



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
MAY 4, 2021 – 3:30–5:00 P.M.
WEBEX Meeting

Present: Al Shihabi, D.; Anderson, M.; Andreasen, C.; Armstrong, P.; Behnken, B.; Beitz, D.; Bennett-George, S.; Beresnev, I.; Berger, D.; Bolser, K.; Boyles, J.; Burrough, E.; Butler, A.; Campbell, C.; Cardoso, C.; Chen, H.; Cook, K.; Cowan, A.; Davis, R.; Day, T.; Dekkers, J.; Dewell, G.; Dubisar, A.; Faber, C.; Frank, M.; Freeman, S.; Gillette, M.; Gomes, C.; Hanson, V.; Hernandez, B.; Hornbuckle, B.; Janvrin, D.; Johnson, D.; Kang, S.; Kedrowski, K.; Kirill, K.; Kreider, B.; Kushkowsky, J.; Lonergan, E.; Lutz, R.; Martin, M.; McGrail, M.; Morgan, E.; Muecke, M.; Munkvold, G.; Nair, A.; Napolitano, R.; Oberhauser, A.; Parsa, R.; Perkins, J.; Peterson, D.; Pistolesi, S.; Quam, A.; Rayburn, C.; Reddy-Best, K.; Robertson, A.; Roe, K.; Royston, N.; Schaal, M.; Schieltz, J.; Schrier, T.; Shaw, A.; Smalley, S.; Smiley, A.; Stevens, J.; St. Germain, A.; Sturm, J.; Svec, C.; Swalwell, K.; Tener, J.; Tootle, D.; Townsend, T.; Vary, J.; Wade, N.; Wallace, R.; Wang, Q.; Wheeler, A.; Wilgenbusch, E.; Winer, E.; Winter, A.; Wood, A.; Wu, H.; Zerbib, S.

Absent: Bratlie, K.; Cochran, E.; Daniels, T.; Dollisso, A.; Gassmann, A.; Mackiewicz, J.; Padgett-Walsh, C.; Rosentrater, K.; Williams, C.

Substitutes: Wensheng, Z. for Chang, C.; Mao, H. for Rosa, J.; Dilla, W. for Watanabe, O.

Guests: Wickert, J. (SVPP); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Assoc. Prov.); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Assoc. Provost); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Knief, A. (SVPP); Jordan, T. (Asst. Prov.); Roepke, D. (University Relations); Lonergan, S. (An. Sci); Martin, P. (HDFS); Dalbertis, L.; Bobeck, E.

1. Call to Order

President Faber called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. and seated substitute senators through the Chat function.

2. Consent Agenda

FS Agenda May 4, 2021 – [20/A/10]

FS Minutes April 20, 2021 – [20/M/9]

FS Docket Calendar – [20/C/10]

Annual Council/Committee Reports [20-40]

Senator Perkins moved to accept the consent agenda. Senator Wallace seconded. The motion was adopted.

3. Special Order: Approval of Spring 2021 Graduation List [20-41]

Past President Sturm moved to approve the graduation list. Senator Freeman seconded. The motion was adopted.

4. Special Order: Memorial Resolutions [20-42]

A moment of silence was observed to honor our late colleagues.

5. Special Order: FH 3.1.1 Summer and Winter Session Efforts and 4.5.1 Holidays and Vacations [20-38]

Senator Freeman said that this item was assigned “special order” status in order to include the changes in the updates to the Faculty Handbook over the summer, so that the policy would be in place for next academic year. These changes are needed because we will have a winter session moving forward.

Senator Freeman said that these changes identify how payments for winter session teaching can occur: either as supplemental pay or a corresponding reduction in spring teaching assignments. If the faculty member receives supplemental pay, that does not count against the 11 months of state salary that faculty can earn.

Senator Day asked whether a winter session teaching assignment could become part of a faculty member’s normal teaching assignment. Could a faculty member be forced to teach during this session against their will? After all, winter session falls within the nine months of his contract. Senator Freeman said no. These changes further clarify that winter session teaching is not included in the nine months of teaching that faculty on nine-month appointments are required to teach. FH 3.1.1.2 makes clear that both the faculty member and the department chair need to agree on winter session teaching assignments.

