

## FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA

November 21, 2024

4:00-5:30pm

*Approved*

**Attending:** Scott Knowles, Kelly Goonan, Chris Monson, John Karpel, Grant Shimer, Chris Graves, John Benedict, Christian Bohnenstengel, Jacob Dean, David Hatch, Derek Hein, Maren Hirschi, Bryan Koenig, Michael Kroff, Elise Leahy, Jon Lee, John Meisner, Elijah Neilson, R. Alexander Nichols, Michelle Orihel, Rachel Parker, Amanda Roundy, Ryan Siemers, Nate Slaughter, Jeanne Subjack, Lee Wood, Chris Younkin, Qian Zhang

**Not Attending:** Scott Hansen, Kevin Stein

### **Proxies:**

**Guests:** Shauna Mendini, Jake Johnson, Shalina Kesar, Matt Mckenzie, Curt Hill. Heather Callison, Dr. Gretchen Ellefson

1. Call to order (4:01)
2. Recognition of Presenters and Guests (4:02)
  - a. Assistant Provost Camille Thomas
  - b. Assistant Provost Jake Johnson
  - c. Graduate Council Chair, Dr. Shalini Kesar
  - a. WAFSEC Interim Chair, Dr. Gretchen Ellefson
  - b. Director, Counseling and Psychological Services, Dr. Curtis Hill
  - c. Director, Student Outreach and Support, Heather Callison
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: (4:03)
  - a. [November 7, 2024 Minutes](#)
  - b. David Hatch and Rachel Parker moved to approve minutes. Minutes were approved.
4. Events and Announcements: (4:05)
  - a. The Writing Across the Curriculum group is partnering with CTI to host a workshop series focused on how to improve writing in all disciplines. You can find

out more information on [CTI's Writing Across the Curriculum page](#). You do not need to commit to all of the sessions. It is designed to pick the sessions that interest you.

- b. Faculty can submit [Caught Red Handed awards](#) to other faculty, staff, and student employees. Staff Association will deliver these awards monthly (if not more frequently).
- c. Giving Wings to T-Bird Dreams Campaign: [Campaign Website](#), [T-Shirt Design Vote](#)
- d. Student Alumni Association Finals Survival Kits (cost \$20.00). Can be purchased for any student using this link [Finals Survival Kits](#).
- e. [Required Trainings for SUU Employees](#) Due on December 1st.

#### 5. Information Items: (4:06)

- a. Student Mental Health Report and Resources (Dr. Curt Hill and Heather Callison)

Heather: A lot of students are feeling the stress and weight of not only academics but personal aspects in their life. And we have been working a lot with students and getting them connected with CAPS, as well as the other additional resources that we have virtually, as well as our non-clinical case management here in Student Outreach and Support.

Scott asked that I reiterate what resources and how we can get students connected as we collaborate together.. I think the biggest thing is knowing that if you send a student to the Student Outreach and Support office or to the ACES, we're going to be able to get them to where they need to be. As far as the faculty and staff resources on the Student Outreach and Support website. There is the SOS Referral form, if a student or you are not in a safe space. There is also an early alert form which you have access to in every course roster, which comes from Dean Ogden, to support and make sure students are connected to mental health resources.

You can always call SUU police, refer students to the national suicide lifeline, as well as Timely Care and CAPS. So those are some of those resources and the ways that we can get connected. If you have questions, I'm always happy to answer them.

Curt: Faculty and staff are seeing concerning trends around mental health with students. Statistics are from the National Healthy Mind survey, this is given in the State of Utah every two years to all the universities. SUU has higher percentages than the national numbers. Last spring the survey showed that nationally 61% of college students sought counseling and locally only 24%. Students are seeking 36% nationally and 15% at SUU. We are busy.

Post pandemic nationally college students have less stigma around mental health issues. But they are less likely to reach out post pandemic. What we're seeing in the SUU Counseling Center

is students that are feeling overwhelmed and white knuckle it longer than is wise and they should have come in earlier.

The strides we've made in making access more possible. We have an SOS office. CAPS has added Timely Care which is valuable for a percentage of the population who prefer face to face. We've changed things in the counseling center so students can get in more quickly. We don't have a very long wait list – we have an immediate same day crisis response.

35% of students who walk through our door identify as members of the queer community. We have done 500 consults with faculty and staff around mental health issues. If you are hearing or seeing students that are struggling – there is a large minority that are really struggling and it is getting worse for them. We are seeing a lot of crises.

