

4-3-2017

4-3-2017 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "4-3-2017 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2017). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 32.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/32>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Governance- Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 3, 2017

4:00 to 6:00 P.M.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Dustin Anderson, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Ted Brimeyer, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Larisa Elisha, Lisa Denmark for Matthew Flynn, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Yasar Bodur for Jonathan Hilpert, Alina Iacob, Bob Jackson, Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Chung-Yean Chiang for Hsiang-Jui Kung, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Lili Li, Lawrence Locker, Ron MacKinnon, Jennifer Kowalewski for Leticia McGrath, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson, Shijun Zheng

Voting members not in attendance: Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Mark Edwards, Tim Giles, Yi Hu, Scott Kersey, Jim LoBue, Li Ma, Allen Mackelprang, Santanu Majumdar, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, Sam Todd

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Eudiah Ochieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Teresa Thompson, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Karelle Aiken, Diana Cone, Christine Ludowise, Olga Amarie, Jayne Perkins-Brown, Nick Sewak, Amy Ballagh, Brendan Ward, Stephanie Light, Granville Winkjer

-
1. [Approval of the Agenda for the April 3, 2017 meeting:](#)
[Richard Flynn \(CLASS\), Moderator](#)

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the March 6, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS),
Senate Secretary:

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports for April 2017: Mark Welford (COSM),
Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair:

- ❖ College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences: two revised courses, four new programs, five revised programs, one inactivated course.
- ❖ College of Science and Mathematics: two revised programs
- ❖ College of Engineering and IT: one inactivated program,

The report was Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair:

March 9th meeting: one program inactivation, one new course, two course revisions, one program revision, one update on comprehensive program reviews to be executed at the upcoming April meeting, one announcement from the College of Graduate Studies on international transcript evaluations.

Two items of old business: The first was a change in degree descriptions for COSM, and the second was on Prior Learning Assessment. The subcommittee had brought back an updated proposal for that based on the request of the Faculty Senate from the end of last term, as well as discussions from Mr. Whitaker's office.

Moderator Flynn noted that the minutes reflect the changes in the Prior Learning Assessment that was brought before the Senate previously, so the Senate would be approving the Prior Learning Assessment Report when they approved these minutes.

The report was Approved.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee: Sarah Bielski (CLASS):

At the February 28th meeting there were no motions and no new business. They had a continuing conversation about whether to condense/align [Gen Ed] in core outcomes, condense [GenEd] and core outcomes to a single set, condense just the [Gen Ed] outcomes, or expand the core, or produce new sets. Bielski wondered aloud, “Can we be more vague?” She noted that many institutions use these two terms interchangeably, but they have a much broader core. Other schools with leaner core outcomes that assess students earlier see general education outcomes as those for a student for their entire career. Of note, it was mentioned that some of our Gen Ed outcomes are not being evaluated or are hard to evaluate. Curriculum mapping was mentioned as a model to deal with this problem. There was a concern that more core specificity would make it hard for students to change majors without having to repeat core classes. A strong point was made that critical thinking and synthesis of information should be core outcomes. A suggestion was made to form a subcommittee to craft a proposal to the consolidation committee on Gen Ed. This subcommittee was formed and met on March 10th and they suggested the following recommendation:

The GECC recommends the following be forwarded to the consolidation Operational Working Group that is dealing with the CORE: GSU’s current General Education outcomes should be part of the discussion in constructing new outcomes/CORE of the consolidated university. In particular, the committee believes that outcomes associated with critical thinking, problem solving, information literacy, and ethical and informed decision making are important and perhaps not captured in the current Core outcomes.

The full committee approved this recommendation on March 22, 2017.

Moderator Flynn asked for clarification about whether the meeting just reported on was the one whose minutes were in the Librarian’s report, noting that only minutes in that report would be voted on re: approval. Bielski said the committee had met twice before the prior senate meeting and she had reported on one of those meetings at the last senate meeting. She said Michelle Cawthorn had told her the appropriate minutes were in the Librarian’s report.

The committee’s report was Approved.

4. President's Report: President Jaimie Hebert:

Legislative Session

We did quite well. Construction funding: We received \$4.9 million for planning and design for our new engineering facility and \$5 million for planning, design, and construction of renovations in Hanner for academic use, including our concussion laboratory. The \$4.9 million in planning and design for engineering, while it's not a guarantee, usually is an indication that we will receive full construction funding in the subsequent year. There was also \$22 million approved for construction of a Health Sciences facility at the Armstrong campus. We also had a 2 percent merit [pay] increase approved in the budget. All of these were waiting for the Governor's signature. Our revenue is actually defined by the USG and not necessarily by the legislature, but as soon as the revenue stream becomes a little bit clearer, we can talk about what our budget priorities will be next year. But they will be predominantly academic.

