

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
(Approved)

April 18, 2001

Volume XXXII, No. 14

Call to Order

Chairperson Curt White called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Senator Crothers called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes of April 4, 2001:

XXXII-119: by Senator Poling, second by Senator Chang, to approve the Senate minutes of April 4, 2001. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Admission Trends at ISU

Steve Adams, Director of Admissions: There is now a \$30.00 application fee for students applying to ISU. We did that to make certain that students who applied were likely to complete the process of enrollment. The President's Enrollment Committee has met all year long to monitor the enrollment situation. We anticipate a higher show rate with the application fee. We are hoping that it will not be above 40%.

As we look at enrollment, we must pay special attention to *Educating Illinois* initiatives. Last year we had a total enrollment of 20,504 and our target for this year was very comparable to that figure. Undergraduate and graduate enrollment was comparable to last year. There was a decrease in the freshman target from 3265, which was the actual enrollment last year, down to 3000. Managing enrollment involves one of the earliest cutoffs of any institution in the State. We cutoff our freshman applications on March 1 in order not to go beyond our target of 3,000 new freshmen. In early February, we admitted only top quality applicants, those in the upper half of their graduating class with an ACT score of 25, except for the special requests such as for athletes, talent admits and departmental requests.

The predictors for enrollment include an increase of 500 students at our area meetings where we go out to students at 13 sites throughout the state, housing contracts, which are up by more than 100, and the fact that we are packaging financial aid for freshmen in March this year. Preview reservations are another predictor of the number of students that will come in. We are considering an enrollment deposit of \$150.00 for students to declare their intent to enroll by May 1, 2002.

We have taken a more aggressive and personalized approach to recruitment. There has been a substantial increase of students admitted in 30 to 36 ACT range. This fall we admitted 300 in that range. 85% of our freshmen rank in the top half and we hope to enroll as many as five national merit scholars this year. The bottom line is that ISU is becoming a more selective institution.

Senator Walker: Is everyone seeing increased ACTs and show rates?

Dr. Adams: At least five institutions are down on admissions and enrollment and are struggling for students. There has been no other school with as early a cutoff as we have with the exception of the University of Illinois.

Senator Walker: Can you explain why we have the increases?

Dr. Adams: I think that students are having good experiences here. Also, the Gen Ed program has made a great deal of difference.

Senator Campbell: I didn't hear anything about admitting minorities or disenfranchised students. What are doing about making sure we have a diverse campus?

Dr. Adams: I think we are taking a more personalized approach. One example is that there has been a more aggressive recruitment for minority students. We also just presented a program called "First Look". That program attracted more than 2 1/2 times the number of students it usually attracts. There were 100 minority students who participated in the program. There is also the element of accessibility and we are certainly doing all we can as far as our admission requirements.

Senator Goldfarb: We also increased our minority scholarship dollars this year.

Senator Campbell: Are we seeing an increase of students who have some sort of limitation?

Dr. Adams: Prior to this year, that rate has been dropping. That is why we have had to take a more aggressive approach in this regard. Those numbers have been going down for a number of reasons. One is that we raised our admission requirements two years ago and secondly we have not been able to provide financial means to students. There has also been a decrease in minority high school seniors in Illinois. This year, I am very hopeful that we will bring in a higher number of these students.

Senator Noyes: How many students apply?

Dr. Adams: We have nearly 12,000 freshman applications.

Senator Noyes: And each of them are paying \$30.00.

Dr. Adams: Yes, we have a waiver process for the financially disadvantaged.

Senator Noyes: What happens to those funds?

Dr. Adams: Those funds are placed in a special agency account and are used for technology, recruitment initiatives and everything that goes along with collecting the fee and administering the applications.

Senator Boschini: The biggest bulk of that was to provide online applications that can be submitted via the internet.

Senator Weber: What has happened with ACT scores in general?

Dr. Adams: Our numbers have gone up at a greater rate than what has happened nationally. Our rate has increased over the last five years and increased substantially this year.

Senator Reid: Are any of the fees going to departments that are doing more and more of the recruiting?

Dr. Adams: There is discussion that that could take place. We are in the process with *Educating Illinois* to try

to identify departmental recruitment programs. If those turn out to be successful programs, it is possible that some of those funds could be channeled in that direction.