Secretary Butler asked whether this policy prohibits substituting a fall semester teaching assignment, since it specifies only spring assignment substitution. What if the department chair agrees to it? Senator Freeman said that this policy currently provides the opportunity to substitute spring teaching assignments only. Once winter session courses have been offered for a while, we will have sufficient data to predict demand for those courses. At that point, we can revisit the policy.

Following on that question, Senator Montabon asked whether the substituted course could be a future fall course in the next academic year. Senator Freeman said that that course would occur in a different fiscal year and different academic year, for which there may be different responsibilities. The faculty member’s PRS may be renegotiated on an annual basis, which would affect teaching responsibilities. Senator Montabon pointed out that some faculty members may not have spring teaching assignments, so the only substitution option would be a future fall course.

The motion was adopted, 63-3.

6. Unfinished Business

6.1. US Diversity Requirement [20-35] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that the edition that was included with agenda materials reflected discussion from the last FS meeting. Many senators vocalized support for the version proposed by Academic Affairs Council (AAC). In the interim, AAC made some adjustments to incorporate suggestions from FS. AAC moved the proposal forward to EB, which made some more wordsmithing changes. The changes highlighted in yellow were made by AAC, and those highlighted in blue were made by EB.

Senator Gillette pointed out that sexuality is mentioned in the preamble but is not listed as one of the categories in the second learning outcome. She voiced support for “and/or” in the list of categories. Senator Bennett-George said that AAC acknowledged the difficulty to construct a list of every single way U.S. society is diverse. AAC made selections about what they thought were the key touchpoint areas that might contain other areas.

Senator Oberhauser moved to amend the learning outcome to include sexuality. Senator Gillette seconded.

The amendment was lost, 47-12.

Senator Behnken observed that FS has engaged in a lot of hard work with the U.S. Diversity requirement. He expressed excitement about its progress and the possibility of a vote. He praised a number of changes, especially the sentence about “rich education” in the preamble. However, he expressed concern about the sentence in the preamble beginning with “Diversity...” The sentence originally approved by AAC was: “Intersectional understandings of diversity consider other categories of identity (e.g. sexuality, culture, and religion) related to race and ethnicity.” The working group included this particular sentence to provide definition to diversity and to bring in other ideas of diversity and identity. That sentence pairs nicely with the sentence about social complexity. But this new sentence defines a specific theory. It provides a nice, textbook definition of intersectionality. But that’s the problem: intersectionality is just one theory, among others. And it doesn’t meaningfully build on the preceding sentence. Senator Behnken expressed concern that it might be taken as a mandated theory for all U.S. Diversity courses. Furthermore, intersectionality lives in certain departments (e.g., Gender Studies and other allied sciences in LAS and CHS), but other disciplines don’t engage in it. Senator Behnken thought that this might exclude departments from meaningfully participating in the diversity requirement.

Secretary Butler moved to replace the “Diversity...” sentence with the original sentence from AAC. Senator Muecke seconded.

Senator Oberhauser replied that the term “intersectionality” is quite widespread, and she disputed whether it is married to some disciplines. Intersectionality engages in ways of understanding how different forms of identity work together. The proposed replacement sentence misrepresents what “intersectional” or “intersectionality” mean. She said that that’s why it was important to provide the definition. She added concern that the AAC version links intersectionality to race and ethnicity, which is not always the case.

In the chat, Senator Kedrowski wrote, “Thank you, Ann. I echo your concerns. Intersectionality does not only exist at the intersection of race and ethnicity.”

In the chat, Senator Reddy-Best wrote, “I agree with you, Ann. Thank you.”

Senator Behnken said that in the original AAC sentence, “intersectional” appears as an adjective, describing a kind of understanding that is given to diversity. In the “Diversity…” sentence, “intersectionality” appears as a noun, defining a theory. Although subtle, the difference is important, Senator Behnken said

The amendment was adopted, 47-22.

Senator Smiley said spoke in favor of changing the number of required learning objectives from 4 to 3. This will provide more flexibility for how these learning outcomes are met in a variety of departments and programs. She moved to amend the motion to make that replacement: “Students will achieve at least three of four of the following learning outcomes.” Senator Freeman seconded.

In the chat, Senator Kedrowski asked, “Which SLO(s) are making people uneasy?”

