

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

December 7, 2023

4:00-5:30pm

Approved

Attending: Kelly Goonan, Abigail Larson, Scott Knowles, Daniel Eves, Gary Wallace, Christian Bohnenstengel, Cody Bremner, Chris Graves, Scott Hansen, David Hatch, Steven Hawkins, Maren Hirschi, Jon Karpel, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Andrew Misseldine, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Grant Shimer, Ryan Siemers, Kyle Thompson, Joel Vallett, Qian Zhang

Not Attending: John Benedict

Proxies: Celesta Lyman for Mitch Greer, Elijah Neilson for Josh Price

Guests: Mindy Benson, Jon Anderson, James Sage, John Lisonbee, Jake Johnson, Camille Thomas, Matt McKenzie, Alexis Mccliff, Grant Courser

1. Call to order (4:04)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests
 - a. Grant Corser, Associate Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences
 - b. John Lisonbee, Staff Association President
 - c. Alexis Mccliff, SUUSA VP of Academics
 - d. Camille Thomas, Asst. Provost of Faculty Engagement
 - e. Jake Johnson, Asst. Provost of Leadership Development and Compliance
 - f. James Sage, Associate Provost
 - g. Jon Anderson, Provost
 - h. Mindy Benson, President
3. Proxy Representation:
 - a. Celesta Lyman, AGNS
 - b. Elijah Neilson, ECON
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:05)
 - a. [October 19, 2023 minutes](#) - Approved
 - b. [November 16, 2023 minutes](#) - Approved
5. Events and Announcements (4:07)
 - a. Employee Giving campaign update – 61 faculty donations (269 total), \$2,342 donated
 - b. Postcards & Pie – December 13, 3:00-5:00pm Whiting Room
 - c. [Pancake Study Break](#) – Monday December 11, 8:00-10:00pm, Ballroom. [Sign up](#) to help or stop by to say hello to students.

- d. National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), and Society for Experiential Education (SEE) [Faculty Survey on Careers in the Curriculum](#) – please encourage your department colleagues to complete the survey. It is open until December 31, 2023. Respondents have the option to be entered to win a \$100 Amazon gift card.
 - e. [Affordable Learning Materials Usage Survey](#) – Please encourage your department colleagues to complete the survey.
 - f. Learning and Development Sessions – January 4, 10:00am – 3:00pm, Alumni Center 2nd floor. Watch for program from CTI.
 - g. T4L Conference – February 28 – March 1, 2024 at BYU-Idaho. Registration in January.
 - h. [SUU Summit on Belonging](#) - February 21. [Submit a proposal](#) by January 12.
 - i. Save the Date – Faculty Open House Tuesday, January 9, 2024 4:00-5:00pm, Charles Hunter Room. Refreshments will be served. Invite your colleagues to drop in, socialize, and meet the Senators.
 - j. Save the Date – Grace A. Tanner Distinguished Faculty Lecture Thursday January 25, 2024 11:30am. Dr. Douglas Ipson
 - k. Spring meeting dates:
 - i. Jan. 18, 2024
 - ii. Feb. 1, 2024
 - iii. Feb. 15, 2024
 - iv. March 7, 2024
 - v. March 21, 2024
 - vi. April 4, 2024
 - vii. April 18, 2024 *in person (location TBA)*
6. Information Items: (4:13)
- a. Emergency Management (Kelly)
 - b. [Updates to Policy 6.2 – Academic Officers](#) (Grant Corser)

Proposal is to add in the academic officers policy a few lines under Section 4.E1 where there is a description under the Associate Dean – to add lines: and may assume a Dean’s responsibilities and functions including approving and signing requisitions and forms by delegation when warranted by the circumstances. This just adds to what Associate Deans are able to do under the authorization of the Academic Deans. This was borne out of a request that the Associate Deans look for ways that they could reduce the number of operations that a Dean may be involved in, so that that Dean can spend more time on strategy and more time working directly with faculty and with students. Some of this may be happening already, but this would specifically put it into policy and allow for academic Deans to delegate things in their absence. For example, if they're traveling for fundraising purposes, or taking well deserved time off, they would be able to delegate tasks out to the Associate Deans and be backed up by policy in so doing.

This has concurrently gone through the Dean's Council, and they have discussed it and voted on it.