Concealed Carry

This measure passed and was awaiting signature from the Governor. If signed, we will first seek an interpretation of some of the language within that bill because some of it is a little confusing and depends on interpretation on how it would be implemented. There was a USG meeting scheduled for the end of April for the Vice Presidents of Student Services, Deans of Students, and Conduct Officers to talk about implementation. If signed, the measure will be law on July 1st, and anyone restricting carry, including President Hebert, would be in violation of law and not just policy. He thought it likely that it would be signed, and it would be something that we will have to work with. He noted that Chancellor Wrigley shared our concerns, and would help us with implementation.

Consolidation

At the last CIC meeting there was only one recommendation that went through and that was a consent recommendation that athletics would cease on the Armstrong campus at the end of spring 2017. This was largely the decision of Armstrong personnel.

The mission statement: We had a mission statement that was largely approved by consensus here, but was not at Armstrong. It was returned to the OWG for further consideration and this senate now had another draft before it. He anticipated that at the upcoming CIC meeting all recommendations from this Senate, from the Armstrong

Senate, and from everyone concerned would be discussed and they would leave the meeting with a mission statement, but “It may not be until midnight.” The Board is expecting one. He thanked Curtis Ricker and Trey Denton for their hard work on this thankless task.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) noted that at the last senate meeting, President Hebert had said that the Presidents had met with the Governor, who said he opposed Campus Carry. Now President Hebert sounded pessimistic, and Pirro asked if we were basically just waiting for the Governor to sign it now.

President Hebert noted this new bill incorporated the elements whose absence had led to Governor Deal’s previous veto of Campus Carry. He noted that while he was in Texas, concealed carry passed with far fewer restrictions than existed in this bill. Without conceding, he said if it was inevitable that we have campus carry, he was glad it would have this many restrictions. That was the only win he could see in this.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) confirmed with President Hebert that guns won’t be allowed in residence halls, and noted we’ll have students who can’t take their guns up to their rooms. She assumed that they will be locking them in their cars, and so asked if we are going to have increased security around all of our parking because people will know there are guns in the trunk or under the seats.

President Hebert said such considerations were why the USG would meet toward the end of April to talk about the complexities of implementation. He noted that implementation took a year and a half in Texas.

Mark Welford (COSM), in regard to the number of high school students that we have on campus taking classes, asked if federal law restricted their exposure to guns.

In reply, President Hebert produced and read, with on-the-fly edits and comments, from a copy of the legislation:

“Being enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, Part 3 of Article 4 of Chapter 11 of Title 16 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to carrying and possession of firearms, is amended in Code Section such and such relating to carrying weapons within school safety zones, at school functions, or on a bus or other transportation furnished by a school, by revising Paragraph 2, except as provided. . . . There’s a little more in there, but it’s all, you know, the legal verbiage, except as provided in Paragraph 20 of Subsection C of this Code. I’m trying to make, I want to make sure I’m following this in order here. Any weapons carry license holder when he or she is in any building or on a real property owned

by or leased to any public technical school, vocational school, college, or university or other public institution of postsecondary education provided, however, that such exceptions shall not apply to buildings or property used for athletic sporting events, or student housing, including, but not limited to, fraternity and sorority houses, not applied to any preschool or child care space, located within such buildings or real property, not applied to any room or space being used for classes related to a college or career academy or other specialized school as provided under certain code here, not applied to any room or space being used for classes in which high school students are enrolled through a dual-enrollment program including, but not limited to classes related to the Move On When Ready Act, not applied to faculty, staff, or administrative offices or rooms where disciplinary proceedings are conducted, only applied to the carrying of handguns which a licensee is licensed to carry pursuant to and it gives the government code there. Only applied to the carrying of handguns which are concealed. So those are the limitations that are included in there, but some of those are actually subject to interpretation. For example, when it says the classrooms where dual-enrollment students may take classes. I mean, in theory every one of our classes could be. I don't think that's the intention of the legislation, and so we are going to have to wait for an interpretation on exactly what that means."

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) thought we would need gun checks put in front of every building because of the number of restrictions. She noted this comment was just to get in the minutes how ridiculous this was.

5. Provost's Report: Jean Bartels

Historical Marker

There would be an unveiling of an historical marker on Sweetheart Circle that commemorates the integration of Georgia Southern University. This would occur in conjunction with the release of a book composed by the members of the First 500, a group comprised of the first 500 African-American students on this campus.