Senator Behnken encouraged FS to oppose this amendment. It’s not how learning outcomes work, and not in line with pedagogical best practices to allow faculty to pick and choose which learning outcomes to engage in. These learning outcomes build on one another. How could a faculty member exclude one and still achieve the others? Senator Behnken added that he prefers a rigorous diversity requirement. The problem with the current diversity requirement is that it offers too much flexibility, by requiring just two of the learning outcomes. He thought it was a bad idea to build this new diversity requirement with the problems that the current one has. He proposed that we first implement the requirement with all four learning outcomes. If we discover that it is too inflexible, we can revisit the requirement in a couple of years.

In the chat, Senator Swalwell wrote, “My PhD is in Curriculum and Instruction. I agree with Brian that learning outcomes work when they hang together.”

In the chat, Senator Wood asked, “Is the intention to re-evaluate courses already approved as US Diversity classes with these learning objectives? I apologize if this has already been answered in previous meeting or correspondence.” In the chat, Senator Swalwell replied, “Yes - that is my understanding.” In the chat, Senator Bennett-George wrote, “Yes, that is the intention. There have not been conversations about the specifics of how that will be implemented by the new committee.” She added, “The discussion in the AAC was about a multi-year process that would give instructors of current U.S. Diversity courses the opportunity to update their courses to meet the new learning outcomes.” Senator Gillette wrote, “Thank you for that info Sarah - I think that's important for everyone to know.” Senator Oberhauser added, “I ditto questions about the process of re-evaluating current US Diversity courses. Women's and Gender Studies has 28 of the 170 courses that meet the requirement. Looking ahead to workload, timing, etc.”

Secretary Butler reported that in previous discussions it was pointed out that the learning outcomes build on each other in accordance with different levels of understanding in Bloom's taxonomy. What's more, students had suggested two of the learning outcomes. It would be a shame if faculty elected to omit outcomes that students themselves wanted.

Senator Freeman said that the amendment does not limit faculty to just three outcomes. Students will select courses based on the particular outcomes that they want. With this amendment, there will be greater variety in courses for them to choose from.

In the chat, Senator Kedrowski wrote, "I doubt that many students look at SLOs on individual syllabi when making course selections. On top of this, many majors are highly proscribed. Students may not have the choice to select the courses they prefer."

Senator Gillette proposed to flip Senator Behnken's principle around: we can begin with greater flexibility. If we find that there is too much flexibility, we can revisit the diversity requirement in a couple of years. Senator Gillette said that in her own class, all four learning outcomes would be met. But she didn't think they would be met in other courses. She expressed concern about whether requiring all four learning outcomes would disenfranchise faculty from minority groups, including BIPOC, women, and non-religious faculty. This stricter diversity requirement might lead students to choose not to enroll in their classes, whereas they would enroll if the requirement were more flexible.

Senator Swalwell said that she serves on AAC and is a professor in the School of Education in social and cultural studies. She said that her doctorate is in curricular studies. She spoke against the amendment. The reason we are revising the U.S. Diversity requirement is to create a shared sense of what students who graduate from ISU will understand. Learning outcomes come as a package. To Senator Freeman's point, learning outcomes are not about which classes students want to take; they are about what understanding and competencies graduates from ISU will have. There will be dozens of classes that meet these outcomes. When we institute this requirement, our promise is that graduates of ISU will learn this body of information, will have this content knowledge, and will have these skills. It doesn't make sense to tease the outcomes apart. The point of a diversity requirement is to provide a guarantee of what students will understand.

In the chat, Senator Parsa wrote, "Great point Katy."

In the chat, Senator Swalwell wrote, "Our sense is that it wouldn't take much for current classes to make adjustments to meet all 4 learning outcomes." She added, "Assuming they want to."

In the chat, (rising) Senator Hanson wrote, "I know I have not been sworn in yet in this meeting, but I will say here (for what it's worth) that our undergraduate students in CALS don't know what they don't know regarding their diversity education. I think we fail them by giving them too much flexibility here."

