



IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate

Executive Board Agenda

Tuesday, March 30, 2021 – WEBEX 3:00 p.m.

Present: Al Shihabi, D. (COD); Andreasen, C. (FDAR and CVM); Bennett-George, S. (Academic Affairs); Bratsch-Prince, D. (Associate Provost); Butler, A. (Secretary); Daniels, T. (COE); Day, T. (J&A); Dekkers, J. (CALs); Faber, C. (President); Freeman, S. (Governance); Oberhauser, A. (RPA); Perkins, J. (COB); Rippke, S. (Parliamentarian); Sturm, J. (Past President); VanDerZanden, A.M. (Associate Provost); Wallace, R. (LAS); Wheeler, A. (President-Elect); Wickert, J. (Senior Vice President and Provost)

Substitute: M. Gillette for C. Campbell (CHS)

Guests: K. Constant; A. Andreotti; C. Jahren

1. Call to Order

President Faber called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. when quorum was reached.

2. Consent Agenda

EB Agenda March 30 2021

EB Minutes March 2, 2021

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

3. Unfinished Business

3.1. Bachelor of Business Administration [20-18] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George explained that this is a limited-credit bachelors program for business professionals who need a degree for promotion at work. This would be a poor choice for undergraduates who arrive at ISU straight from high school.

Senator Oberhauser asked whether the courses offered are mostly online. Senator Bennett-George replied that they are totally online.

Senator Bennett-George added that there will be representatives from each of the programs at the FS meeting in case there are questions.

3.2. BS in Human Resource Management [20-19] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal furthers the specialized options available for majors in COB. The industry is looking for more focused, specialized degrees from students who enter college straight from high school.

No comments.

3.3. MAT in Mathematics Education [20-20] – Bennett-George

3.4. MAT in Secondary Education [20-21] – Bennett-George

3.5. BS in Secondary Major in Education [20-22] – Bennett-George

3.6. Minor in Cyber-Physical Systems [20-23] – Bennett-George

No comments.

3.7. Drop Limit Policy [20-24] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that the second bullet point was removed because CVM does not use or enforce the drop policy.

Senator Perkins moved to accept the amendment. Senator Bennett-George seconded. The motion was adopted.

Senator Bennett-George said that she would send the amended version to President Faber to be included with the agenda materials for FS meeting.

4. New Business

4.1. Governance Council: Response to Joint Action Plan on Teaching Assessment and Evaluation - Freeman

Senator Freeman said that the Governance Council subcommittee looked through FH for mentions of student evaluation of teaching. After examining those passages, the subcommittee unanimously agreed to recommend that FS make no changes to FH. The subcommittee did agree that there are things that need to be discussed further, but they are processes not contained in FH, and outside the charge of the subcommittee. This memo documents that the subcommittee completed its charge.

President-Elect Wheeler thought the memo was inadequate. She said that she would like a report from the subcommittee that provides more information about what the subcommittee did.

Senator Freeman asked for clarification about the concern. The committee reviewed FH and recommended that no changes be made. President-Elect Wheeler replied that the memo supplies the recommendation, but not the factual basis on which the recommendation was made. The subcommittee has until May 2021 to complete its charge. The expectation was that it would be more work for the subcommittee. Senator Freeman replied that had the subcommittee recommended changes, then those changes would be proposed to Governance Council and that would need to be reviewed and approved. In that case, the process would have taken longer. But in this case, the subcommittee decided that no changes were needed.

Past President Sturm said that he was curious about the matters that the subcommittee thought should be looked at, but fell outside the charge of the committee. Senator Freeman said that the subcommittee considered whether any of the processes involved in format, administration, and use of student ratings of teaching should be included in FH, and decided that they should not. These matters are raised in the SET Task Force report, and the subcommittee agreed that they were appropriate concerns, but fell outside the scope of the subcommittee's charge.