John: Has there been an increase since the closing of the Q center?

Curt: No but there has been a trend in the last two weeks. Many students express needing to leave the state to feel safe.

Elise: Not being in the mental health field, if you could define “consult” just so we know what you mean by there being 500 consults, and also what do you recommend that we do? What sort of steps could we take?

Curt: We define “consult” broadly, it's any time that we're working with an office, or faculty/staff on campus. Sometimes it's students, but mostly employees who are developing a program or have a concern about a student group or an individual student. They're psychological consults with people who are working directly with students.

The second part of the question – being aware of what the resources are and where you can refer a student in need. The other thing is just engaging with students, I think the most important thing to do is to lean into our relationships with students. Students come to brick and mortar institutions because of us. Educators, especially at a university like SUU, we're not common people – you shouldn't work at a place like SUU, if you don't have something about you that is a little bit unique and special. The ability to just engage and care about students, that's the most important thing we can do.

#### 6. Action Items: (4:32)

- a. [6.60 Graduate Studies: Personnel and Curriculum Revision](#) (Shalini Kesar and Jake Johnson)

Shalini: Nothing has changed from the last meeting.

Motion was made by Elise and seconded by Maren. The motion passed 24/25 (1 non-voter)

- b. Faculty Scholarship and the Non-traditional Student Office (Jon Karpel)

We updated the requirements – the office will administer the scholarships and bring the short list to Faculty Senate for approval.

David Hatch moved to adopt and Elise Leahy seconded the motion. Yes: 22 No: 1

c. [WAFSEC Budget Request](#) (Chris Monson and Gretchen Ellefson)

Gretchen: We are working in tandem with you and the Compensation Council. We have made an adjustment to the Compensation Council. We have taken out the distribution of the cost of living funds. Instead we are opting for a general model where we can adjust as necessary moving forward. One of the proposals is splitting the COLA between a flat rate amount and a percentage based increase. The general motivation behind this is to have a combination of percentage based increases because of inflation, and equity based interests where inflation affects those of us who are lowest paid more than those of us who are higher paid.

So the combination is the motivation we're trying to develop more specific metrics for deciding how much goes in each category. So one of the current ideas that the Compensation Council is leaning toward is to try to set a flat rate amount first on the basis of the average Utah salary and what the average Utah salary would need as an increase in order to adjust for the effects of inflation. The average Utah salary is roughly \$45,000 a year. In order to deal with inflation, e.g to be able to buy the same groceries, we would need \$1,500, and then the flat rate amount would be set in that way. Whatever is left over essentially is the percentage base increase.

Currently, you can see there's a link on the document to a table, where it's calculating out what kind of effect this would have on salaries at different salary levels and on the basis of variable amounts. So both flat rate and percentage based. You can see that the input right now is a \$1,500 flat rate and .75% increase. That .75% is if we do the 1,500 based on the numbers we are anticipating .75 is what we expect to have left.

The second change is, in addition to this split flat rate and percentage base, we are asking for the adjustment to bring all faculty up to their COUPA median so that number will be the same. We are now trying to include that in part of the COLA funds rather than asking to split the COLA funds. We are asking for the same amount as we were before, \$390,000.

This general approach was developed in concert with the Budgeting Office, and does have support. One of the reasons why we're trying to keep our hotspot fund requests mostly within the scope of the COLA funds that we expect to get from the legislature is, as you saw with Mindy's email earlier today, there's a lot of uncertainty about how much flexibility the university is going to have. The message that we're currently getting is that we do not anticipate being able to secure funding over and above whatever COLA we get from legislatures. Of course, we don't know for sure. The best way to get what we want, is to make sure that everyone is up to their median. The best way to do that is, to make sure that those funds are accounted for by COLA funds, if nothing else.

Mike: Certain disciplines depend upon a certain salary when they are looking for faculty to fill positions here at SUU. We need to stay competitive.

Gretchen: I think it's a real concern. The problem is that we don't have enough funds all around, so we need more funds in all of these different categories. We have to make decisions about where we're prioritizing the funds that we do expect to have. I will say, I do not think that we hope for this identical approach to happen year by year.

Mike: Is there a way to change the language to say we want to do this for next year? Does it need to be an ongoing policy? Or is there a way to frame it like you just said, where this is what we're trying, but we don't know if it's gonna stay.

Gretchen: This is a proposal for faculty and staff salary increases. WAFSEC is working on procedures.