Senator Razaki: In the 30 to 36 ACT range, are those students spread across all of the different colleges?

Dr. Adams: I don't know the answer to that question, but I can certainly provide it to you and to the Senate.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator White: This is the last Senate meeting for this Senate. I want to thank all senators who will not return to the Senate in 2001-02 for their participation and generosity this year. On April 5, I met with the chairs of the other Illinois senates and we had a very good turnout. All of the senates at all of the public universities in Illinois are interesting in becoming a part of this group. The group now has a name, the Council of Illinois University Senates. We have a constitution, which has not yet been approved, but which the various senates will be asked to approve. It will be on our agenda for the May 2 meeting. We also set a list of action priorities and the faculty member on the Board of Trustees is the second item on the agenda. Our top agenda item is to promote information about the way in which state monies are used for private universities and the effect that has on the funding for public universities. You should have received through email a copy of the proposed constitution as well as the minutes of that meeting. This will be a major discussion item and the focus of a Senate Resolution on May 2.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Brown: Thank you for the year. I will return the Senate as Student Trustee, which I look forward to. There have been a lot of changes this year that I am really happy about; we have done a lot.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Senator Kording: Thanks to those student senator who are returning. I know it takes a lot of dedication to serve on a body like this. I also want to thank the incoming senators. Last week at the Student Government, we did a lot of orientation to get used to the new structure. The Student Government approved a resolution supporting Illinois House Resolution 15, which deals with textbook tax credits. We have not yet found a student who feels that the textbook tax should not be eliminated. We will send the resolution on to our state legislators.

Administrators' Remarks:

- **President Vic Boschini:** Congratulated Senator Brown on her election as Student Trustee.
- **Provost Al Goldfarb:** I have to be on a small group that is dealing with issues of non-tenure track faculty to respond to the IBHE's request that we report on this issue. I have asked Faculty Affairs to slow its process so we can know what is going on statewide as well. The group will meet this summer and into the fall.
- **Vice President of Student Affairs:** *Not present at time of administrators' remarks.*
- **Vice President of Finance and Planning:**
Senator Bragg: No report.

Committee Reports

- **Academic Affairs Committee**

Senator Meckstroth: Thanks to those of you who gave us input on the University's Mission Statement. The subcommittee has made another revision and we will now undertake getting this out to various constituencies and asking for university wide input. We will ask for additional input in the fall and then present a revised Statement based on university-wide discussion. We are going to also ask for more input about the Tiered Program Admissions proposal and we will be sending those out to College Councils so that faculty will have more of a chance to have input on that.

Administrative Affairs Committee:

Senator Meier: No report.

· ***Budget Committee:***

Senator Howard: The Budget Committee met this evening to look at information from a budget perspective on the different name changes and the request for school designation. From a budgetary standpoint, there appears to be no objections.

· ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

Senator El-Zanati: We have an interim non-tenure track philosophy report that hopefully will be an information item the next time around.

· ***Rules Committee***

Senator Razaki: I would like to express my appreciation to the Rules Committee. We met two hours last week primarily focusing on the internal governance structure proposal, which will come up as an action item tonight.

· ***Student Affairs Committee:***

Senator Kowalski: Right now SGA is launching recruitment for the external committees of the Senate. This is a very large job and we need about 300 students. What I have passed around is a form on which you may nominate students to these committees.

Information Items:

Academic Plan

Betty Chapman: The annual plan was completed by the Academic Planning Committee, which is an external committee of the Senate. I would like to thank the members of that committee for their hard work. The plan is comprised of four major sections: the Mission Statements, institutional priorities, academic objectives for the coming year and program reviews. The middle section, the academic planning section, has been entitled Institutional Priorities in the past, but because of the *Educating Illinois* initiative, we felt that it would be ill advised for this committee to go along a separate track. Therefore, the committee decided to adopt it as a whole to be part of the plan. The final section is our periodic program review. We review a segment of the academic programs so that within an eight-year cycle, every program is reviewed. The complete report on all of the programs that were reviewed can be found on reserve at Milner.