Daniel Eves: So it sounds like we're just setting this up to be a backup in case something needs to be addressed by the associate team.

Grant Corser: That's correct. If there's hiring that needs to go through and documents that need to be signed, all that could be delegated. If there's a form that needs to be signed. For example, for a student wanting to add more credits that could be signed by the Associate Dean, if delegated from the Dean.

John Meisner: For colleges without an Associate Dean, does that then transfer to the Department Chair? Or does that mean that's not an option for those departments or colleges.

Grant: Oh, that's a great question. So my understanding is with the exception of the library, that all academic colleges or schools will have an Associate Dean by the end of this year. Most already do.

Elise: We have had moments where we have had to hire and get things in motion but our dean is out of the country so this will be really helpful.

Kelly Goonan: We will list that as an action item for our January meeting. So feel free to take this back to your departments, and discuss if you have any additional questions or feedback. You're welcome to share that with Grant or myself, and I can pass it on but we will add that as an action item at the next meeting and vote to approve that policy revision.

- c. Update on <120 credit Bachelor's degree (Jon Anderson)
It was discussed for 10-15 minutes at the Board of Higher Ed meeting last week. Julie Hartley presented and Scott Wyatt answered questions. Both were coming from very different perspectives. Julie was clear in saying that she had talked to the president of Northwest and they are not open to any other test pilots right now other than the two (BYU-I and Ensign College) that are set to begin this spring 2024 and run for 3 years. The BofHE did not take any action. They won't meet again until March. We have a few proposals in the queue and wait until we hear back.
7. Action Items:
 - a. None
 8. Discussion Items: (4:26)
 - a. [SUUSA Midterm Evaluation Survey Promotion resolution](#)

Kelly: The Faculty Senate, Provost's Office, and Dean's Council received a resolution from the Student Association titled Midterm Survey Evaluation Promotion. Hopefully, all of you were able to read that resolution in the link on the agenda. "The current practice of conducting student surveys at the end of each academic semester presents limitations in providing timely and constructive feedback to instructors and implementing mid term surveys would offer an opportunity to gather actionable insights into the teaching methods of professors or instructors earlier in the semester, enabling timely adjustments for a better learning environment." So that's the context and what the Student Association has asked for is they are strongly urging university administration to utilize midterm course or professor feedback surveys for all courses: "The administration and relevant university departments are encouraged to develop and communicate the procedures for midterm surveys to ensure widespread implementation and participation and that the midterm surveys would not impact professor's tenure or promotion but rather serve as a tool for continuous improvement and self-reflection." This was passed unanimously by the Student Government and we had a good discussion at the Executive Committee meeting last week but felt that since this resolution was addressed to the Faculty Senate as a whole, we wanted to take this to the full group and have a discussion. Alexis, is there anything that you would like to add on to that resolution?

Alexis: You pretty much covered it, Kelly. I just want to say that this is something we've been hearing from students. The end of course survey has no impact on the class that you've just taken and students would really like to have some input on things that maybe could be done better, or things that are working during a class. So that's kind of the idea behind this, so that students have a chance to actually make a change in the class that they're currently attending.

Daniel: In thinking about my own process, I don't have a lot of leeway in changing my delivery method in the middle of the semester. I plan everything out beforehand. I don't know if I could make those changes before the end of the semester.

Mike: This will impact the end of semester evaluations – there are things we can change and cannot change. It's hard to be clear with students what we can and can't change, and things we don't change that shouldn't change might still affect the evaluations at the end of the semester. So this has implications beyond just trying to make a better experience for students.

Alexis: One idea that has come up is to add a question on the end of semester feedback question that says something like, did this professor seek out and implement student feedback throughout the semester? So whatever that looks like, just did they? Did professors do that? I think that will benefit professors if

they do seek out and implement student feedback throughout the semester. I think that will positively impact the end of semester course feedback surveys.

Michelle: I understand where students are coming from but at the same time I don't think students understand what this means for professors. This brings trauma especially in receiving negative evaluations. All the faculty in our department oppose this. One highlight is how do we overcome the fundamental gender/racial bias of these surveys? I don't feel like this will aid the effort to build relationships in the classroom.