Honors Day

She reminded faculty about the Honors Day Award Celebration the following Wednesday, and encouraged all to attend.

Final Exam Week

Final exam week would be May 1-4. All courses are required to hold an exam or its equivalent in the timeframe. She stressed that grades are due 48 hours after that final is given. That is critically important for many reasons, not the least of which is what happens with students and their financial aid.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Moderator

The SEC voted to include on the agenda the one motion request it received, and Moderator Flynn added the mission statement once he received the revised version. He noted that he had attended the USG Faculty Council meeting the previous Friday. There was a lot of tension, particularly from some of our colleagues at Armstrong, and so it was not a pleasant meeting, and nothing much was accomplished.

7. Unfinished Business Revised Mission Statement

Moderator Flynn noted that he had sent out the revised version to Senate over the weekend, and had heard from more than one person concerns about the lack of emphasis on research in the statement, and he shared those concerns.

Moderator Flynn wondered if he needed to make a motion, Jake Simons (COBA) said something inaudible, and Moderator Flynn agreed with whatever that was.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if the senate would vote on it that day.

Moderator Flynn said we needed to vote re: sending it forward to the CIC because President Hebert needed to get a new statement, whatever it was, in place in order for us to proceed with the consolidation, and it was not put on the CIC agenda at the last meeting because of disagreements. Yet it had to go forward “come hell or high water.”

Cyr asked if the Senate had to vote to approve or just vote to send it forward.

Moderator Flynn said it had to be a vote to approve, but it could be discussed. James Stephens (JPHCOPH) made the motion, and was seconded.

Ed Mondor (COSM) said he was likely one of the first to express displeasure with the version then before the senate. The first had little about research, and this had virtually none. He was very concerned that the direction we were going was to being a teaching

college, which was fine if that's what people wanted – he would turn his lab into a gun storage facility. Jokes aside, though, he could not vote to approve the statement.

Adam Bossler (CLASS) said disagreements over the mission statement match the problem we have had at this University for the entire nine years he has been here, which is the question of what is a public comprehensive university, especially when we have the designation of a Carnegie Doctoral Research University. His general comment was that Georgia Southern is a Carnegie Doctoral Research University, designated a public comprehensive University, while Armstrong is a teaching college. He felt we were in negotiations with Armstrong on what should be the mission of the University, but that if we retain the designation of University, the very first sentence, which drives the whole, should say that Georgia Southern is a Carnegie Doctoral Research University designated as a public comprehensive university that values research, teaching, and service. He also noted that besides research, other types of scholarly contribution should be added.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) agreed, saying creative work must be noted since we have departments dedicated to that.

Moderator Flynn said he calls his own work “scholarship” and felt current wording was heavily geared towards not-humanities, not-arts based kinds of work, and that needed to be corrected.

(Secretary's Note: Someone said something inaudible to which Moderator Flynn replied inaudibly.)

President Hebert (President) said that, technically, the CIC, the Consolidation Implementation Committee, would forward a recommendation based on consensus during their meeting. What he sought were strong statements from the faculty. In a couple of other consolidations the CIC itself was charged with writing the new mission statement. He did not feel that was appropriate, despite the current composition process's complications. He felt the Senates at both institutions, as representatives of their faculties, should provide input. He thought the stronger the statement coming from the GSU Senate about maintaining mention of the doctoral research classification in that statement, clearly saying something about research, cultural enrichment, and creative efforts will send a strong message to the CIC that this is how the faculty at Georgia Southern feel. He thought that would carry a lot of weight in that discussion.

(Secretary's Note: There is more inaudible material, though it seems to be a back and forth between President Hebert and Lowell Mooney of COBA.)

Moderator Flynn said this might be a point of order for our parliamentarian: He wondered if it might not be wise to pass this motion, but defeat it with our suggestions.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if the motion was take it or leave it, or if we could amend it.

President Hebert said it could be revised and approved as amended.

Cyr suggested removing “personal attention” in the first sentence, and to the end of that sentence adding “academic excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, creative work, and service.” He thought we could leave the rest of the statement as it was until we could come back to in the next couple of years.

Moderator Flynn noted that many people wanted the Carnegie Doctoral Research designation back in the statement.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) thought we needed to identify ourselves before we started talking about the mission.

Ming Fang He (COE) thought “diversity” needed to be mentioned, and agreed we needed to mention our status as a comprehensive university and that our graduate program has Carnegie Doctoral Research status.

Moderator Flynn and Provost Bartels both noted the Carnegie classification is for our entire institution, not just the graduate program.