03.26.01.03 *Request for Department Name Change for Political Science (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committees)*

Senator Meier: The Administrative Affairs Committee met several weeks ago and discussed the request from Political Science the name change from the Department of Political Science to the Department of

Politics and Government. We had no real concerns or issues and would like to bring that forth to the Senate as a positive recommendation.

03.26.01.04 Request for Department Name Change for Industrial Technology (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committees)

Senator Meier: We also were asked to review the name change for Industrial Technology from the Department of Industrial Technology to the Department of Technology. We discussed this, had no concerns and would also like to positively recommend this name change.

01.08.01.04 Academic Calendar for 2004-05 (Administrative Affairs Committee)

Senator Meier: We looked at the Academic Calendar and all we are to do was make a recommendation for the 2004-2005 academic year. We recommend that the calendar be accepted.

Senator Goldfarb: Senator Bragg, in the 2005 academic year, July 4th falls on a Tuesday. That was an issue a year ago when we made the Administrative Closure day Monday, July 3. We need to review the issue of whether classes will be held on July 3.

Action Items:

Academic Freedom Committee Election (Rules Committee)

Motion XXXII-120: by Senator Razaki, second by Senator Noyes, to accept the slate of nominees for the Academic Freedom Committee. The Senate elected the following faculty members to the committee:

Paul Holsinger, History
Margaret Hutchins, Special Education
Nweze Nnakwe, Family and Consumer Sciences
George Palmer, Milner
John Stark, Theatre

Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee Election (Rules Committee)

The Senate elected the following faculty members to the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee:

Donna Adair, Curriculum and Instruction
Gary Ames, Accounting
Michael Gorr, Philosophy
Christine Kubiak, Milner
David MacDonald, History
Hassan Mohammadi, Economics
Elizabeth Timmerman-Lugg, Educational Administration
Yvonne Unrau, Social Work

Panel of 10 Election (Rules Committee)

Senator White: Members of this group are selected to chair search committees for central administrators and college deans.

The Senate elected the following members to the Panel of 10:

David Borst, Biological Sciences
Hank Campbell, Industrial Technology
Brian Clark, Physics
Lucia Getsi, English

Claude Graeff, Management and Quantitative Methods
Edward Meckstroth, Milner
Karen Pfof, Psychology
Liane Stillwell, Philosophy
Douglas Turco, Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Paul Walker, Agriculture

03.30.01.07 Internal Governance Structure Proposal (Rules Committee)

Motion XXXII-121: by Senator Weber, second by Senator Razaki, to approve the proposal for the Senate's internal governance structure. There was some major restructuring of the internal committees. The major change was that Student Affairs Committee functions would be taken over by SGA. The Faculty Caucus has also been formalized. This will include all faculty members of the Senate. There have been some major changes in the functioning of the Administrative Affairs Committee as well; what used to be the Administrative Affairs Committee is now the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee and what used to be the Budget Committee has now become Planning and Finance.

Senator Reid: The faculty caucus will be the same as now, but it will be a formalized committee because now the Appointment, Salary, Promotion and Tenure Policies will go through the Faculty Caucus and will not come to the full Senate. Essentially, the idea is to make the Planning and Finance Committee a long-term planning committee, where as the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee will be short term. The old Budget Committee dealt with program changes. This would now go to the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee. That committee would provide oversight of the Academic Impact Fund. The annual capital planning and budgeting would continue to go to this committee, which again is one-year planning. Planning and Finance will deal with strategic planning, which would include the Campus Master Plan.

Senator White: Congratulated Senator Weber and Senator Reid for their restructuring of the Administrative Affairs and the Budget Committees. The proposed pages will replace the current pages in the Blue Book.

Motion XXXII-122: by Senator Kowalski, second by Senator Brown, to amend the proposal for the Student Government Association functions. The amendment states as one of the SGA functions: "The Student Government will appoint students to the external committees of the Senate. All appointments must be communicated to the Senate office. The SGA will appoint students to any committee for which a request has been made for Senate student representation. All appointments must be communicated to the Academic Senate office." Also, in number eight of the Rules Committee functions: the Rules Committee would "make faculty appointments to the external committees of the Senate"; however, the wording about receiving nominations from the SGA would be eliminated. No nominations for students to committees would go to the Rules Committee or before the Senate as a whole for election.

