quickly, you're not going to have that – for our institution, the smallest of the comprehensive public universities in the state of Illinois, which prides itself on its informal atmosphere and intensive attention to colleagues and students: is this the best model for us?

ABEBE: I don't want to justify this based on the HLC, because the HLC is not prescriptive, they make suggestions; it's up to the institution to justify and to document and to defend what it is doing, so I don't want to connect this to the HLC if at all possible, because some person on campus will come back with that argument – in terms of representation, we changed the Senate Constitution so that election is at-large rather than representing different colleges, so we did have college representation at one point – I share the concern that this is too big a group, 50 is very difficult to manage, not much work is going to be able to be done, but we've made that argument with regard to the CUPB, that it's too big and unwieldy; perhaps the chairs of these various councils could be on the Senate instead of the entire group

STOWELL: We have discussed that, but the chairs presently on these councils would not agree to it, serving on Faculty Senate is too much for them – the chairs would be on the executive committee of Faculty Senate

ABEBE: I'm interested in the incentive for people to serve on the various committees – two dimensions: 1) we need to make sure that we align the committee structure with what is contained in the DACs, that university service is highlighted as a requirement – we shouldn't care what happens in other departments, we should worry about who's doing the work in our own; the incentive for departmental service is a self-imposed standard; but I do care what those from other departments do on any university committee that's going to affect me – 2) the second dimension has to do with the way the President and the Provost appoint committees; if they appoint committees as they have done in the past (asking for names), we should have a way to make sure that the people elected are the ones likely to be on these committees that the President or Provost are likely to appoint – that might infringe on their rights, but we have to work with the President and the Provost to see if we can have some form of understanding, otherwise the incentives are not there; we should tie what we do here with that process; if we can have an understanding, I think we can change the incentives

STOWELL: To clarify, you're suggesting for the ad hoc committees that the members come from those already serving on one of these councils?

ABEBE: Yes, whatever formula we set up, so that there is representation from [the councils]; otherwise we will be changing things without any eventual impact

BRUNS: If people are going to be serving on these councils and then also serving on Senate...the current chairs do not want to do this, so doesn't that tell us this model is going to lead to a Faculty Senate that is supposed to meet two or three times a semester, and people already have all this other committee work they're doing...they may not want to be doing this; and if ad hoc committees also pull from these councils, now there's a third thing that people on these councils are going to be expected to do – if anything, this is going to drive some of our colleagues to serve less rather than more

STOWELL: I've only been to CAA so far; that was not their concern because the Faculty Senate meeting would be in place of one of their meetings, so the time investment in meetings would be the same

BRUNS: But that would cut down on time [for CAA]

STOWELL: And that led to 'do we have a time we could get everybody together,' standard meeting time

BRUNS: The question about Faculty Senate being at-large members: I don't have an issue with that, because that is an election, the whole faculty body votes on who represents them

OLIVER: Are the five at-large Senate members going to be the ones who fulfill the responsibilities on our subcommittees, or will subcommittees be restructured – couldn't the chairs or vice-chairs of these seven other councils come to a monthly meeting – what about nine [at-large Senate members], serving staggered three-year terms: Chair, Vice-Chair, Recorder, and the other six could each chair one of our subcommittees or could be liaisons with these councils – there's no indication of term length

STOWELL: Five is not a fixed number, it's how many do we need to carry out the existing day-to-day functions of the Senate, which include awards, nominations, elections...

OLIVER: And Faculty Forum

STOWELL: The at-large members of the Senate would carry out all of those duties, so if we need more than five, that's fine

GATRELL: I agree with Sen. Abebe about [not] having HLC be our primary rationale for this – my number one priority is that new programs and major decisions are reviewed by faculty governance; it makes sense that there's a governance oversight role for this body [Senate] – do we need all the committees listed here: does CASL become the gen ed committee; CFR is a narrowly-defined, prescriptive role; I would look at the role of these committees in shared governance – each of these committees is cross-populated by some of our most outstanding faculty members; if we start creating these large structures, we won't have the ability or capacity to have outstanding colleagues serve in multiple roles – I think Senate should meet more often [than is proposed in the draft model] (not more than it currently does), at least monthly

STOWELL: The reason these committees are in the draft is because somebody suggested them; if you look at the text of the HLC visit, it was curriculum assessment, which would be the five committees listed on the left (not Faculty Development or CFR), then the numbers become closer to 30-some people

