

Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, November 2, 2020

Present: Melissa Anderson, Amy Belcastro, Jeremy Carlton, Enrique Chacón (rep. Marianne Golding), Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Justin Harmon, Merrilyne Lundahl, Brendan McMahon, Matt Moreali, Jesse Longhurst, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

Absent: Laurie Kurutz

Guests: Lee Ayers, Sherry Ettlich, Sarah Grulikowski, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Karen Stone, Dale Vidmar, Sue Walsh, Jody Waters, Chance White Eyes, **Rattaphon Wuthisatian**

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes from 10/19

Motion:

In an undetermined order, Fedorek and Oliveri made a motion/seconded the motion to approve the minutes.

Discussion:

Fedorek noted typos that needed correction.

Vote:

The motion to approve the minutes with corrections to the typos passed with one abstention by Carlton. **Motion passed.**

2. President's Report – Linda Schott

Report:

President Schott greeted everyone and recognized a shared anticipation on the eve of the Presidential election.

- 5th Week Enrollment Numbers

President Schott reported that we received our 5th week enrollment numbers today.

Enrollment

- Overall, FTE is down 13%. This is a little more than had been anticipated, but the fires complicated initial projections. Much of the loss is in dual-credit students, with the fires and pandemic as the main cause.
- Graduate enrollment is up about 2%. This is good news because graduate students pay more.

Budget Impact & State of the University Address

- Though we are down in our budget, a 13% drop in enrollment translates to less than a 13% hit to our budget.
- As an unanticipated piece of good news, there are lower costs associated with operating remotely. For example, we're traveling less and spending less money on in-person events with food.
- We are still working out the details but will have definitive statements on the budget by the **State of the University Address** (November 10, 12:30-1:30 pm).

- President Schott emphasized that there is no dramatic surprise or hidden axe that is about to fall. They are still working through the budget details, and there will be a more definitive statement on Tuesday, but, as of now, it looks like we might be able to make it through the year without any drastic actions.
- HECC Meeting
President Schott gave promising news about an upcoming HECC meeting.
 - The meeting will take place on Tuesday and Thursday of next week. This is a change to the usual Wednesday-Thursday schedule, as Wednesday is Veteran's Day. SOU will also observe Veteran's Day as a holiday this year.
 - The Finance Committee meeting will be on Tuesday, and there is a proposed change to the SSCM (Student Success and Completion Funding Model) that we believe will benefit SOU to the tune of ~\$1 million.
 - This isn't as much as we had hoped for, but it does seem more fair.
 - We will continue to push for a greater allocation of money in the mission part of the model. We are exploring a strategy that will focus on support for underrepresented students.
 - This is on the agenda as an action item, and, if the commission decides they do not need more time, we could have a decision by Thursday.
 - This has been a long process, and the good news is that we have made progress.
- Federal relief bill
President Schott gave an update on the status of the Federal Relief Bill. Below are her current reads of the situation.
 - If President Trump is reelected and the Senate stays Republican, there will probably be some kind of relief bill in the lame duck session, and it will have some relief for higher ed. It will probably not have any backfilling of state and local governments due to Republican opposition.
 - If Biden wins and the Senate stays Republican, it is likely that nothing will happen.
 - If Biden wins and the Senate changes hands, we will very likely see a relief bill but it won't happen until after the inauguration in January. If it were to occur in February, SOU could see the relief in March.

President Schott shared hope that we would have more clarity in the next few days regarding when a relief bill would be seen and how it would function for higher ed as well as state and local governments.
- AASCU Annual Presidents Conference
President Schott highlighted an opportunity for faculty presented at the conference.
 - A group of faculty members are doing research on what they call **rural anchor institutions**, which include colleges and universities (like SOU) that are located in largely rural parts of the United States, but play a significant role in the local economy and for the students of the region.
 - If any faculty member is interested in this as a research topic, President Schott would be happy to connect the faculty member(s) with this set of scholars.
 - Example: They have evidence showing that we could start lobbying for a designation of rural-serving institutions, like Hispanic-serving or minority-serving institutions.
 - This is promising because it recognizes the value of these kinds of institutions across the United States.

- President Schott shared that the group seemed interested in SOU, how SOU is helping the region after the fires, etc. She stated that the group will likely follow up with her.
- Belcastro and Longhurst indicated that they were both interested in participating. President Schott said that she would send the information that she has to them.