John Meisner: I'm generally supportive of the direction this is going. I think it's a way to do the most good with very limited funds. And to Mike's point, we have a similar issue in our leadership program. Educational administrators make significantly more than we do as regular college of ed faculty. This has been a persistent problem for longer than I've been there. We just simply cannot recruit administrators because they make so much more.

Scott: Nothing about the COLA percentage increases, like the raises that we get from the legislature, increases the number that we hire faculty at like that is, in fact, a completely separate process. And in fact, the state legislature does not give us money if we have a position that is unfilled. So the money is only for currently engaged salaries and it does not actually change the number that we use to hire people. So, for example, in the arts, and I know in chemistry and a number of other areas, the hiring number currently is like \$58,000 for a faculty member in those areas. That is not going to go up any percentage or any flat rate amount for the next hiring cycle, because of whatever we decide here today. It happens in some other loosey, goosey way, I don't quite know. But we should probably ask that question, Gretchen, and find out, how does that get increased over time? Because I don't honestly know. Ryan, you have a question.

Ryan: One of the things that I think we find appealing on WAFSEC, is that as we make these requests, and putting into procedure the fact that we do make a request every year and are doing that early enough that it becomes part of the budget process. If we're making requests, and the requests are not fulfilled year after year, that's something we can start to track. And so we can build that into our justifications. Going forward, we can say the last two or three years, we requested X amount and we received Y amount. We have this difference. So we would like to wrap that into future requests. So it'll be nice to have a bit of a record where we can say, this is what we've requested and we have this shortfall and we're building that into our justifications, going forward.

Gretchen Ellefson: If we have a couple of years like this one where we anticipate that people making, you know I don't know more than \$90,000 a year, or something like that are really

falling significantly behind the cost of living, then we can track that as we go forward to see if there are adjustments we need to be making. Or vice versa. If the lower paid faculty are never getting adjustments that ensure equity, we can also track that.

Scott: There are two approaches we can take here. Recognizing that the proposal did change because of what the Compensation Council brought into the conversation. We can defer a vote on this until our December 5th Faculty Senate. Meanwhile, gather feedback from your constituencies. If you are comfortable, however, we could also entertain a motion to vote on it now.

Gretchen: This vote will be on the model as it stands. We don't have the specific numbers filled in but those specific numbers are going to be determined based on some kind of split in a more or less principled way.

Mike Kroff: I'm in favor of deferring because I'm not sure what the change was before the other document had the CUPA part in it. And this one doesn't. I do not understand why that was taken out.

Gretchen: That will be part of the proposal. We just haven't finished all of the language of the proposal, and I don't want to mess with the language as the Compensation Council is putting it together and then it'll just have to be changed again. I can include in the proposal that the line for the CUPA adjustment.

Maren Hirschi: I think I would like some clarity on what exactly the action is for this item. It seems like we've gotten a great update from Gretchen, and it seems like there's more work to be done. If I'm understanding correctly, perhaps we need to push it back a bit?

Gretchen: I'm open to that. One concern here is the difficulty of my role being between Faculty Senate and Compensation Council and I feel like I can't give any final thumbs up to the Compensation Council until I have some kind of mandate from you all, and I can't quite get a mandate from you all until we have a plan in the Compensation Council. I don't know how to solve this problem, but that's a bit of the issue here.

One reason why it might be useful to have some kind of vote sooner rather than later is if we have approval for this kind of approach, then I can take it back to the Compensation Council and say, Yes, we're on board. Let's fill in the numbers and get going. But I also take your point that in some ways it feels like if we want to vote on something really substantial, then we need to have a little bit more detail.

Maren: It seems like we're a dog chasing its tail. This is coming back at least every other meeting, and we're having the same discussion over and over. So what do we need to do to move this forward? I don't have any answers.

Nathan Slaughter: Is this time sensitive? For example, if I make a motion to move forward with the model. Would that help move this forward?

Gretchen: I think that would be helpful to move forward. It is time sensitive, how time sensitive is the question. That I don't have 100% clarity on. The proposal, as it is in draft, says February, blank 2025. So our goal is to have it submitted by early February.

John Meisner: I'm in agreement with Marin and Nathan, and for that reason I'll move to accept it as it currently stands so that we can move this process forward.

Elise Leahy: I second. Thank you.