Senator Peterson said that he did not like the move to require only three outcomes. The concern with the current diversity requirement is that it is too broad. Only the second learning outcome mentions diversity categories. So if a course does not meet that outcome, but meets the others, it

wouldn't have to include those diversity categories. But then that opens a Pandora's box. The working group and AAC worked very hard to narrow the focus of diversity classes. To Senator Freeman's point, the current problem is that students have too much choice. Senator Peterson said that he had taught a U.S. Diversity course. A number of students said that they had selected his class because he is a white guy, and they didn't want a course that would challenge them to understand diversity. Senator Peterson said that if we as a faculty are committed to U.S. diversity being an important part of the curriculum, it is important that we do not water down the requirement, which is what the amendment would do.

Senator Frank pointed out that if the intent is to make the diversity categories inclusive, then the "or" is out of place before "religion." With just "and," all categories must be taught.

The amendment was lost, 22-51.

Senator Frank moved to amend the motion by removing "or" in front of "religion" in the second learning outcome. Senator Wallace seconded.

Senator Smiley spoke against the amendment, because it made the learning outcomes very prescriptive. ISU does not have many general education requirements that everyone takes. There needs to be some flexibility in how diversity is addressed. This speaks in favor of leaving "and/or."

Past President Sturm said that his understanding from prior discussions was that "and/or" leaves it to each faculty member to decide what the primary emphasis of the course will be. If the outcome had just "and," then every diversity course would need to address all of these issues. "Or" gives faculty a change to determine what the emphasis of the course will be.

Senator Muecke agreed with that understanding. "Or" gives flexibility to faculty to choose which areas they want to include.

Senator Gillette asked whether this was consistent with the previous argument against requiring only three learning outcomes. For learning outcomes, it is not a best practice to let faculty choose one, two, or three of the four, but it is okay to allow choice within the learning objective?

No one immediately responded to this challenge. Secretary Butler offered that the relevant difference is between focus of the course as opposed to its specific content that achieves that focus. She did not think that there was a contradiction.

In the chat, Senator Swalwell wrote, "Meghan—my sense is saying the objective is looking at a "bundle" of related content that allows an instructor to have a different foregrounded community/dimension of identity. I agree with what Annemarie said."

The amendment was lost, 14-52.

Senator Smiley said that she thought that there was something missing from the preamble. After stating that we want to familiarize students with history, she proposed adding something to the

effect that this requirement will “promote honor and respect for one another.” She said that as educators, that’s what we’re going for in this kind of requirement. She moved to amend the motion in this way. Senator Parsa seconded.

Secretary Butler pointed out that this point fits better with the first paragraph. It’s not the goal of just the U.S. Diversity requirement, but both the International Perspectives and U.S. Diversity requirements.

This led Senator Smiley to withdraw the motion and Senator Parsa to withdraw the second.

With respect to the general point, Past President Sturm thought “responsible civic engagement” covers honor and respect.

President Faber said that hopefully we honor and respect each other; that’s what we all do.

In the chat, Senator Campbell wrote, “I like adding respect.”

In the chat, Secretary Butler wrote, “To J Sturm: Our Principles of Community make a six- or seven-fold distinction among things that are an awfully lot alike... :)”

Senator Swalwell moved to call the question. Senator Behnken seconded. The motion (to vote) was adopted, 51-13.

The motion, as amended, was adopted, 57-11.

In the chat, Senator Swalwell wrote, “Sarah Bennett-George was a great AAC chair this year! Thanks for her work on the US Diversity requirement!”

6.2. Masters of Healthcare Analytics and Operations [20-36] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that CVM contacted COB about the work that they already do in this area, and offered assistance and collaboration. There have been no changes since the first reading.

The motion was adopted, 63-1.

6.3. FH 5.4.1.3 Review for Advancement [20-37] – Andreasen

Senator Andreasen thanked people who offered comments after the first reading. She summarized the changes, which were primarily consolidation and arrangement for clarity. There were other substantive changes. In FH 5.4.1.3.2, prior service is consideration for hiring, but not advancement, and is granted at the discretion of the hiring unit. This decision must be made at the time of hire or before the issuance of the first multi-year contract. In FH 5.4.1.3.4, “tenure-eligible” was added to include faculty who are associated professors but not yet tenured.