3. Provost's Report – Sue Walsh

Report:

Provost Walsh said that she was glad to see everyone, she had two things to share, and she wanted to be mindful of the general education discussion.

- Academic Program Review
 - The academic program review schedule has gone out to chairs, and programs on the list for this year will be notified by their chairs.
 - The process has been fine-tuned with the help of faculty and division directors. The updated version seems better.
- New Student Evaluations
 - The new student course evaluations will be taking effect this Fall.
 - Prior to this year, the process lived in Enrollment Services. The process will now live in the Provost Office and run through AI.
 - Chairs will be walked through a live demo of the process at the chair's meeting on November 18. Melissa Anderson will be present at that meeting.

Discussion:

Yates had a question regarding the status of the Senate recommendation for the scholarship award.

Walsh stated that she had signed the recommendation and that had passed it along to President Schott.

Schott verified that she had also signed the recommendation.

Yates clarified that he had wanted to get the call for nominations out. He also shared there were several nominations for the teaching and service awards that he will soon pass to the Faculty Development Committee.

4. Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Melissa Anderson

Report:

Anderson stated that she had many notes from last week's AC meeting but that she would share them quickly so as not to cut into the later discussion on general education.

- Academic Calendar
Next year's calendar will likely be like this year's calendar, with a midweek Fall start and Veteran's Day as a holiday.
- Finals
Fall: There will not be a finals week this term.
Winter: We will have a regular finals schedule in Winter term.
Spring: There will not likely be a finals week in Spring term due to furlough days.
- Division Personnel Committee

Small programs do not have enough faculty to fill their program's faculty personnel committees. Usually, these small programs ask other people from their division to serve on their committee. There is some bylaw language about this but there is some concern that this might need more clarification. We will likely bring this to another meeting later.

- Undergraduate Advising Committee
The Advising Committee notified us of their priorities for this year, and that brought up some questions about committees that have not been meeting regularly the past couple of years. This will also likely be brought to a later meeting.
- Emeritus Status to Professional Track Faculty
There is no process in the bylaws to grant emeritus status to professional track faculty. In the past, this has been done through a special vote in the Senate, but AC thought it would be a good idea to propose a process in the bylaws so that this could be done more efficiently. This will likely be brought to the Constitution Committee fairly soon.
- Scholarship Award
Yates mentioned that the Scholarship award is working its way through the process and the other awards are moving forward as well.
- EDI Committee
AC briefly talked about the EDI work that's being done and the EDI committee, and everyone wants to be sure this is done in a coherent way. Some people have been confused about the language around cultural competencies and the charge of the committee. There is a desire for clearer communication, so we will have more conversation about this topic in the future as well.
- General Education Task Force
AC also discussed feedback from the Gen Ed Task Force. Anderson stated that this was on the agenda and that she only wanted to add two things: (1) the task force is putting together an FAQ to help people understand aspects of the proposal so far, and (2) the metaphor in moving forward in this process is that it's like an engagement rather than a marriage and we would be talking about what the engagement would look like in the later discussion.

Yates added that the student assistant for Senate has been mining through 10 years of Senate minutes to try to discover bylaws updates that may not have been incorporated in the version of the bylaws available to faculty online. One of the things the student found was a mention of a bylaws change that would have allowed for emeritus professional faculty. Yates said that he will do more research.

5. ASSOU President's Report – Sarah Grulikowski

Report:

Grulikowski shared that she had a short list to share.

- Election Connections
ASSOU, in collaboration with Student Life, have developed a series of events called Election Connections. These are intended to help the SOU student community

reflect, engage, find information, and support. Grulikowski shared that would take place all week. Event details went out to students, but Grulikowski asked the faculty to get the word out to students who might be interested.

- Applications
ASSOU is currently seeking applications for the clubs and organizations senator as well as student-at-large positions on a variety of committees. Please encourage students that might be interested or involved on campus to apply or send them to Grulikowski. She is happy to answer any questions.
- Shared Goals all SOU Student Presidents
Grulikowski met today, on a very general level, with the other student body presidents at the public universities in Oregon. They developed some general shared goals for the upcoming year, which include preventing cuts from higher education, COVID support for students, and battling food insecurity.
- Executive Branch Hires
ASSOU has two new hires. The new Director of Finance is Chris New and the new Director of Public Relations is Bathscheba Duronvil.
- Upcoming Meetings
The ASSOU Bylaws Committee will meet on Tuesday for the first time, and the ASSOU Senate will meet Wednesday at 6 pm.