The reason for this amendment is that SGA feels that it is redundant for nominations to go to the Rules Committee and then to the whole Senate. With the original proposal, it could take as long as a month to get students in place on committees. No student has ever been rejected by the Senate, which is another reason that we are bringing this amendment.

Senator Brown: I am in full support of this amendment for the reasons listed in the rationale. I hope that you all see that this is a much needed change.

Senator Razaki: I want to speak in opposition of this amendment. The Rules Committee debated this issue at length and I think that almost every faculty member on that committee was opposed to this amendment. I

think Senator Kowalski is incorrect when he gave the timeline for the way in which we propose to elect students to the external committees. I don't see how he thinks it would take a month. I don't see that there would be any additional time required for it, because ultimately things have to come to the Senate floor to be approved and voted on. According to their amendment, students would be appointed by SGA directly to the external committees of the Senate without being voted on by the full Senate. There is something to be said for efficiency, but there is a lot to be said for effectiveness. A number of the members of the Rules Committee felt that one important function of the Rules Committees performs is that if there are not enough nominations, for either students or faculty, then the Rules Committee can pursue this and try to get nominations. If this amendment were passed and if the SGA failed to bring in enough nominations, then those seats would remain vacant. This amendment does not address how that would be handled.

Senator Reid: I do see that it would be a lot faster to just appoint them directly. But what I am uncomfortable with is that these are external committees of the Senate, not of the SGA and one would assume that the external committees of the Senate would be voted on by the Senate itself, not be appointed by SGA. SGA is not a subcommittee of the Senate.

Senator White: The Student Government Association will have its own page in the Senate Blue Book, so how can we argue that SGA is not a part of the internal structure of the Senate. The SGA will enjoy a dual status. It will be an independent body with its own constitution and it will be functioning as an internal committee of the Senate.

Senator Reid: If it is indeed an internal committee, then I would withdraw my objection.

Senator White: We can't call it wholly an internal committee. It has a dual existence. I had another point that needs clarification. Doesn't this present a problem of nonparallel functioning? The SGA can directly appoint members to the external committees, but the Faculty Affairs Committee would still need to bring its nominations to the Rules Committee and students would be voting on them.

Senator Goldfarb: I would like to support the proposal. Since there is an unfair process of nomination, I would suggest that the faculty nominations not be brought before the whole Senate, since there is an unfair structure.

Senator Razaki: We would just eliminate an item under Faculty Affairs.

Friendly Amendment to Amendment: by Senator Goldfarb, accepted by Senators Kowalski and Brown. Revision to Amendment brought by SGA: "Make faculty appointments to external committees of the Academic Senate and faculty nominations would be reviewed by the Faculty Caucus of the Senate."

Senator Kording: The Student Government is not a separate organization from the Senate. In the past, committee appointments have been organized by the student caucus of the Senate. This would be the same if this proposal were adopted. In addition, I recognize that the Rules Committee was concerned with the need for oversight of the SGA to make sure that the student appointments were brought on time. That is already in the structure. The Senate can put all the pressure it wants on the Vice President of Student Affairs who can exercise that oversight if some future government is not efficient in making the appointments in a timely manner. Even at some point in the future if a group of student leaders was a little less efficient, that ought to be the student's mistake to make. The structure is already in place for the Vice President of Student Affairs to exercise that oversight. Every other week, the SGA will meet and a representative from the Vice President's office will be there, so I think that the communication with the proposed system will be better than it has ever

been. It is not just a relationship that the SGA has with the Senate, it is a component.

Senator Mamarchev: Senator Kording and I have been talking about this and I think that what he is articulating as the role of the Vice President of Student Affairs is that it is our responsibility that students that are being proposed are free from conduct probation and are not on academic probation. Even more important is that the students who are selected understand that it important that they be present at committee meetings and follow through with whatever their assignments may be. Our role is to have very close contact with the students. That may not have been the case in previous years. I would hope that if there were anyone in the Senate who felt that the SGA needed some prodding that they would feel free to call me.

Senator Crothers: I see no real downside to the amendment other than some structural differences. I think that there should be something called the Student Caucus and the Faculty caucus.

Friendly Amendment: by Senator Walker to change "reviewed by the Faculty Caucus" to "voted on by the Faculty Caucus". This amendment was accepted by both Senators Kowalski and Brown.