Scott Knowles: A current article on the issues of sexism, racism, and bias in student evaluations that might be of interest to folks:

<https://www.chronicle.com/newsletter/the-review/2023-12-04>

Grant: I think that feedback is a good idea but if there is a mandatory midterm feedback form that every instructor can tailor to their classes as to what is/isn't working then it becomes an educational tool and we can get an understanding on why some things may not be working. If all the questions are the same I'd worry about retribution from students. This could be a safety issue. Faculty should design their own feedback forms.

Scott Knowles: Yes, there's a reason we get feedback after final grades are due. And then have more time to work on implementing changes due to feedback.

Matt Mckenzie: Optional Midterm Feedback could be done on an individual basis using Google Forms, anonymous Canvas Quizzes (graded, ungraded, and bonus point setups), etc. For those that wanted to do a midterm eval

Andrew: I'll probably just echo a lot of what has already been shared here. The idea of the student feedback forms taking place at the end of the semester after final grades are posted, is mostly as a protection to students. I would hope that the vast majority of us faculty have no interest in retaliating, and students and the vast majority of us are open to feedback, and are probably listening to students informally throughout the semester, trying to read the room and read the class. We do have to help those students who might be in an unfortunate situation where a professor could be retaliatory. That's a legitimate concern if a mid-term feedback form becomes a formalized thing, what type of safety would there be for students? We definitely should be listening to students in the middle of the semester but I do have concerns, like Daniel, about those situations that aren't actionable mid-semester because there are just certain things that I might not be able to change. If students have a formal way to make their complaints but then the Professor doesn't change anything, because perhaps it's beyond their power to do so in the middle of the semester, what happens to the classroom dynamic? Students will feel that they're unheard again. And so, I have

some concerns about some of those things, and then also, as Michelle was talking about, if there is a severely negative critique mid-semester, this potentially could have the consequence of making the class worse. It could create a hostile environment potentially between students and faculty, or the whole class itself. This is not to say that the students' concerns about being heard mid-semester should be forgotten. I definitely hear what the Student Senate is saying, students do have a right to make their voice present, but if not handled appropriately, it could actually exacerbate problems instead of fixing them.

Chris: Thoughts from some of the Library faculty is that if students are not happy at the end of the semester that certain changes didn't get made, will that make their end of semester evaluations worse? I think that would definitely be a possibility. Another faculty member said that students are under the impression that changes can be made based on feedback, and some of the changes might not be able to be made, or it might be something that the faculty member knows wouldn't work or the feedback may not be actionable. The underlying concern is that this would open up a divide actually between faculty and students. If students enter a class under the impression that they can suggest something and that it will happen, and then it doesn't happen, I don't think that can go anywhere positive. So I agree that midterm feedback would potentially cause a lot of problems between students and faculty.

Maren: I don't want to take additional time during the meeting and would like it known I agree with everything that has been said thus far.

Matt: It could also reduce the number of final evaluations you get at the end of the semester. Over the past year, SUU has a return rate of approximately 45 - 50% depending on the semester

Gary: I talk to my students in the beginning and tell them there are many different ways to learn, and I'm here to help them do that. But what I can't do is customize it to each individual student. The law of averages are, if I have a third of my class saying too much homework, a third that says it's perfect, and a third that says it's not enough. Which way do you go? You know I had my first negative review last semester out of 23 years, and the only negative was I didn't like his facial hair. So again, it's attacking people personally. The first thing I say in my classes is that I'm always approachable, come talk to me, but there are some things I can change, some things I can't. If we get to the mid-semester and every student writes it to what they want, how can we adhere to every last thing that every student wants? I'm not saying, do away with evaluations. We have the end of the year so there's no retaliation.

Chris: This could be an issue with academic freedom. If students are in a class and they don't like what the teacher is teaching, and then use this as a way to try

to change or alter things, that might run up against the academic freedom of the instructors.

John Miesner: I agree with all that has been said. If the feedback is composed of fixed items without open form (worrying about personal attacks) maybe 0 to 3 questions that focus on a couple key components. As Matt Mackenzie noted, if the questions could be tailored for the instructor/class, this could potentially be actionable and reduce some of that hostility

Kelly: A lot of the same points we raised in the Executive Committee. One of the main reasons the end of year evaluations are held back until after grades are submitted is to limit likelihood of retaliation. Matt also brought up that we don't have a great response rate on the end of year survey and this mid-semester one could make those numbers go down further. CTI receives several complaints from students about being asked to complete the forms so a universal form was not viewed favorably.