****Yates made a request from the SOU Policy Council shared by Jason Catz for a would like a faculty representative. This group meets each first Thursday from 3:30-5 pm. Yates would like to volunteer for this and would like an alternate for this week. He put the request in the chat and asked that someone contact him.****

6. **General Education Task Force Report** (Discussion – possible vote in 2 weeks) – **Andrew Gay, Alena Ruggerio, Dale Vidmar, Elizabeth Whitman**

Preface:

The Gen Ed Task Force took Senate's feedback into account, as well as feedback from others and groups. The discussion today will involve the capacities.

Summary:

Gay shared that other members of the task force, Ruggerio, Vidmar, and Whitman were present. He shared that after the last Senate meeting, he's had discussions with Yates and with AC about next steps. He also reiterated, a number of times during the ensuing discussion, that all of this is subject to Senate approval and direction.

Next Steps

Because the task force is a small group with many duties and a development of the capacities would require a high level of detail and sensitivity to all programs across campus, they would like to create subcommittees for each capacity.

These subcommittees would articulate what each capacity means, what the proficiencies beneath those capacities would be, the rubrics for measuring the student achievement of a capacity, and even templates around course approvals.

Request From Senate

Before working on each capacity at that level of detail, with 6 panels of faculty and hopefully student representation, the task force would like to know that there is provisional agreement on the 6 capacities.

Latest Task Force Work

Directly after the last Senate meeting, the task force reviewed each line of feedback, organized the feedback in terms of themes around the components of the model and proposal, and discussed and prioritized different aspects of the feedback.

This will be the source of the Frequently Asked Questions that was mentioned earlier. There have been a number of behind the scenes discussions to identify where the task force has already addressed an issue that was raised, where ideas are new, etc.

At the last meeting, they focused on the capacities. The capacities document shared for this Senate meeting reflects the minor revisions the task force has made in response to the feedback received. They reviewed the reasons they chose each of the capacities and decided that they were still happy with the six capacities they had originally proposed, though they did update the description of quantitative reasoning and change its name to numerical literacy. They are not married to the names of the capacities, to the current descriptive language of the capacities, or the details of the proficiencies of each.

There were a few things that came up that they decided, after a robust discussion, were not appropriate to include in our general education. (The examples identified in the discussion are listed below.)

- Financial literacy. Our student mix includes increasing numbers of non-traditional and adult learners, and it might make more sense to encourage financial literacy courses rather than require them. Senate can disagree, but as of now the task force left this out.
- Sustainability. This was one of the task force's original 14 outcomes, but it did not, in the end, become a capacity. The task force believes that sustainability would be more effectively addressed within disciplines and by asking students to consider how sustainability connects to their discipline and desired career path.
- Adulting skills*. (The asterisk implies that the task force believes there should be a better name for this.) These are general skills that would benefit most students. The idea is that there should be a transparent offering of these students, perhaps packaged as a certificate or program option, but that they should not be required for every student.

6 Capacities

Gay shared his screen and addressed each capacity in turn.

- Purpose Integration (PI).
The task force does not particularly like the title, but they believe in the idea of the capacity. There has been some criticism along the lines of whether we are seeing the University's role as just producing workers or products. It seems that students often come to college not knowing why they "are here" and leave with

that question unanswered. The task force wants students to be able to connect college to their purpose. There is a career benefit from this – students often come to college to prepare for a job – students, parents, legislators see this as a reason to support their higher education. Students who learn to recognize their own goals and learn to recognize how their learning connects to their goals might also live more meaningful lives, be more satisfied with their education, and be able to communicate why liberal arts education is valuable to their employers. It's not about making students who are career driven but helping students make connections.

- Communication.

The task force is conflicted about this title because they do not want students to believe that if they take any communication class it will count for this capacity. The task force recognizes that communication skills are essential. It is one of the top skill sets that employers continue to find lacking from college graduates. The task force also recognizes that communication skills are essential to a functioning society. This is one of the reasons it has remained as one of our core capacities.