Ming Fang He also noted that “personal attention is a very weak statement” and that she did not understand what was meant by “time-honored commitments.”

Eudiah Ochieng (SGA Vice President, Academic Affairs) said the SGA would appreciate a description, in the first sentence, of the student population as diverse.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) realized she might get thrown out for saying this, but she did not care much about calling ourselves a Carnegie Doctoral institution because that was just something coming from higher up down, but it bothered Armstrong a lot because they were already defensive. She said GSU had had an identity crisis for years: Are we a research institution? Are we a teaching institution? We don’t know how to do promotion and tenure, and now in this statement we had to try to figure out who we are and how to say this, plus add in another whole university. She hoped we could make clear we are the collective result of the research, the teaching, the everything, from faculty who make individual contributions; individuals don’t have to do everything individually.

Adam Bossler (CLASS) agreed with Steirn, but wondered what “Carnegie Doctoral Research University, designated a public comprehensive university” meant re: how much we should emphasize teaching and research and service and teaching loads. He felt we should not run away from the designation, but needed to figure out what it means in practice, and consolidation was problematic without clearly understanding and stating that.

Jake Simons (COBA) said something that is inaudible.

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) noted that his college has four doctoral programs, and his department has 69 doctoral students, so they were very concerned that we include the Carnegie designation in the language.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if we could make an amendment in which we proposed the original document that we had. Or, alternatively, whether if we turned down this one, it automatically would revert back to the one we previously approved.

Moderator Flynn asked President Hebert what negotiating position it would put him in if the senate voted disapproval, given how much was being said against the present proposal.

President Hebert said he would take the discussion back to the CIC. He said he understood the consensus to be that the senate was reluctant to approve a mission statement that does not contain the phrase “Carnegie Doctoral Research,” a clear indication of research and creative activity as part of the mission. He noted that he had often talked of the fact that to his mind we are a comprehensive, doctoral research institution, and what that means is that we balance the teacher/scholar model. That’s who we are, and he thought that’s who we want to continue to be. He did not want a mission statement that doesn’t say that. That was what he would take to the CIC, along with the addition of diversity, and he further felt that adding technological innovation, scientific discovery, education, health services, cultural enrichment, maybe something about creativity might say enough about research to get through the next year or so until we revisit this, though he would have preferred something stronger.

Mujibur Khan (CEIT) agreed that inclusion of our status as a research and doctoral institution was important if we hoped to increase our number of doctoral programs.

President Hebert also suggested we needed to remove the word “select” from the statement because we do offer a broad range of degrees in a broad range of disciplines.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked what, specifically, in the original version had been objected to by the people at Armstrong.

Moderator Flynn had a list, which he would distribute if wanted, but noted that they objected primarily to the fact that it looked like just a slight revision of Georgia Southern's current mission statement. It sent the message that it was an absorption rather than a consolidation. President Hebert agreed that was the issue.

Provost Bartels observed that, re: language, over and over the Armstrong faculty's concerns centered on that "personal attention" statement. She thought Armstrong truly rests their accomplishments on the fact that they are student-centered, take care of their students, and worry about them personally. We pointed out many times that we would say the same thing about our approach to student teaching and learning, but that's where the language gets slanted in order to preserve that personal attention to "student phenomena," as they put it.

Ed Mondor (COSM) agreed with where he saw President Hebert going with the statement. He did not see the research issue as an us-against-them situation because he knew several faculty members in the Department of Biology at Armstrong who do very good research. He wondered if Armstrong is having the same identity crisis there as we're having here; trying to meld it all together was the tricky part.

Barbara King (CLASS), on the personal attention issue, said some of our faculty members had noted the disappearance of the "large scale, small feel" orientation, and it seemed to her that that captures some of the aspects of personal attention that are very much part of our identity, and now that Armstrong is also to be large-scale, will be part of their identity as well.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said she was concerned that we don't know who we are, yet the people at Armstrong feel like they're getting us shoved down their throats. If the mission statement says we are a research institution, it must also make clear that not every individual contributes to that part of the mission. We don't want a mission statement that makes people feel they will be forced to do research. We could lose good Armstrong faculty who will feel they don't belong.

Moderator Flynn said he thought the following language from the proposed statement covered much of Steirn's concern: "Deploying the shared resources of its multiple locations, the University creates vibrant learning environments that foster an inclusive, student-centered culture of engagement designed to prepare students for lifelong service as scholars, leaders, and responsible stewards of their communities."

Steirn said she read that as saying, “here’s the environment we are building for our students, not here’s what we expect from our faculty. And I think the reactions we’re getting are from the faculty. They are not from the students.”