A lot of departments do recognize that soliciting feedback from students during the course of the semester is a good practice. A lot of departmental promotion and tenure criteria actually recognize that and "reward" faculty who do that so part of the conversation shifted to this as an opportunity to work with folks like CTI and others to develop some templates or some tools that faculty could use. Also, some training on what kinds of questions are good to ask during the semester and how they collect feedback anonymously so that it can't get linked back to an individual student. That is the summary of our smaller group discussion on this topic from last week. Any final comments?

Matt: We can make surveys anonymous – we can provide training on this. We've got the January 4th training event and we can do a session on this there and record it so that those that can attend can see that later.

Kelly: Alexis. I think you can report back to SUSA that the Faculty Senate does not support a mandatory universal course feedback implementation. However, we do support developing tools and training to help faculty, better solicit feedback from students and implement that feedback during the course of the semester. Is that an appropriate summation of our discussion today? I see some heads nodding. Alexis, if you have any questions or concerns about that we're very happy to work directly with the student government, CTI, and others to look at what some of the specific concerns led to this resolution are and how we may be able to address those in some professional development and training and tools that we can provide to faculty to help them improve. So that they're giving the best experience to the students that they're able to.

Alexis: Awesome. Thank you. I took notes on everything that you said, so I'll pass that all along to the senators who have been overseeing this resolution. So thanks for all your input.

b. Benefits Committee and Insurance administrator RFP update (Cody Bremner)

We met last week to discuss this. I want to acknowledge that this is not a perfect system but we know it impacts individuals and real lives. Some of the positives and strengths about our current healthcare coverage – we have heard that many are not happy with the current UMR system. In the last 12 months there were 29,000 medical claims (not prescription) and only 242 were denied for medical necessity and 763 that were billed for non-coverable services. Overall it is a small percentage of claims that are not being covered. We do want to better understand why some of the 763 were not covered by our medical services. When we say we are self-insured it means that we tell UMR what we're not going to cover and they are just the controller of this. So we want to understand these 763 cases better so can hopefully we make some changes.

We are one of few universities that have access to multiple health systems in our network, University of Utah Healthcare and Intermountain Health is all considered in-network as well as some other surgical centers, etc. One of the headaches we have is the separation between Motiv RX and UMR. UMR provides our medical coverage and Motiv RX covers the prescription coverage. I recognize and acknowledge that this is a challenge at times but something to understand is it does benefit us by separating those out. Our premiums with our medical coverage have actually stayed relatively low. Prescriptions are at an inflation rate of about 20% whereas medical coverage is about 12%. So by separating those out, it allows us to control our medical premium a little bit. Acknowledging that's not a perfect system.

As many of you know, our original UMR contract and Motiv RX contract was a 3 year agreement. And that's ending this next year, July 1st. We have two options:

Option 1 is that we submit an RFP, which is a request for proposals and we won't get response until after the holiday and likely won't get any information back until Jan/Feb, which would leave practically no time for feedback from the campus community on all the choices, and make a decision by April 1st. If we rush we wouldn't be learning anything from our previous experiences about UMR decision making

Option 2 is to renew with UMR for a year, which would allow us to use the remainder of the academic year to become more educated and better understand the needs of the campus community. We have a campus booklet that

tells us what is covered and what is not. Nobody knows what the decisions are behind what is covered and what is not in this booklet. An extra year will also give us time to take a closer look at the claims that weren't processed to see if there might be things that we could add or alter to provide better coverage moving forward. We would also like to conduct a campus wide survey to get an understanding of what's important to everyone when it comes to their coverage. Are there people interested in paying say \$100 more in their premium so they can get better coverage? So to delay this for a year we would be able to collect data now and be ready to go to RFP in September of next year with all our priorities in place to really describe to the two potential vendors what we're looking for and what is important to our campus community so they can tailor their proposals to us. We should then have plenty of time to review the proposals and know what the options are and send them out for open comment. We will all be better educated when April 1st 2025 rolls around for us to make a better decision.

Elise: I've been at SUU since 1992 and I've never heard so many stories from people about coverage being refused for medical necessities. We need to evaluate the options and understand what is not going well.