Senator Oberhauser added concern about how Class Climate forms could be modified or adjusted. She recommended that FS continue to discuss that matter. Senator Freeman agreed that it would be good to continue to discuss those matters, but they are not FH issues. Through this memo, Governance Council is not claiming that these other matters are unimportant. All they are saying is that no changes should be made to FH. This memo affects only item #1 on the Joint Action Plan. It has no bearing on future action items. This recommendation against modifying FH does not imply that other actions should not be taken elsewhere.

President-Elect Wheeler said that it would be nice to identify those other places where teaching evaluations are referred to. Senator Freeman said that he thought that they would be identified through the other action items.

Senator Al Shihabi noted that it is well-known that teaching evaluations have problems right now. What can be done right now to address these? Are colleges supposed to address these concerns and institute best practices? President Faber replied that the next action item is to conduct a survey to ask faculty about their perspectives and experiences. This action item is in President-Elect Wheeler's domain.

4.2. Beef Cattle Production Management Certificate [20-25] – Bennett-George

4.3. Equine Science and Management Certificate [20-26] – Bennett-George

4.4. Swine Production Management Certificate [20-27] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George presented these three proposals together. The main discussion at AAC was why certificates were proposed instead of minors. The Animal Science major is general, providing students with preparation to enter industry. A certificate would allow specialization to enter the industry in species-specific fields. The curricular reason to propose a certificate instead of a minor is because a number of classes in the proposal are already required as part of the Animal Science major, and the total number of credits would exceed the limit of nine credits that can be used both towards the major and the minor. The certificate proposal allows students to select specialized classes.

Senator Wallace said that these proposals have strong support on the CALS curriculum committee.

4.5. Preservation and Cultural Heritage Minor [20-28] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that this COD proposal has strong support from History. Essentially, this minor recognizes the role of historic preservation within design fields. This proposal was well-supported in AAC.

4.6. Discontinuation – Masters of School Mathematics Program [20-29] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that the enrollment in this program has been very small. There are no current students enrolled in it.

No comments.

4.7. Fashion Culture, History, and Social Justice Minor [20-30] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that minor offers a social justice-focused approach to fashion history. All students take one 100-level course for the U.S. Diversity requirement, and two classes in fashion or dress history. Other courses are to be selected from an extensive interdisciplinary list of courses. There are supporting letters from all of those departments.

No comments.

4.8. FH 10.7.2 Student Outcomes Assessment [20-31] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal moves forward with establishing university-wide learning outcomes, in accordance with the recommendation from HLC (the university accreditation body) at their last site visit. This proposal required completely rewriting the section of FH, and therefore it would not be helpful to include a marked up version of the current FH section. The current policy requires actions that aren't taken, refers to offices that no longer exist, and cannot provide the deliverables that HLC asks for. This proposal creates a system to collect data and report them out.

Senator Freeman suggested including this explanation in the preamble to the proposal.

Senator Oberhauser asked what impact this change would have on departments. Do faculty need to change their syllabi? Senator Bennett-George replied that this is a first step. The Outcomes Assessment Committee is developing actionable steps.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that this is a first step that we need to do for the upcoming HLC review. It also ties in with continuous improvement required by legislative mandate. Director Boyne is looking at how to streamline and minimize the amount of faculty reporting. FS will be included in these discussions.

Senator Wallace reiterated the important of having written documentation of this structure for HLC review. He added that it ensures that departments can achieve the same standard of reporting. The committee aimed not to increase the reporting burden on units.

4.9. Graduation with Distinction [20-32] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal adds language so that S/F courses can also be included in the minimum towards graduating with distinction.

4.10. Catalog: Repeated Courses Policy [20-33] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal was made with students who take science lab-heavy course loads. 15 credits of allowed repeats goes far for 3 credit class, but 4-5 credit lab courses can deplete the number of repeats quickly. By increasing the number of allowed repeats to 18 credits provides greater flexibility for these students early in their academic careers. Senator Bennett-George added that AAC questioned whether the repeat course policy would make more sense in terms of number of courses, rather than credits. Academic Standards Committee looked into the matter and determined that it couldn't be done. The other point that Senator Bennett-George stressed was that courses taken for a grade initially must be repeated for a grade, not P/NP. Were students allowed to repeat the course and earn P, the initial grade would disappear entirely. AAC's discussion of the merits of this policy devolved into abstract questions about the point of grades. The controversial proposal was passed 7-4-0.