- Numerical Literacy.

The task force changed the name and refashioned the definition to make it more detailed, borrowing some language from OIT. This was not one of the original capacities brought to Senate last Fall. Feedback from that meeting led to its inclusion as a capacity. Its connection to society is clear – we live in a world where increasing numbers of people have difficulties understanding (and can be confused or manipulated with) data, numbers, and statistics.

- Inquiry & Analysis (IA).

This capacity has been somewhat controversial, not because it is opposed, but because of the language used to describe it. Rather than arguing that students learn humanities, social science, and science because they make the liberal arts, the goal was to emphasize that the common element (and measurable skill) is through the lenses of inquiry. That is how inquiry and analysis came about. Critical thinking and information literacy were also merged into this capacity so that students could learn the skills of inquiry and analysis through different disciplinary lenses. Much feedback indicated that the language seemed exclusive, particularly to the humanities. The task force has done some revisions to the language.

The task force believes this is one of the most essential capacities and needs the most input in how the proficiencies are developed. This might need a larger subcommittee with many branches. The task force wants to bring together what's common among the humanities, social sciences, and sciences, and for the subcommittee to develop the language for each area so that no programs are excluded.

- Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion (EDI).

EDI is part of our strategic plan, part of our cultural capacity requirement at a state level, and the task force believes that it is a part of our values and an important piece to include. There hasn't been negative feedback for this; rather, the feedback has been overwhelmingly positive.

- Creativity & Innovation (CI).

This is present in all disciplines and we want students to learn to use creativity in any number of fields. The current model has a creativity and innovation class at the upper division level, which asks students apply creativity and innovation in an outward way that connects to our community – e.g., a class that puts on a play, goes to a conference, offers a scientific solution to a problem. One concern is

whether this should be an upper division course, as students often need prerequisite skills to implement creativity in a particular discipline.

Ruggerio thanked Gay for summarizing the many hours of work from the committee.

Gay stated that the task force was present again so that senators could share thoughts and questions that they could bring back to the rest of the task force and so that senators could carry this discussion to their colleagues. Gay also asked that senators not hold their feedback until the next Senate meeting as the task force would have 2 meetings before the next Senate meeting where they could address any feedback.

Discussion:

Fedorek thanked Gay for answering many of his questions during the summary. Fedorek observed that many of the capacities have skills in their descriptions and asked whether there has been a discussion regarding which skills SOU students should have when they graduate.

Gay identified the development of the gen ed model as a circular process. The task force began with a list of skills which were later organized into 14 learning outcomes (LOs). Some of the LOs were dropped and others were included in the 6 capacities. The task force then revisited the capacities and identified the larger proficiencies and LOs connected to those proficiencies. Whitman and Ayers were involved in the communication capacity, and it is probably the most developed. They drew out the underlying proficiencies and have a very robust set of skills articulated. Part of what the task force hopes is that the subcommittees will drill down to identify skills as well as knowledge outcomes and habits of mind that we would like to measure. The task force started from the basis of what they wanted a student to have when they graduate from SOU.

Thatcher asked if there is intentionality or ranking with the capacities, citing that PI is listed first.

Gay responded that PI appears first only in the sense that the task force wanted to highlight the capacities are building toward the student's purpose (goal/aim). It's generally first as a thematic statement. However, the capacities are not ranked and that the task force sees all of them as having equal importance. The only difference is that IA has a divided aspect, so that the model will likely have more IA courses than other things because we believe that it is important that students look at IA through multiple lenses (humanities vs. science, etc.).

Condon said that he could see how social and emotional skills could cut across a few different capacities such as PI, Communication, and EDI, but asked for the task force's perspective on how those skills might fit into the model.

Gay said that he'd like to hear Whitman and Ruggerio's thoughts on this. He said that the task force is still having a conversation about the first year experience, which might bring in all of the capacities as a way to set the stage for the rest of the gen ed. Gay said that those skills might be addressed in the first year as well as in Communication and the proficiencies.

Ruggerio responded that people who teach these skills would be great assets to the subcommittee conversations. She continued, sharing that the committee has considered including emotional intelligence and mindfulness in a category of things for which the task force would like to encourage the creation of micro-credentials and

certificates. With a smaller number of credits associated with gen ed, students will generally have more credits to play with on their way to the 180 credit requirement.