Cody: April is when we have all the informational stuff ready but we will make the decision well before then. No one knows where the booklet came from and how the decisions were made. The committee will be meeting likely after the new year.

Kelly: If we have the time, it would be nice to be able to get some feedback from our departments. Right now, we only have one voice per department. What's the committee's timeline that they're working under?

Cody: Yeah, that's a great question. I'm not the chair of the committee. I don't set the meetings. We'll send out a doodle to find out when everybody's available. I don't anticipate that being before the holiday break. Again, UMR is not making the decisions about what we're going to cover and not cover. We decide that and tell them. This is why we're really trying to get educated because we can't cover everything. These are big decisions.

Chris: Anecdotally again, I know friends who had serious medical conditions that weren't covered and have paid a lot of money out of pocket. I'm wondering why it would be worse now than it was before?

Cody: I'm not the consultant. I'm certainly not an insurance expert. What our consultants are telling us is, we actually have more things that are covered now because we have University of Utah within the network, in addition to Intermountain, as well as the surgical centers. I understand these are real people,

real issues. I'm not discounting anyone. I'm just saying this, based on the data and information that they're giving us. This is one of the challenges of the committee. I didn't start on the committee till last year, the UMR decision happened over 3 years ago. There's not currently anybody from then still on the committee when the decision to go to UMR was made. Our consultants have said numerous times that what is covered has not changed, only who is basically managing all this. So we're wondering: Is it more of a HR issue? Meaning, are they less responsive when our faculty are calling or when there's emails. Is it more of an administrative issue where they're not getting back to us, or they're not working with us in the same way that maybe previous companies did. That's one of the things that we would like to look at as this is what's important to faculty and staff. What are the most important characteristics of a provider, because they charge us a fee to manage our benefits. Our consultants don't really feel like the cost is gonna be very different. For example, UMR was able to include University of Utah and Intermountain in our coverage. Whereas, EMI did not include that. But was EMI better at responding to our issues than UMR? Is customer service really important to us as we're considering these companies or not? As a committee, we don't know these answers yet because we haven't gotten data or information or answers other than hearing from people who are having problems, which is important too. But that's not everybody.

Ryan: Every year I have a physical over the summer where I get my blood work done. This past summer for the first time it was not covered and it was about \$200. I don't get why things changed. I don't think that was new with UMR, I think UMR covered it a couple of summers, and not one it just seems rather curious. I mean, I'm not opposed to giving the committee more time to study this. It seems like it really needs to take the time to look into this. Is it an option to switch to a different provider and then also take some extra time to do the work, to look at what we're covering?

Cody: Yeah. So my understanding is we could do that but we would be locked in for 3 years. The UMR contract was renewable up to two more years. So we're saying, let's do one more year and become more educated. My fear is this, we could go out to RFP, right? But what are we basing our decisions on if we haven't figured out what is important to us. Is it cost or is it coverage? We should know what everyone is looking for. As a reminder, we're only a recommending body so we ultimately don't make the decision. We simply send a recommendation to the Cabinet, and they can choose to follow it or not follow it.

Kelly: Can we have our senators get feedback from their departments about preferences in coverage, etc. and we will put all of it into a Google doc so Cody can get an idea what the faculty are recommending and vote on our behalf.

Maren: I am just wondering. how many people had similar issues with labs being denied, I wonder, is that something that the committee can look into is that something we should take to HR?

Cody: We do have a new Benefits Manager. Yes, this is what we are talking about. We need to get a better understanding about what has been happening. Is it because the doctor or the medical group does not put it in exactly right and then it gets denied. Are we required to follow up with the doctor and follow up with the insurance to get the appropriate paper/process right? I'm not saying that's always the case, but that is a common concern and issue. And that's still frustrating, because that's more time on our end to chase these decisions and processes down. The committee has talked about the possibility of making a recommendation for the necessity of more support on campus to help faculty/staff when they run into these kinds of issues.

Chris: I think it's important that we know where we should be directing the pressure. We should take the time to understand where the problem is – perhaps we're all assuming it's a UMR issue but what if it's not and then we don't solve anything.

Cody: I'll work on a doc similar to what I sent out last year with vision and dental where you can express which option you would prefer – (1) renew for 1 year while we really evaluate all this or (2) go out to RFP. The sooner we can decide and push this out the better – before April is our deadline.