ECKERT: I like the idea of nine [Senate members], it could get rid of some of our problems of staffing the committees where Faculty Senate appoints people; these nine members should serve on the nominated committees, so we have someone on Faculty Senate who goes to these meetings; that's the problem, we don't get any feedback – it would be weird to have faculty senators and then these members from other committees; if Faculty Senate has representatives on these other committees, then it becomes a body that is really involved; everything could be brought back, more perspectives

STOWELL: That's the other model, to send faculty senators to these committees

STERLING: Part of the problem now is that [these committees] have meetings, they're all doing something, but there's nothing that requires them to communicate with any of the others...so people are doing overlapping things, some things don't get done at all, some very important decisions about the future of the university are made by a small subcommittee with no input from the faculty at large – my problem with this proposal is it's not obvious how that changes; the mere fact that members [of these other committees] would be called faculty senators in no way guarantees communication – if we have a meeting with 50 people a few times a semester, we can't go around and ask each committee what they've been doing; that would [create] communication, but meetings would be daylong, with no time to talk about university issues – my concern is that we could move to a structure like this and end up in exactly the same place where we are now – I don't see how big meetings are going to function effectively even if committee reports aren't required

BRUNS: We're trying to solve two issues: 1) reporting structure, 2) finding faculty members to serve on committees – why is CUPB not on here

STOWELL: It's a Board of Trustees committee

BRUNS: Do these other committees have secretarial positions?

GATRELL: They're task-oriented ...

BRUNS: I ask because to solve the problem of the reporting line, we might recommend that the committee minutes taker (not the chair who's trying to run the committee) be the person to serve on Faculty Senate and to share the highlights with us; that would be seven (or however many) new Senate positions from these committees, the remaining positions would be at-large – as to not having enough faculty to serve on committees, changing the model won't address that

STOWELL: We're still in the process of getting feedback – do each of these committees need as many people they have: for example, is there a requirement from an accrediting body that says COTE needs 11 people from a certain number of departments; CAA has already reduced their members by one

OLIVER: Is 15 the magic number for Faculty Senate: three serving on the executive committee, six serving as subcommittee chairs, six serving as liaisons with the six most important companion committees across campus

STOWELL: We're not going to have 15 next year at this rate – as soon as we started talking about this, [when others] heard that we were thinking about working with their committees, their initial reaction was defensive, 'Faculty Senate is taking control'; so trying to find that balance – my hope is that by the end of this semester we will have decided on something to go forward; if we're ready to make a change, then over the course of the next year we would rewrite bylaws – some of this could be impacted by the number of colleges, which isn't resolved yet

WHARRAM: Regarding the number of representatives on committees, these are the numbers in their current constitutions? So the possibility of reducing numbers is another questions – How many of these council chairs have service CUs attached?

STOWELL: CAA, CGS, COTE

BRUNS: CFR does

WHARRAM: I was going to make a suggestion similar to [Sen. Abebe] about council chairs becoming part of Senate; if these are CU-bearing service positions, that makes sense as part of their duties – CFR does seem discrete, I don't know how much communication is necessary between Faculty Senate and CFR

STOWELL: How many of you think that CFR should be part of the model, does it seem justified when they meet once a year for a relatively narrow purpose

ROBERTSON: We were initially focused on curricular aspects; as the conversation evolved, later we realized [that we had overlooked CFR]; but if we revisited it, maybe it wasn't as much of an oversight

STOWELL: Our initial discussion was the curriculum, because many senates possess a curricular function

ABEBE: The critical committees are CAA, CGS, and COTE; they affect people campuswide

STOWELL: Gen ed doesn't really exist separately

WHARRAM: A separate gen ed committee makes sense, it would take some of the workload pressure off of CAA – just as we had Newton Key come to talk about Faculty Development, could we extend a similar invitation to CFR or CASL

STOWELL: We've had CASL come before – let's stick with the curriculum focus – how do you feel about Senate members serving on these committees versus members of these committees serving on Senate

B. YOUNG: Senators serving on [other committees], or attending and reporting, maybe non-voting, but this ought to go a long way toward remedying the communication problem

STOWELL: *[calls for an informal show of hands]*

STERLING: I am more interested in having a Senate that's 15 members or less, not 30 or 50 – I don't feel strongly about which model, either way we end up with roughly 15 Senators and some connection between Senate and the committees – it's more important that Senate be small enough to debate things and get stuff done