No comments.

4.11. FS Bylaw Change: New Committee under AAC – US Diversity Course Requirement Committee [20-34] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George said that this proposal builds on the workgroup report on the U.S. Diversity requirement. FS Administrative Committee recommended that AAC make changes that FS could vote on rather than issuing another report. This proposal recommends the creation of a new university-wide FS committee under AAC. The charge of this committee would be to evaluate and approve courses for the U.S. Diversity tag. Currently such evaluation takes place in college curriculum committees. They are not provided a lot of guidance for evaluation. There have been anecdotes about blanket approval, because curriculum committee members feel unqualified to stand in judgment of whether the courses satisfy the U.S. Diversity requirement. The consequence is an "extensive and toothless" list of diversity classes. This new committee would be chaired by someone with demonstrated expertise in diversity as selected by AAC. Such expertise would ensure that courses with the U.S. Diversity tag would be appropriate.

The second, related proposal (20-35) provides a strict list of outcomes that must be met for the U.S. Diversity tag.

President-Elect Wheeler asked whether 20-34 and 20-35 need to be proposed at the same time. She thought that the learning objectives might generate a lot of conversation. The committee charge says that the committee will evaluate courses according to these learning objectives, but FS has yet to discuss the learning objectives.

President Faber asked whether it would be possible have the discussion of U.S. Diversity learning outcomes in connection with the committee creation.

Senator Wallace thought it would be prudent not to introduce the motions at the same time. Establish the learning objectives and change the Catalog first, and then create the committee to oversee that.

Senator Freeman recommended the opposite order. Currently, there is consternation and pushback from curriculum committees on approving diversity courses. Establishing this committee would be welcome whether or not the new learning objectives are approved. It would make sense to move the evaluation process out of curriculum committees to this new committee. They would be in place to take over this job in the fall, and can use the current criteria or new criteria, if approved.

Senator Bennett-George said that AAC had discussed these proposals as linked together, derived from the same workgroup recommendations. But they are independent proposals, so that the passage of one does not require the passage of the other.

President-Elect Wheeler thought that it would be concerning if the committee is approved, but the learning objectives are not. Then we'd be back to square one, where the committee reviews all of the diversity courses based on existing objectives.

Senator Oberhauser said that she thought the committee was important for moving forward on the broader project, to move beyond the broken current situation. She thought that the proposal involving learning objectives (20-35) still needs edits and careful review before it is put forward to FS. In particular, she thought the presentation of the analytical categories needed more careful consideration. She called particular attention to the rewritten paragraph on the focus of the diversity requirement.

Senator Wallace asked whether there is any reason that both motions need to be presented at the same time.

Senator Bennett-George said that they address two different problems. Voting for one but not the other would solve half of the problem. She would prefer for them to both be approved together, which would give the U.S. Diversity requirement a real chance for success and the change that students have been begging for.

Senator Freeman said that he did not have a problem with linking the two together, but he thought that the learning objectives would be more likely to be passed if senators had reason to think that college curriculum committees would not be asked to make the assessments about the new learning objectives, because many curriculum committee members do not feel qualified to make these assessments. He thought it was important to foreground the creation of the committee.

President Faber said that it sounded like the proposals are tied, but she wanted to postpone the discussion until the discussion about FS meeting agenda.

4.12. Catalog Change: US Diversity Requirement [20-35] – Bennett-George

Senator Bennett-George responded to Senator Oberhauser’s concern. She said that AAC went back and forth, and came to agree that the categories of race, ethnicity, and gender are separate from sex, culture, and religion. The first three are something that is a core construct of identity that you can’t take on or off, whereas sex, culture, and religion are more intersectional categories that move back and forth within the first categories.