Past President Sturm asked about the change to FH 5.4.1.3.2. He questioned the clause about the faculty member’s “entire career.” Prior service is considered at the first promotion, but not subsequent ones. Is this new language purposefully vaguer, or is it an oversight? Senator

Andreasen said that it was not an oversight: at any hire or advancement, the entire academic career is considered. Senator Freeman added that even for tenured faculty the entire career is considered for promotion. Of course, the emphasis is the work since the last promotion. Senator Andreasen said “trajectory” is the word often used in promotion documents. Senator Peterson pointed out that Past President Sturm’s concern is addressed in a paragraph below.

Secretary Butler expressed concern about the sentence in FH 5.4.1.3.4 that adds “tenure-eligible.” She worried that it made associate professors eligible to vote on advancement cases for professor. Senator Andreasen thought that the word “rank” would cover such cases and make clear that it would not be allowed.

In the chat, Secretary Butler offered a number of combinations of words, which senators agreed did not fix the problem. ("Associate Professors (tenured or untenured), tenured, and term faculty at or above the rank being sought..."; "Term faculty and tenure-eligible and tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought..."; "Term faculty, tenure-eligible and tenured faculty at or above the rank being sought..." [The last version provoked jeers from advocates of the Oxford comma.]

In the chat, Senator Kedrowski offered, “How about "faculty at or above the rank being sought, including term, tenure eligible, and tenured individuals, may...” Senator Vary suggested, “How about inserting the word "all" before "at or above”” Senator Freeman suggested, “Can we take out all of the qualifiers and just say "faculty at or above the rank....””

Senator Campbell asked for clarification about who votes on advancement for a term faculty member at the rank of associate professor has an MA, not a terminal degree. Can an associate professor with a terminal degree and tenure vote on advancement of the term faculty member? Senator Andreasen pointed out that this section does not address issues about terminal degrees. That matter is handled in departments.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince said that terminal degrees are not addressed here, and policy varies from college to college. This sentence addresses the faculty member who is tenure-eligible, and hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure. This sentence says that that faculty member would be eligible to vote on advancement to the associate rank.

Senator Freeman said that if the concern is rank, then the sentence should simply say “faculty at or above the rank.” It doesn’t matter whether the faculty is term, tenured, or tenure-track.

Senator Andreasen said that that was exactly correct. This sentence concerns rank. This includes all faculty.

Senator Smiley said that she was confused. In her department, term faculty cannot vote on tenure-eligible faculty promotion. Does this sentence open that door? Senator Andreasen said no. Senator Freeman said that this sentence concerns only term faculty advancement.

Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince added to Senator Freeman’s earlier point. When FH says “all faculty,” some people interpret that to mean just tenure-track faculty. This sentence was expanded to provide clarity.

Senator Frank said that his department also wanted to make clear that term faculty are ineligible to vote on tenure-track faculty promotions. They did allow tenured associate professors to the pool of eligible voters for advancement to term professor. This document would prevent that.

Senator Andreasen pointed out that eligible voters must be at or above the rank being sought.

Senator Frank asked whether that meant that that tenured associate professors could not vote on term professor advancement cases.

Senator Perkins and Senator Campbell thought that tenured associate professors should be able to vote on term professor advancement cases. Senator Frank thought that any restriction would not go over well in his department.

Past President Sturm offered to replace the one sentence with two sentences: “Tenure-eligible and term faculty at or above the rank being sought by the term faculty member shall be eligible to serve on the committee. All tenured faculty shall also be eligible to serve on the committee.”

In the chat, Secretary Butler wrote that the sentence has the same ambiguity.

Senator Gillette asked why tenured associate professors are eligible to vote on advancement to teaching professor. Simply being tenured does not automatically make someone qualified; they may not do much teaching.

Senator Munkvold said that he disagreed with the sentence where someone gets to vote on advancement just because they have tenure.

Senator Perkins said that the principle expressed was nice, but not our policy.

Senator Frank said that departments should have freedom about how they put together their committees.

Senator Andreasen said that if department governance documents do not already specify that eligible voters must be at or above the rank being sought, it needs to be put in there.

Senator Vary spoke in favor of allowing departments flexibility to handle their own eligibility requirements. The sentence does not say that eligibility is restricted to those who are tenured or above rank. So it leaves flexibility at the department level to handle these cases. In general, if it is feasible, there should be faculty (tenured or term) at or above the rank being sought as voters, for the sake of parity. For promotions to tenured professor ranks, only tenured professors are eligible to vote. But, if there are not enough eligible voters, the case needs to be handled in the governance document. This wording leaves it open.