Motion was made for the WAFSEC Budget Request 18 votes in favor; 3 votes for no; and 2 abstentions.

d. Dual Career Assistance Program (Kelly Goonan)

i. Example from Utah State University:

<https://www.usu.edu/provost/faculty-recruitment/dual-career-assistance>

ii. Policy: <https://www.usu.edu/policies/385/>

I've heard in several conversations that one of the challenges for faculty working at SUU is if they have a spouse or a partner, it is difficult for that person to find employment in Southern Utah, and I came across a policy at Utah State University that basically provides some assistance in what they're calling Dual Career Couples. And so the question is, would we like to request that SUU pursue some kind of a similar policy or arrangement to assist new faculty in particular in helping their spouse or partner find gainful employment at SUU.

Elise: I would just say, I have colleagues who would have appreciated having that kind of help because their spouses or partners are having difficulty finding good employment, and not just colleagues from my own department. Efforts have been made to try to see if there were places at the University, but really no one was interested in that kind of help. So personally, I think my department would be interested in this.

Ryan Siemers: I'll motion to approve.

Maren Hirschi: I'll second.

Scott: We have a proposal to move forward with this process to ask the University to create a program on dual career assistance.

Dual Career Assistance Program was motioned and approved 20/23; No 1/23; Abstain: 2/23

7. Discussion Items: (5:07)

a. [Policy 6.6 Academic Freedom Revision](#) (Kelly Goonan)

The Academic Affairs Committee has recommended the following revisions to policy 6.6. One big thing that I do want to point out is, we currently have a temporarily approved version of 6.6 which was posted on the website. The red line version that was provided compares the changes that we are proposing with the November 2000 version of the policy. We felt that this would be the most transparent. The one that did go into effect July 1st was a temporary authorization that had some pretty significant additions from the previous version of the policy, so we wanted to very clearly show what those changes were.

In the policy, you'll note that we added numerous references to other SUU policies, as well as the USHE resolution establishing expectations for implementing principles of free expression on campus. We added a definition of academic freedom and then we really made the policy a lot more robust and filled it out. The previous version of the policy was quite brief, and so the Academic Affairs Committee feels that the revisions being proposed add a lot more substance to what academic freedom means at SUU, and how that applies to faculty, staff, and students at the University.

Chris Younkin: I have a comment. One of my colleagues here in the library is on the ad hoc committee for non-faculty policies and he says that the policy dovetails with the number of other policies, but there are some incongruities between those that need to be addressed before we vote on it. So just checking policy 6.6 against any other connected policies to make sure they're all aligned.

Kelly: Did they provide what specific policies they feel 6.6 is not aligned with? Because that would be helpful if we knew.

Chris: No. I can ask

Kelly: I can say, having spent a very long time looking at 6.28, that it aligns very well with 6.28. I think, for example, in section G, evaluating students on academic bases. If your colleague feels that there are specific policies that are kind of not in alignment with 6.6. that would be helpful.

Jake Johnson: The only other one that I think might be in this space would be 5.1, and it was discussed the other day at PLC. That's the only other one I can think of.

Scott: Unless he's also thinking about 5.20. Those are the only two that I could think of that deal with what it is faculty can say or do with regards to academic freedom. Please reach out to that colleague and have him provide the information. Without knowing the specific concerns with incongruities, it's kind of hard to address.

Elise: What's the timeframe?

Kelly: If folks don't have significant concerns about the policy, and if Faculty Senate feels like they can all vote at our meeting in December that would be great. If there are a lot of concerns, the Academic Affairs Committee is not meeting again until January. This was our last major policy that we were working on for the fall semester. I canceled our remaining meetings to give



folks time to focus on wrapping up the semester and give them an hour plus back in their weeks. And so we would take this back up in January. If faculty feel that there are substantial concerns.

You'll see in some of the redlining we did try to go through and clarify some things. For example, changing an officer of the institution to employee, because we felt the officer was confusing. In Section B, we added where it says without interference, we added faculty, students and staff to that also, saying that it's not only people outside of the university or the university administration, but that also folks from within the institution should not interfere with the free investigation, research, publication, etc. We had a good discussion about engaging in discussions. We wanted to make sure that folks felt that, yes, they can engage in intellectual discussions with their colleagues. Even if it might be in an area that is not directly related to their expertise. So we spent a good bit of time going through and trying to clarify some things that we felt might be either unclear or need a little bit more clarity. I don't know that there is a significant rush on this, but if folks are unhappy with it, and we don't feel that it would be ready for a vote at our December meeting the goal would be to try to get it in front of the Senate in January.