Kelly: I think we're almost starting to talk about 2 different things. One is which option do we want to advise the Benefits Committee to take? (1) Go with the RFP as it's getting ready to expire or (2) renew our coverage for one year. A second issue is, how do we better support employees who are experiencing these issues and also collect data on just what is happening. As Cody mentioned, can we see some specific patterns that lead to the issues we're hearing about – is it services, errors in how the paperwork is getting processed or submitted and people aren't catching it? I think those are both important. Deadline is next Friday for feedback.

9. Standing Committee Updates: (5:17)
 - a. Faculty Review Board (Daniel Eves)
 - b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Daniel Eves)
 - c. Staff Association (John Lisonbee)
 - Super Star Stations – sign ups will be going out.

- d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)
Working on piloting new assessments for GE classes. We will be reaching out to every department on campus to get volunteers to participate in that pilot.
- e. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
- f. Student Association (Alexis McIff)
Thank you for the Scholarship Fund participation. We passed a bill to give \$7000 to the Hope Pantry. There are a lot of holiday events going on so just know it means a lot when faculty stops by and interacts. We are working on a resolution to reintroduce T-bird bikes to campus. This was an awesome semester and it's been a pleasure. Please let me know if you have any spring semester ideas.
Alexis McIff: suusa_academicsvp@suu.edu
- g. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
- h. Faculty Awards Committees:
 - i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)
 - ii. Inclusion & Diversity Awards Committee (Kelly Goonan)
 - iii. Outstanding and Distinguished Educator Award Committee (Bryan Koenig)
 - iv. Distinguished Scholar/Creative Award Committee (Christian Bohnenstengel)
 - v. Distinguished Faculty Service Award Committee (Andrew Misseldine)
- i. Treasurer's Report (Daniel Eves)
- j. Past President's Report (Abigail Larson) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee – we'll have some new policies coming down the pipeline for the Faculty Senate to take a look at in January.
- k. President Elect's Report (Scott Knowles) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC)
- l. President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council
Pres Leadership and Dean's Council met over the last couple of weeks. Jake Johnson has asked the Deans to work with their departments to gather all their policies, procedures, guidelines, handbooks, etc. to see if we can streamline and make the Provost's Office more aware of all the procedures folks on campus are using and look for some ways to streamline everything.

I was invited to attend a legal issues seminar before Thanksgiving that was hosted by HR in the office of Legal Affairs. It was fascinating, 95% of it did not apply to what I do because I do not supervise people, but I'm really encouraged that the folks in those positions are offering these training sessions to our deans, our department chairs, our area directors. They covered all manner of things from how to interact with employees and correct behavior concerns, to various policies, to all kinds of leadership insights. I just wanted to share with this group that we've got people in those offices really working to educate and support our

leadership on campus and I think that's awesome. I will be working on resurrecting the Faculty Senate Canvas shell so that we can share agendas with campus more effectively. We publicly post the minutes on our website but we currently don't have the agendas posted and since we are holding these as webinars, I think it would be nice for folks to kind of know ahead of time what we're discussing. So they're welcome to drop in if they see anything interesting. I did briefly want to address that the Board of Higher Education passed a resolution on exercising the principles of free speech on campus that, per my understanding, requires university administration to maintain a position of neutrality, which is one of the reasons why you received an email from me today with the statement saying that this is not an official university statement. This is a President of the Faculty Senate speaking on behalf of her constituents. I just wanted you all to be aware of that. So that people are not bombarding Mindy with, why didn't you say anything about UNLV or something else? They're in kind of an interesting position trying to navigate this new resolution that was just passed on December 1st. I will share the file for that resolution with everyone in the minutes (link to [Resolution Establishing Expectations for Implementing Principles of Free Expression](#)). So you can read that for yourselves. I do want to be very clear that this does not affect faculty's right to free speech or academic freedom on campus. I had a conversation with Maureen Redeker, our General Counsel, yesterday mostly because I asked Mindy, is it okay for me to send an email, and she said, I don't know yet. Maureen said that as a faculty member representing faculty constituents and not as an official university decision maker my speech largely fell outside of what was addressed in that resolution. So I'm sure that's something that I will be hearing more about and learning more about in the coming months.

10. Call for Executive Session

11. Adjourn (5:27)