The amendment was adopted, 42-18.

The motion, as amended, was adopted, 38-11.

7. Special Order

7.1. Recognition of Retiring Senators

President Faber read the names of retiring senators. She added that Parliamentarian Rippke is retiring too.

7.2. Passing of the Gavel

President Faber thanked senators for their dedication and hard work to make this an incredible year. She called senators' attention to the COVID-19 Response FAQ (<https://web.iastate.edu/safety/updates/covid19/vaccinations>), and processes and procedures for wrapping up the semester from CELT (<https://www.celt.iastate.edu/canvas-isu/lms-policies-procedures/>).

President Faber “passed the gavel” to President Wheeler.

President Wheeler read a commendation for President Faber and displayed a picture of the award.

In the chat, many senators thanked President Faber for her service.

7.3. Seating of the New Senators

President Wheeler read the names of new senators and seated them. She also introduced Amanda Knief, the new FS Parliamentarian.

8. New Business

8.1. Poultry Production Management [20-39] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George introduced the motion.

Senator Smiley said that this proposal was just like those for other breeds which were passed in previous meetings. AAC had hoped that FS would pass it today.

Senator Wallace moved to suspend the rules to allow voting on the first reading. Senator Smiley seconded.

The motion to suspend the rules was adopted by hand vote.

The motion was adopted by hand vote.

9. Announcements

9.1. Faculty Senate President

President Wheeler said that it is an honor to serve as FS President. She said that this is an incredibly important time as we move back on campus. Very important decisions will need to be made. Paraphrasing VP Stewart, President Wheeler said that we aspire not just to return to

normal, but to come back better. President Wheeler said that issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion will be on her agenda as we move forward next year.

9.2. Faculty Senate President-Elect

President-Elect Perkins said that he looks forward to helping President Wheeler, and they have already worked together on some issues. One duty for president-elect is to plan and execute the Spring Faculty Conference. Over the summer, President-Elect Perkins will reach out to college caucus chairs to begin that process. Senators should send their ideas, suggestions, recommendations on themes, or topics to him or their caucus chair.

9.3. Senior Vice President and Provost

Provost Wickert thanked senators for their work this past year, which he described as “a crucible.” The university – faculty, staff, and students – were tested. Provost Wickert reflected on how uncertain we were last May. Would we be able to teach students in classrooms in the fall? Would we be able to run a residential campus and maintain the quality of the student learning experience? We had important conversations about face coverings, classrooms, and tenure clock extensions. We’re stronger for this journey and more aware of who we are. Never before has shared governance been tested as it was over this past year. Provost Wickert pronounced it a success, because of the work done together. Other universities had to shut down, but we made it through this year.

Commencement

This weekend, over 4000 graduates, including Masters and Ph.D. students, will participate in graduation ceremonies. That is about 500 more students than a normal year. There will be commencement events in October for students who graduated during Spring or Winter terms of 2020. They will be welcomed back to campus for a very special in-person ceremony to honor them.

In the chat, Senator Cook asked, “Can 2021 spring grads who are not able to attend graduation be able to participate in the October ceremony?”

Change of FS Leadership

Provost Wickert thanked Past President Faber for her work. He appreciated her grace, fairness, and principle in leading the senate and university through this year. She rose to the occasion and set a high bar. He could not imagine anyone doing a better job than she did.

Provost Wickert said that he looks forward to working with President Wheeler to maintain FS’s momentum as we welcome students and faculty back to in-person instruction. Provost Wickert said that we will communicate that usual attendance policies will be in place in the fall, both to faculty and students. This will reduce the occurrence of double-teaching that we saw this past year.

Provost Wickert thanked senators for their important work this year, as well as the commitment and value they brought this year.

He wished senators a safe and productive summer break.

9.4. P&S Council

None

9.5. Student Government

None

9.6. Graduate and Professional Student Senate

None

10. Good of the Order

None

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, August 30, 2021

Annemarie Butler

Faculty Senate Secretary

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 – 3:30 p.m.