Elise: It looks good to me. I think if we're not voting today we should be voting at the next meeting. Today's just the discussion where we introduce it.

Kelly: The vote would be at our December 5th meeting.

Scott Knowles (he/him)

We do have one scheduled currently? Are there any other questions or discussion? Basically, I suppose what we would ask is that folks take this back to their faculties, gather feedback and then and then bring it forth.

My question on that front would be, do you? Do you feel that we need one of those Google documents that we create? Or do you feel like we can gather that information reasonably well without the Google document.

Rachel Parker: I would say the document is good to just keep everything straight, and in one place.

Kelly: It's helpful to see what all the feedback is and to align it with the specific policy sections and also for transparency, so the Faculty Senate can see what feedback is being provided. It has been helpful for some of these bigger and or more consequential policies.

Scott: Let's go forward. I'll create a Google document for everybody and send out an email and then you can share that with your respective constituencies, and we'll get feedback into that document. And then, based on that feedback, we'll kind of know whether we're ready to vote on it on December 5th or if we need to wait until the New Year.

b. [SUU Volleyball and Institutional Neutrality](#) (Scott Knowles)

We discussed this item last week, and had some additional conversation about SUU volleyball and institutional neutrality. In conversations with a number of people, there seems to be three things that we want to ask, and they are, importantly, not really connected to SUU volleyball and that specific incident, although that incident certainly inspired the questions. Those questions are:

(1) What constitutes a political statement by someone working at SUU, whether faculty, staff or an organization or unit

(2) What should the University do when outside forces and incidents make something SUU has done political?

This is specifically referencing the fact that Governor Spencer Cox made the volleyball forfeiture political when he congratulated and supported the decision based on the idea that the forfeiture was made because there was a trans athlete on the opposing team. Should the University, for example, respond and counter a false claim like that?

(3) Can we get any kind of clarity on institutional neutrality, and how it operates for different members and groups on campus, and any differentiation when working in different areas of our jobs. For example, does institutional neutrality apply when engaged in service work at the university, but not when we are teaching or when we are researching.

Those are the three questions that came out. Is there any discussion on this? The idea here is that we would discuss this and see if we want to send a resolution, asking these questions to the President's Cabinet, in hopes that we get some clarity on them.

Rachel: Some people in my department mentioned are other auxiliaries of SUU proper under the same rules of political neutrality. For instance, this instance was the SUU athletics, does this apply to the Utah Shakespeare Festival, or to Utah Summer Games? Are they still under those same bounds of political neutrality if SUU athletics is not.

John Benedict: I'd also like to ask, when a student is wearing an SUU uniform, are they representing the university? And how does this affect those students and coaches and assistant coaches?

Rachel Parker: Another question was asked, if SUU athletics is given this sort of latitude, are other smaller groups on campus given that same latitude? For instance, if our department wanted to put on a show that does not have political neutrality, will it be given that same grace that athletics was.

Scott Knowles: I can answer that, which gets into that idea of academic freedom. How is academic freedom applied? So academic freedom is applied to creative practices, because that is equated with research at our institution. So presumably the theater department putting on a show or a particular dance being put on that has a really specific political message or bent

would fall under the auspices of academic freedom, and therefore would receive that latitude what's not clear is how that sort of idea applies to other units and groups on campus if it does, or if it doesn't, and I don't know but we can certainly try to find out any other comments or questions.

I will update and put these other questions into this document. Please share it with your constituent faculty members and see if you can figure out whether or not the faculty as a whole would like a resolution like this to go to the President's Cabinet and then we can have it as an action item on our December 5th meeting.

Ryan Siemers: I was trying to find food the other day, I was hungry, and it occurred to me that we're kind of a food desert. If you want a fresh fruit or a vegetable, and you don't want to leave campus, you basically have to go into the cafeteria, and it's kind of roulette there. So I've heard this brought up when I got hired 6 or 7 years ago, someone in dance at the time who, I think, isn't here anymore, said, Hey, when are we going to get some decent food? She asked Scott Wyatt at the time in the student center. It still seems to be an issue. Even the sandwich wraps that you used to be able to get from the Starbucks coffee shop, I don't know if they're doing that anymore.

Scott: I will follow up on that. Incidentally, I actually had a student do a whole report on the food desert in upper campus, which is incidentally more of a food desert than lower campus, according to the report. But I can follow up on that and see what we might be able to get movement on. Thank you, Ryan.