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) said we depend on our doctoral students to bring in grants, and we have a lot of grant funding coming in. The doctoral program in his college is very important and should be mentioned in the mission statement. The Carnegie Doctoral designation means a lot to his college.

Moderator Flynn said he saw that, with one or two exceptions, as the consensus of the Senate.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) called the question. After some explanation of that parliamentary procedure, the Senate voted to call the question and vote on the motion to approve the mission statement.

By unanimous vote, the motion was Not Approved.

8. New Business

Election of Secretary and Librarian.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) had agreed to run for Secretary and Mark Welford (COSM) to run for Librarian for 2017-18. There were no other nominations. Cyr and Welford were elected by acclamation to serve in those offices.

Motion: Inclusion of Senate Vote on proposed SRI with final SRI report

Barbara King (CLASS) was concerned that the consolidation Operational Working Group (OWG) to which the SRI committee’s report was being forwarded for informational purposes only would not recognize that, since we formally voted down only one of the report’s recommendations, we had rejected all of the report’s recommendations. She thought this needed to be made clear as part of a full relay of information to the OWG. Just forwarding the report was not forwarding full information because it would not relay the faculty input provided by the Senate discussion, particularly misgivings about the SRI instrument itself.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that King had raised something like this during the last meeting, but it got lost in the donnybrook of discussion. He thought her motion sought to forward to the OWG a clearer version of what occurred, and he thought that was a good idea.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) agreed with the basic motion. At the last meeting, we had said we did not want to make recommendations to the OWG that would develop an SRI for both GSU and Armstrong, but just forwarding the report could send the wrong message. A note that we have strong reservations should accompany the report.

Moderator Flynn asked if inclusion of the results of the senate vote would accomplish that goal.

King said that would be a start.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) wanted to include the vote, but also a paragraph saying that this was discussed at length and there were several reservations.

Moderator Flynn asked if they wanted to send the minutes or a reference to the minutes, or would that accomplish more than they were asking for.

Alice Hall (CHHS) noted that consolidation had formed part of the discussion, and wondered if we had voted the measure down because we did not like it, or because of consolidation. She thought forwarding the minutes would be important to show how we arrived at the vote.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) said the overwhelming consensus was we didn't like the new measure, and that needed to be communicated.

King was also concerned that the OWG would not be able to tell how many people voted against it because they didn't like it, how many did so because of consolidation, and how many used consolidation as a way of not having to be mean.

Cyr said that issue was cloudy and that was a reason to send the minutes to the OWG, so they could see for themselves what was said.

Moderator Flynn noted at this point that the motion had not been formally made, so King made it: to include the Senate vote on the proposed SRI with the forwarded SRI Report. It was seconded.

Jake Simons (COBA) said something inaudible, but it appears to have been a suggestion that the motion be amended to include the minutes of the SRI discussion. After some discussion of how amendments work, Mark Welford (COSM) formally moved an amendment that we include the minutes of the discussion along with the SRI committee's report in the material forwarded to the OWG. He was seconded.

Adam Bossler (CLASS) was concerned that just forwarding the minutes would not make clear how strongly faculty were against the new SRI, regardless of consolidation. The OWG might want to take some of the recommendations from the report and try to implement them even though we were strongly opposed to them.

Moderator Flynn asked if Bossler was clear on the fact that the amended motion would forward both the minutes and the result of the vote.

Bossler said he understood that, but noted that some people had said the minutes weren't very clear about whether we voted it down because we were against it, or whether we were just trying to be nice by saying we rejected it because of the consolidation. He thought we should be much clearer about why it was rejected.

Cyr thought Bossler's suggestion would have to bring up an entire new discussion in which we would have to gauge how much we hate it. He wasn't sure that there was any reason to do that right now. He thought the amended motion sent as much clarity as we could achieve.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) did not think sending the report forward would result in its being accepted and implemented. She thought there would be much more discussion even with forwarding the minutes that included Senators' objections to the report.

The amendment was voted on and Approved. The amended motion was then voted on and Approved.

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

10. Announcements from the Floor

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) announced, "My wife and I on April 3rd have been married 41 years. And she's, I love her very much, she's a good woman. That's all I had to say."

Moderator Flynn called this the "Best announcement ever."

Mark Welford (COSM) announced that the AAUP and the Provost would host a reception honoring the recently promoted and tenured faculty on Friday, April 21st, at Eagle Creek Brewery.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) reminded faculty that their closing show of the year was *Chicago*, running April 27th through the 30th.

11. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.