Senator Razaki: Point of clarification, the entire Senate will never vote on any nomination to external committees?

Senator White: That is correct.

Senator El-Zanati: I think this Senate is unique in the way it brings faculty and students together and I am perceiving this separation as students wanting control of their own affairs, but we continue to see that the Faculty Affairs Committee continues to have students on it. Perhaps if this passes, we should eliminate students on that committee, but I don't think that is what we want to do that, so I do not support this amendment.

Senator Thomas: I am speaking against the amendment also. I thought that the new structure was designed to include others besides faculty and students in the Senate. Based on this new amendment, those individuals would not be voting on any appointments to external committees.

Senator Razaki: I think we are becoming more exclusive. We look at faculty as one separate group and students as a separate group, so I think there is going to be less participation in each other's affairs than currently exists and I don't think that is the goal of the Senate. Senator Kording states that we are looking at what might happen a couple of years from now. You only have to look at the recent past to see that those things have happened. There was a member of the SGA who would not come to meetings. I have not seen the current Student Trustee coming to Senate meetings this year. So it is not as if this was in the far off past. One of the problems that was caused by the lack of student attendance was that the internal committees would not have a quorum because students did not show up. So there is really no guarantee that this cannot happen again in the future. I am impressed by the current Student Government, but there needs to be some oversight by some part of the Senate to see that proper representation does take place.

Senator Bathauer: Senator Razaki said that the whole Senate would never vote in these elections. Students would vote on whom they want to place and faculty would do the same. Since I have been here, no student has ever been rejected. Also, regarding your comments about prior administrations--how can you penalize us for what we have not even had a chance to do yet? There can be a check. My understanding is that this can always be changed again to the way it is currently.

Senator Brown: We are not trying to make this more exclusive by doing this. These committee elections have consistently been a rubber stamp for the Senate. One of the main reason for a merged governance proposal, which took a lot of time and effort and which was accepted, was that we wanted students to be stronger on the Senate and to be more inclusive. I don't think that this proposal is saying that the faculty senators and student senators are split at all.

Senator Reid: I want to compliment the students for putting together a very strong argument. I was specifically convinced by response that the SGA is responsible for itself under the Vice President of Student Affairs, so I will now support this.

Senator Kording: Senator El-Zanati and Senator Razaki made reference to the idea that we may be approaching a trend where we will be more exclusive in the Senate. I think what we doing here is becoming more selective with the business that we address. It saves a lot of time on the Senate if we don't have to do an election here. Students are much uninformed on the faculty they elect other than to those committees for which vitae are submitted.

Senator Walker: Do the students consider casting a vote for a faculty member as a burden or privilege?

Senator Bathauer: I don't think burden would be the correct word, but we would see it as a privilege to elect our own. When we fill these positions, we will make sure that the students represent us.

Senator Walker: I am wondering how this change would allow less oversight. Once someone is appointed to the committee, it is still their responsibility to attend the committee meetings.

Senator Razaki: My point was oversight of the elections.

Vote on Amendment to Main Motion: Senator Razaki moved the question to close the debate on the amendment. The debate was closed by affirmative votes from all senators with the exception of Senator El-Zanati, who voted no. The amendment was then voted on. It passed by a majority of the Senate by voice vote. Debate returned to the main motion.

Senator Thomas: What would be the role of non-faculty and non-students in appointing members to external committees?

Senator Reid: None--faculty would elect faculty and students would elect students.

Senator El-Zanati: I have chaired the Faculty Affairs Committee this year. We have two students on there and they are extremely valuable. Now the Faculty Affairs Committee has two students on it and they get to participate in nominating faculty for committees. They continue to be involved in faculty issues.

Senator Razaki: No, they don't. The Faculty Caucus nominates.

Senator Reid: Senator Brown, wasn't it you who felt that we did not need more than two students on the Faculty Affairs Committee?

Senator Brown: Since we are eliminating the Student Affairs Committee and making it the Student Government Association, I asked why should there be students on the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Rules Committee felt that there should be and I tried to keep it to a minimal number because I did not agree with

that.

Senator Razaki: What the faculty members on the Rules Committee were not willing to accept was that there would be any internal committee where the faculty did not have at least one more vote than the students so that we maintain the majority.