Gay added that the original proposal had included the idea of level-ups, which would be a series of valuable, adulting-type courses that would be front-facing and perhaps incentivized to students as they registered, particularly during Raider Reg for incoming students. The idea would be that students can opt to take these, but they would not be requirements as one of the 6 main capacities.

Yates said he was aware that the idea is to consider the capacities before drilling down to consider the particular courses or numbers of credits involved. He shared that he had a comment and a question. His comment was that he very much appreciated that the task force put more meat on the bones of Numerical Literacy... and that he isn't concerned about what it's called. His question addressed the IA capacity. He asked if we anticipate that the IA, which seems more broad now, would be distributed in such a way that the committee would want to see one to come from a group of objectives that are more humanities-ish, another from a group of objectives that are more science-ish, and another that's from a group of objectives that's more social science-ish.

Gay replied that the task force revisited and reaffirmed the idea of having these 3 different approaches to IA. He stated that Anderson shared Kemble's opinion that the IA seems even more broad, generic, and unclear. The sample template was a single template including all 3, but the task force will move away from that, believing that each of the 3 courses needs its own template. The task force also wants to find what is common among the three – the trick is in finding the top line definition of IA that is true of all of these courses. Then, subcommittees will define what humanistic inquiry, scientific inquiry, and social inquiry each look like.

Yates followed up with a concern shared last week that going from 3 courses to 1 in each area, students might not have enough gen ed. He asked whether the subcommittees will make recommendations whether the objectives and capacities should or could be covered in one course, two courses, and so on. Yates shared that he had some misgivings about students not having enough liberal arts. He wondered if students might be required to take (as an example to express his idea) something like 5 IA courses, where only 1 could be in their discipline, giving students a way to get breadth without inflating credits.

Gay replied that it would be possible for the subcommittees to make recommendations back to the task force in the way Yates mentioned. He then shared that the task force is still in the process of prioritizing the other feedback, and they are grappling with two issues. First, there is no communication course on its own, so they are considering whether there should be one *and* whether it should be upper or lower division. Second, they are considering whether the CI course should be upper or lower division. So there may be 2 additional courses in the lower division that would not be division-specific and could be an avenue toward increasing a student's exposure to disciplines outside of their own. In addition, the task force has had a broad discussion about the credit number. While a minority of voices shared that they would like a smaller gen ed, and another minority shared that they thought it was about right in size, most voices shared that they appreciated a smaller gen ed but perhaps this was too small. There seems to be openness on the task force to the 44-48 credit range. This is subject to Senate's support and direction.

Belcastro commented that both Yates and Gay mentioned the liberal arts. Belcastro wondered where the arts fit in and what the Center of the Arts' take on this is.

Gay said that the division will have a meeting with the task force this Friday. He then stated that the arts could easily fit into a number of capacities, including Communication, IA, and CI. The original proposal for the model, which had CI as an upper division course, was a challenge for OCA because the classes that could best meet that were either lower division or would have a lower division requirement.

Belcastro said that there is potential to have more inclusive language. She highlighted that the devil is in the details, so when rubrics, etc., are created, we will likely see where people fit in.

Ruggerio agreed that it is important to craft capacities where people across campus will be able to see themselves develop courses to fit each capacity from their lens. This includes the arts. The consistent feedback they've received from the arts is that the gen ed should be smaller so that students could focus on their major.

Anderson asked if the task force could speak to the role of disciplinary perspectives. The idea expressed in the AC meeting is that any program could offer a class to meet any capacity, but the disciplines do have differences. There are differences between looking at something from a scientific standpoint and looking at it from a humanistic perspective. But the idea of the liberal arts is that you are actually exposed to all of these approaches. Anderson said that it wasn't clear how the disciplinary perspectives fit into this.

Gay replied that the task force did not want capacities that were discipline specific, meaning that they didn't want to create a gen ed where one capacity could only be taught by one discipline. The idea was to choose capacities that could probably be taught by many disciplines. At one point, there was a Critical Thinking capacity and an Information Literacy capacity, but they merged, and that developed into IA. At one point they were going to leave IA at that. However, the task force realized that there was value in having to encounter the different ways of knowing and encountering the world and following a different disciplinary tradition in that process. IA is the one capacity where the task force wanted to have students dabble in the three different disciplines to meet that capacity. They wanted to leave the others open. CI, for example, is a great fit for the arts, but STEM could also contribute. Some are skill based and not tied to a particular discipline.