BRUNS: I agree, the number of members is critical – Sen. Oliver's suggestion of 3/6/6 makes sense to me

STOWELL: I'm still getting to these other committees for feedback; I will revise and update with what our current thought is – regarding the curricular approval process: if we're hurting for numbers, could we recruit those currently serving on college curriculum committees to serve at the university level by eliminating or replacing the college curriculum committees

ECKERT: It has to go through CAA anyway – departments have curriculum committees, they work on these issues and then go to CAA

WILLIAMS: I agree with the idea of senators on committees or committee members on Senate – my concern would be, right now I have to keep Tuesdays afternoons free for Senate meetings; if I have to be on another committee that might impact my teaching and research schedule, would I get to choose one that fits my schedule; this is something that could cause disarray

ABEBE: We're dealing with problems that we shouldn't be concerned with – if the colleges want to establish curriculum, it's up to them; if departments have curriculum committees or they don't, it's their business

HUGO: On our college curriculum committee we have a lot of revisions that the departments don't catch, so CAA might have more work once it gets to that level – I'm not necessarily saying don't eliminate, but put in guidelines that help departments to be more critical or to have a better idea of what CAA is looking for, because they're looking more at program content, not at what is appropriate for approving as a university

STOWELL: CAA recognizes that; they've mentioned looking at requirements, conditional branching, electronic error checking in the submission process – we need more people serving on university committees, could we better use their volunteerism at the university level

BRUNS: We need to understand why that's happening, asking why we're not getting people to serve

STOWELL: We've lost a third of our faculty; new hires are less likely to be Unit A

B. YOUNG: For historical perspective, when this institution opened, the entire faculty and the students used to meet at the beginning of every single day, where they were addressed by the President – we're working against a culture in which people go off in all directions and relate to one another on Facebook; we could think about ways to nudge in the other direction: the President's calling us all together at the beginning of the Fall semester and giving his talk is a good example of bringing the community together – if we want to make the whole campus conscious of the need to interact, we might call a town meeting, make an effort through the departments to get people to come, then address these problems in the same place at the same time

Committee Reports

Elections Committee

STOWELL: I'm working with ITS to set up elections, to be conducted the week after Spring Break (Wednesday-Tuesday)

Nominations Committee

OLIVER: I sent the Executive Committee a summary of research in regard to some of our nominated committees where we might be able to eliminate or become more efficient – Campus Recreation Board: meets "as needed;" it's rarely been needed; there's an IGP; recommendation is to keep populated with one faculty member in case a situation arises – Committee of Brand Champions: no one knows what it is, no one wants to own it, some of the goals and purposes seem to have been absorbed into EMAC; recommendation is to eliminate – Environmental Health and Safety Committee: per conversation with Paul McCann, it's called "as needed;" it hasn't met in the last few years because of the lack of internal construction programming; working on updating safety manual, committee will be involved in its review; recommendation is to maintain faculty population – Office of the Registrar Advisory Committee: hasn't met recently; Amy Lynch recommends folding it into the Student Process Team workgroup she's created; recommendation is to maintain faculty population – Parking Advisory and Parking Appeals: both meet "as needed," per Police Chief Kent Martin; recommendation is to consolidate into Parking Advisory and pull from that for Parking Appeals as needed – Student Government External Relations Committee: faculty member has never been called to serve in 20 years; recommendation is to eliminate – include on agenda for next meeting

STOWELL: We might also want to consider elected committees that never meet, including the Sanctions and Terminations Hearing Committee and (aside from last year) the Academic Program Elimination Review Committee, which could be populated by Faculty Senate on demand – faculty members could be used somewhere else

OLIVER: In our department we have to provide evidence of committee activity; make evidence of activity standard on DACs; faculty are getting credit for meetings that have never taken place

Faculty-Student Relations Committee

CASH: [Student Senate] Executive Board applications are due tomorrow; only contested position is Vice President of Student Affairs

Faculty-Staff Relations Committee: No report

Awards Committee

HUGO: Distinguished Faculty Award recipient will be announced at the next Senate meeting

Faculty Forum Committee: No report

Budget Transparency Committee

STERLING: We had a request to look into marketing and advertising, comparison of spending; it's impossible to get that data from other universities, expenditures are hidden in other places; I can't verify the 1-2% number cited by the President – I've also been looking into and gathering data on some other budget-related things

Ad hoc Committee on Extracurricular Athletics: No report

Provost's Report

GATRELL: Vitalization workgroups 7, 8, and 9 have been occupying my attention; I'm supportive of the Senate draft resolution as written; I'd be willing to open it up for questions right now

BRUNS: Review committee student representative Luke Young has joined us today; Jeannie Ludlow was here; I'd be happy to answer any questions about the process

ABEBE: Point of order: Are we discussing the resolution?