Senator Panfilio: I just wanted to comment on what Senators El-Zanati and Thomas spoke about concerning becoming exclusive and removing ourselves from this cross pollination that allows us to see into each other's worlds. Serving on the Faculty Affairs Committee has made me more aware of issues throughout the university. In terms of voting for faculty, the first time I did that I felt very awkward. I had to ask questions about scholarships and publications and service to the University and it made me rethink what the University is about and become more effective on other committees, so I don't think we should lose the opportunity to share committee space with it each other; I think it is valuable to have representation from both sides. I would love to see a faculty member on the SGA.

Senator Sass: What is the rationale for having a Faculty Affairs Committee when its functions can easily be done in the Faculty Caucus?

Senator White: The Faculty Caucus is limited to issues having to do with appointment, salary, tenure and promotion. The Faculty Affairs Committee would deal with for example ethics and grievance issues. It has also been given oversight of the use of non-tenure track faculty.

Senator Weber: The assumption is that the Faculty Affairs Committee will be meeting on a regular basis where as the Faculty Caucus may meet infrequently.

Senator Fowles: It seems like the Rules Committee appoints faculty to external committees and the Faculty Affairs, under number three, would "Nominate faculty to any other committees for which a request has been made for Senate faculty representation." What sort of committees would that be?

Senator Weber: This would be a request for a committee other than an external committee, such as an ad hoc committee or a search committee.

Senator White: For many of the external committees, the internal committee would need to be as small a body as possible because many of those issues that it deals with are extremely sensitive.

Senator Walker: We would add to the functions of the Faculty Caucus not only ASPT, but also nominations to external committees. Then Faculty Affairs, even though it would not nominate members to those committees, would still provide oversight to certain external committees.

Senator Howard: I have a concern that we are moving away from the attempts that were made to broaden the Academic Senate, that we are now taking away some of the rights of its members to vote on some of these issues. I see this as a loss.

Senator Weber: This is not an external committee of the Senate, but a committee for which Senate faculty representation has been requested. Those faculty names would be forwarded from the Faculty Affairs Committee to the Faculty Caucus.

Senator Wells: There seems to be a slight misunderstanding. Faculty nominations come out of the Rules Committee. The amendment that was passed includes the wording that the Rules Committee would make

faculty appointments to the external committees of the Senate. The faculty nominations would then go to the Faculty Caucus. The point of clarification is that the nominations come from the Rules Committee. If there are ten people who are needed on a committee, will only ten names come from the Rules Committee? What would be voted on?

Senator White: We would essentially go through the voting procedures we went through tonight. You would have the option of removing one of those persons or adding to the nominations if you knew someone who wanted to be nominated.

Senator Reid: We have to eliminate number eight for the Rules Committee.

Senator White: Number 8 has already been amended. We have that language here.

Senator Reid: I would be surprised if the Civil Service or AP even cares one way or the other about voting for nominees to external committees. I think there are many issues that are more important. We are going to have a major voice through the Planning and Finance Committee on all of the capital planning and AP and Civil Service will be included in that. So I think this proposal really increases the voice of all constituencies.

Friendly Amendment: by Senator Goldfarb to add to the membership of the Faculty Affairs Committee the Provost as an ex-officio member. Senators Weber and Razaki accepted the friendly amendment.

Move the Question: Senator Razaki moved the question in order to close debate on the main motion. The Senate voted unanimously to close debate.

Vote on Main Motion: The main motion was to place the pages submitted by the Rules Committee, as amended, on the structure of the Senate's internal committee into the Blue Book, the supplemental document to the Senate's bylaws. The motion was passed by a majority of the Senate by voice vote. Those who voted against the proposal were Senators Razaki, Thomas and Howard. There were no abstentions.

Communications

04.02.01.01 Global Studies Sequence in Political Science Proposal - Approved by Senate via Consent Agenda as of 4/17/01.

Motion XXXII-123: To adjourn by Senator Bathauer, second by Senator Noyes. The motion was unanimously approved by standing vote.

Academic Senate
Hovey 408, Box 1830
438-8735
E-mail Address: acsenate@ilstu.edu
Web Address: <http://www.academicsenate.ilstu.edu>



Microsoft Excel
Worksheet