Siem asked, in the spirit of allowing all disciplines to meet any capacity, if the subcommittees would have representation from each division.

Gay replied that there may not be enough faculty and that he envisioned small subcommittees of perhaps 3 faculty and a student. He clarified that his aim is not that every single division would be represented. He gave an example from the Communication capacity – Ruggerio, Ayers, and Whitman went to each program and asked what should be included in the Communication capacity.

Ruggerio added that she met with English, Creative Writing, EMDA, USEM, and the Communication academic program.

Gay indicated that that was just the start of this process and that he sees the subcommittees doing similar outreach. Hence, the subcommittees would have a few disciplinary eyes and engage faculty across campus to solicit feedback.

Siem asked whether the capacities would be developed simultaneously or in a staggered way that might be able to include more people.

Gay responded that he thinks the effort would need to be simultaneous because it would take too long to have a staggered approach. He emphasized that that many people could still be involved and that the level of service done by faculty on campus would preclude the possibility of involving every division in each subcommittee.

French shared two pieces of feedback from OCA. First, they have noted that the fine arts do not have a clean fit here and it seems like a substantial change from a liberal arts institution to one where things are being squeezed in. Second, the timeline, with a vote coming so quickly after giving feedback to the task force, people seem to have the sense that this is moving forward, regardless of the input. The question is why say we are going to have a change until we know more clearly where the train is going.

Gay said that the task force is asking which track to be on. If Senate says that the arts are missing, so this isn't the right track, then the task force will make changes and return with an updated set of capacities. Gay stated that he is very creative, lives in the arts, and is not concerned that they will be able to find a way to make OCA feel comfortable with the language. He said that he believes some of the concern has to do with early language that felt scientific and the current phrasing of CI. In the language around Communication, the language now explicitly mentions artistic expression in the definition. Gay reiterated that the task force will meet with OCA and that if we need more than two weeks, we'll take more than two weeks.

Fedorek expressed concern from his constituents with answering the question of how this is different from the current model. He rephrased the question: How isn't the current model we are using addressing capacities? He then fit aspects of the general model into the capacities and stated that the one seems like a repackaging of the other.

Ruggerio responded that it became clear when talking to the students that they wanted to know the answer to: Why are you making me take these things? She stated that the current gen ed feels like filling buckets, in part by what it is named and in part by the way its components are clicked in DegreeWorks boxes. When we switched from strands to capacities, we hoped to highlight the skills so that students could better see the meaning — they could carry these into their lives, relationships, and professions. She stated that Fedorek is right in that if we continue to advise in the same way, the new gen ed won't feel much different except that it is lighter in credit load and gives them more flexibility in choosing their own certificates and microcredentials. The difference for Ruggerio is in helping students articulate their "why" in this. The reason for not using language such as arts and social sciences and sciences is because that's not a "why" for them.

Fedorek wondered what this might be like in 15 years when they become capacity buckets. He agreed that these are basically the same things but repackaged in a more meaningful way. He then asked, as a follow-up question, if there will be both upper and lower division for each of the capacities. That is, if we identify the capacities as important, they should be with the students all four years.

Gay replied that Fedorek's insight is valuable and will require a bigger conversation.

Final Remarks:

Yates asked the senators to continue this conversation, especially if they have concerns that might help the task force massage their capacity proposal.

He asked that senators bring feedback to the members of the task force before the next Senate meeting by email, phone, etc. The task force will need to know if they are going in the right direction and, if not, they will need specific indications on what, where, how to change. Keep the discussion on the number of credits, whether it is upper or lower division, which program things live in at minimum for now.

One thing that was not clear in the document but is clear from the discussion is that the IA capacity would still be divided into 3 directions.

We do need to keep this moving so that we can begin talking about structure, templates, etc., next quarter and can begin planning the rest of the work.

7. Announcements/New Business

None shared.

Yates thanked Tiffany Morey for covering Yates in the Policy Council this week. Because no one else expressed interest, Yates said he will continue as the Faculty Senate representative to the council..

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 pm.