ROBERTSON: Procedurally we need to have a motion and a second, then proceed with discussion

STOWELL: Motion to adopt the resolution

B. YOUNG: Second

Discussion of Senate Response to the Recommendations of the Vitalization Workgroups 8 & 9 Review Committee

WHARRAM: There's a suggestion for an ongoing committee tasked with proactively identifying [future challenges and trends]: I had suggested, as WG9 suggested in their original report, a task force to look at this – there's a sense of urgency to figure out if and how we're going to reconfigure the college structure; I support that the decision needs to be made sooner rather than later – there are other parts of the report that could be further thought through... ; I support the idea of what WG9 had originally suggested about a task force

BRUNS: The review committee was tasked with pulling two reports together; that doesn't give us the time to investigate everything, such as the idea of repurposing a dorm as a retirement community; some issues could be further explored

GATRELL: The VP areas have been assigned to review all workgroup recommendations, so there's an active review at the vice-presidential level and a dialogue once a month at President's Council about progress on action items; light work has been done; substantial questions about programming and reorganization; I am supportive of anything that prompts us to keep moving in the direction of innovation and collaborative dialogue

ABEBE: A number of issues have been raised by different members of the Senate in conversations we have had; those have not been spelled out [in the resolution], those are now going to the Provost on an individual basis – so my understanding is that approving this resolution is not approving the "EIU Signature Experience" document – but Senate would be endorsing the last two items pertaining to the idea of a strategic committee ... – if that is the understanding, then I am prepared to vote "yes"; if the understanding is that we are approving WG8&9 documents and the review, the resolution doesn't say that

B. YOUNG: As principal author of the draft resolution, I can confirm that your understanding coincides with mine

STERLING: It looks to me as though Faculty Senate is punting: we're not going to make a recommendation one way or another; if individual senators have something to say, they can send their recommendations on to the Provost, where they'll be mixed in randomly with the advice from all faculty members – so the Senate is not taking a stand, but several senators raised serious concerns (especially about the college realignment), and I would prefer that our resolution say something to that effect

WILLIAMS: Speaking as a member of the draft committee, show us how we can incorporate language that changes it to make it better, not just complain about what it doesn't have

ABEBE: But we did submit ideas

WILLIAMS: We took what we had and did the best we could in a short time

GATRELL: I do not see that report as a plan per se; given budget constraints, it can't be implemented as written; there are only so many resources at the university, and we need to invest in faculty and not more administrators – I have received feedback about college reconfigurations [etc.], I have feedback from the chairs and deans as well as CUPB – we're going to put together a proposal, share it with the executive groups of campus leadership, then have a campuswide discussion – it's important that the process allow campus to deliberate and have a discussion around the principles and core themes of revisioning, student success being primary, new program development in health and human services, sharpening the mission of colleges (CEPS and LCBAS) – all will be distilled into a proposal, but time is limited and there is some urgency – this is a great opportunity to create a new set of structures that resonate with who we aspire to be as an institution – I appreciate this resolution because it focuses on process and not specific recommendations – having Continuing Ed under an academic unit also became clear; the Dean of Continuing Ed position was swept three years ago, that salary line isn't there

ROBERTSON: I think the resolution as authored is very good – I would like to move that we add specific support for the EIU Signature Experience document recommendations II.A and II.B on the unification of student academic support services, increased support for interdisciplinary activities and undergraduate research – I'm also very much in favor of creating a School of Fine, Performing, and Applied Arts; STEM/STEAM would also be an excellent way to revise what we do here

ECKERT: We have had enough committees on committees, what we endorse should be more action-oriented – if you want to have a School of Fine and Performing Arts, then we [the departments affected by realignment] should

be involved in the conversation; where's the money for it; what would help Doudna is resources and potential for leadership, we don't need a school – Health Sciences, there are so many issues; let's talk about it with the people who are concerned and find out what they think, not another committee

GATRELL: I'm not suggesting any more committees – I have made a commitment that this restructuring will be position-neutral – if we create a School of Fine and Performing Arts, then over the next year the work would be done by the faculty to create the structure that resonates with their priorities; I think part of that would be integrating Doudna into the curriculum, but that's a dialogue for the faculty to have

ECKERT: What's the incentive for us to do that

GATRELL: From an admissions and recruitment perspective, a School would be attractive; having an integrated marketing campaign across all three programs would be a win-win; it also creates a framework for developing new programs in arts administration and musical theater without a tug-of-war over turf

ECKERT: So, when will we have a meeting with you?