- c. Call for New Business / Faculty Input
8. Standing Committee Updates: (5:24)
- a. Faculty Review Board (Michael Kroff)
  - b. Parking Ticket Arbitration Committee (Victoria Zhang)
  - c. Staff Association Liaison (Amanda Roundy)
  - d. General Education Committee (Ryan Siemers)

The surveys should have gone out to everyone teaching general education courses. And so those are surveys for the instructors and also for the students. Just as a reminder, the accreditors would like to see that we are collecting longitudinal data on our GE program and that we're able to use it to improve the program. So that's what that is about. Please take those surveys, encourage your students to take them.

- e. Honors Council (Maren Hirschi): <https://www.suu.edu/honors/>

Yes, honors contracts are due this Friday, November 22. So if you have honors students in your courses who are completing honors contracts, they should be completed and approved by tomorrow.

Katie says we still have room in David Camacho Spring 2025 Honors 4010 seminar available. There is a symposium on December 4th at 6 pm. Where some of the honors capstone students will be presenting their capstone projects. All are welcome, and there is food.

- f. Graduate Council (Shalini Kesar)
- g. University Curriculum Committee (Rachel Parker)
- h. Student Association Liaison (Om Mehta)
- i. Benefits Committee (Cody Bremner)
- j. Faculty Awards Committees:
  - i. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer and Grace A. Tanner Committee (Christopher Graves)
  - ii. Employee Commitment for Access and Belonging (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 (Derek Hein)
- k. Treasurer's Report (Jon Karpel)
- l. Past President's Report (Kelly Goonan) - Academic Affairs Committee; University Faculty Leaves Committee
- m. President Elect's Report (Chris Monson) – UCFSL; Workload and Faculty Salary Equity Committee (WaFSEC); Ad Hoc committee on policy outside of 6.0

So I do have several things to report. First of all, the ad hoc non 6 Policy Committee commented on a bunch of the policies that were just ending their 21 day review, and so that ideally, we would like to get those comments to the Faculty Senate before they get sent to someone. But they were due on Monday, and our meeting wasn't till Thursday. So, the problem was, we only got the policies to review the same time everyone else did with the 21 day review. So we apologize for that. Hopefully. In the future we'll be able to get policies that we feel need work to send it to approve. The committee thought if we ask them to totally rewrite a policy, since

they're not 6, we're probably just going to get ignored. If we ask for very specific and doable changes, there's a greater chance that we're going to get something to happen. So we tried to make the majority of our policy requests specific and doable if that makes sense. The Utah Council of Faculty Senate leadership had a meeting which essentially everyone was nervous in the entire state about all of the changes happening.

- n. President's Report (Scott Knowles) - Policy/Procedure Arbitration Committee; President's Council; Dean's Council

Thanks to the Academic Affairs Committee for all the work that they've done this semester. It's been a lot of effort. So please, if you ever see Kelly on campus, buy her things, she really deserves it. I do want to remind you about the Giving Wings to T-bird Dreams last call, it closes tomorrow. The last time I checked we were nine away from me getting a tattoo. So if you really want me to get that tattoo, we need 9 more donations. Tell your friends and family we'll see if we can make it. We have received more donations, and more people participated in this campaign than has ever participated in the past, which is really great and a wonderful accomplishment.

You may recall that we are working on an Employee Privacy Committee and it's actually been very, very fruitful so far the subcommittees are meeting, and we're coming up with some really excellent ideas to improve our responses to campus privacy issues and safety issues which I think is wonderful.

I'm still looking for faculty stories. I've shared those links in the past. I do have a student specific link.

We kind of trialed this with the psychology department. They sent out this link to all of their students to fill out stories and we actually got some really lovely responses. So if your department wants to send this out to their constituency of students, that would be helpful to me. We are also working with the Student Association to try to distribute that through them as well, to continue to gather all the wonderful things that faculty are up to.

The final thing I have is, I'm sure everyone saw President Benson's email about the potential budget cuts that are sort of looming from the legislature and the various anxieties that I imagine that is causing everyone involved. The email specifically asks you to reach out to your Vice President and your Deans with any recommendations or ideas. But if you have other ideas that you'd like to send me, that's also great. Any kind of budget efficiency that you can see or envision. We're looking at all kinds of ideas, and President Benson would love it if Faculty Senate as well as vice presidents and deans gather that information and share it with her and the President's Cabinet so they can work on that issue.

9. Call for Executive Session (5:32)

10. Adjourn