GATRELL: There will be a discussion with the deans

ECKERT: With faculty in the departments – that's where you can convince us that such a school is good for our mission – we're talking about people rather than having them be a part of it

GATRELL: This was brought to the table in the various workgroups by faculty members from the fine and performing arts – my hope is to come forward to an action point, a decision – my desire is not to create more administration

ABEBE: Either we separate the resolution focused items, or we add to this document before "Be it further resolved" in the fifth paragraph: Whereas Faculty Senate has raised concerns of import in the implementation of the items as spelled out in the EIU Signature Experience – then we can say "Be it further resolved" – if that were to happen, I would feel comfortable voting in the affirmative; otherwise this would be punting, we have not been constructive

B. YOUNG: I would accept that as a friendly amendment

WILLIAMS: I would do the same

BRANTLEY: Does that address Sen. Sterling's concerns?

STERLING: I'm happy with it in that it suggests we have serious reservations

BRANTLEY: Perhaps in a different kind of document, rather than each of us [submitting comments] on our own, how might we bring this together as something the Senate puts forward

ABEBE: I have an amendment on the floor, and it has been accepted

BRANTLEY: But that doesn't speak to all concerns

BRUNS: It can't

ABEBE: They're numerous

ROBERTSON: If anyone on the Senate has a concern they would like to forward anonymously, I can collect them
[Overlapping responses by several senators that their remarks can be passed along without anonymity]

[Robertson asks Abebe to repeat the wording of his amendment]

ABEBE: "Whereas Faculty Senate has raised numerous concerns of import in the implementation of the items as spelled out in the EIU Signature Experience, be it further resolved" – that addresses all the issues put on the table, it makes us a bit more constructive

ROBERTSON: Let's call it to a vote: All in favor of approving the resolution with the friendly amendment?

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

Other Business

ROBERTSON: I mentioned via email that the Naming Committee met a week ago and did not forward a recommendation to President Glassman to change the name [of Douglas Hall]; there were various objections to it – the committee will continue to meet throughout the term and follow up on the charges given by President Glassman – I do believe that some good will come from our resolution: there's strong momentum toward an ongoing, permanent lecture series to discuss challenging topics, changing signage in the foyers of those buildings, rolling out a review of campus names on a more regular basis; the committee will undertake reviewing the IGP on the naming of buildings – Sen. Abebe has stepped forward to continue on that committee

B. YOUNG: Did the committee include in its discussions that in the Fall of 2018 is the 150th anniversary of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates – it's an opportunity for this university to draw attention to this and to have some kind of commemoration – I'm willing to author a resolution for Faculty Senate to urge that this be done; this would be a

positive consequence of all the energy we put into it; it would draw the attention of the larger community to the importance of this debate ...

ROBERTSON: I agree – Sen. Abebe, if you would relay that to the committee

L. YOUNG: I'm also on the Naming Committee – that might be a good thing to present to a different [body] on campus, because going forward the committee is going to be focused on the naming of buildings; that's not something the committee is charged with

ROBERTSON: The President said he would support the lecture series proposed in the Senate resolution

BRUNS: But the Naming Committee's not where that happens

L. YOUNG: I think it's a good idea, I just didn't want it to get sent to the wrong committee

B. YOUNG: I can take it to my Americanist colleagues in the History department

GATRELL: I think the President would welcome a resolution to that effect

B. YOUNG: Let's put it on the agenda for the next meeting; I can come up with a draft

BRUNS: Often it's difficult for us because we're not in the room with the committee, we don't hear the discussion, and sometimes when results come out of committees it's easy for us to have an immediate reaction; that being said, I was very disappointed in the decision, because I thought Sen Williams's suggestion was very good – the impression was that the Naming Committee dismissed this a little too easily

Session adjourned at 3:43 p.m.