Senator Oberhauser replied that everything is socially constructed. She added that gender identity and sexual orientation are different. She thought it would be good to have this undergo another round of revision. She offered to work on such a revision.

Senator Perkins asked whether it might make sense to assign this task to the newly-formed committee. It would be composed of people with relevant expertise, who would be in a position to state precisely what the outcomes should be.

Senator Bennett-George said that the committee’s first task would be to evaluate courses for the U.S. Diversity tag. If the current learning objectives are still in place when the committee is formed, they would use that standard. If these new learning objectives are not approved this semester, the Catalog will not be changed, and it will be another year before the Catalog can be changed and these new objectives implemented. She thought that expediency was the strongest reason for taking these two proposals together.

Senator Perkins thought that expediency was a secondary concern to getting the learning outcomes right. He reiterated that he thought that the committee would be best suited to make the best judgments.

President Faber pointed out that the current system is not working, and that the proposed changes would be an improvement.

President-Elect Wheeler said that the working group was a tiny group who came up with these objectives. But there are more experts on campus, who may be able to offer improvements. President-Elect Wheeler suggested asking them for their opinions before presenting the proposal to FS.

Senator Bennett-George pointed out that the learning objectives received support in the letter from the EDI Committee, which includes diversity experts.

Senator Dekkers asked for clarification about the second paragraph. In particular, he wanted to know what “diversity in education” means in the last sentence: “Diversity in education means exploring these social complexities in the classroom to familiarize students with the historical,

societal, and political contributions of diverse populations.” Senator Bennett-George replied that it lays out the framework when teaching concepts of diversity at the college level. Senator Dekkers understood that point, but thought that “diversity in education” does not make sense. Senator Bennett-George asked him to suggest a revision. Senator Dekkers said he didn’t have a suggestion, but wanted to register that it was confusing. He also asked whether “in the classroom” excludes class activities outside of a classroom. Senator Bennett-George said that any experience used to satisfy the U.S. Diversity requirement will be associated with a class number, which would be assigned a classroom. The point is that the experience must be in a structured educational setting. Senator Dekkers thought that “structured learning environment” should be used instead of “in the classroom.” Senator Bennett-George added that the learning objectives are the four bullet points, not the paragraph.

Past President Sturm said that the working committee and task force were comprised of campus experts, and supported by relevant groups of people working on EDI. He thought that if EB was concerned that this proposal would be mired by a long discussion and amendment process, then it needs to be revised before it is sent forward. But if the current proposal does not have fatal flaws, then it is appropriate to send forward so that FS can act on it. He worried that the proposal might languish, and when it returns in the fall, new senators might be unclear on the problem.

President Faber agreed. She said that the proposal could be brought forward for a first reading. If a number of issues come up, it can be held back and worked on before being put forward for a second reading.

Senator Freeman said that the learning outcomes came from the workgroup’s report last year. This proposal just implements those learning outcomes.

In the chat, Senator Oberhauser wrote, “Another observation ... gender is not included as one of the 'categories' in the learning outcomes, but race, ethnicity, religion are included.” In the chat, Senator Gillette wrote, “Yes Ann - I think that second paragraph needs to be reworked due to issues you've already talked about, and also because isn't totally congruent with the learning outcomes.” President Faber asked Senator Gillette to clarify. Senator Gillette said that the problem was in the second paragraph.

Secretary Butler pointed out that FS never voted to approve the learning objectives from the workgroup report. They voted to receive the report. She agreed with Past President Sturm’s comments about strategy.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that associate deans noted that the proposed learning outcomes are very different from the current U.S. Diversity learning outcomes. Under the new proposal, each course is required to meet all four outcomes, instead of four of six. That significantly affects what types of courses could be offered to meet the U.S. Diversity requirement. Associate deans wondered about the implications of those restrictions.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden also wondered about the impact of this proposal in the current state political climate. The Iowa legislature has a bill concerning “divisive concepts” in diversity and inclusion training. She encouraged EB members to think about how legislators would perceive these changes, where all 27,000 undergraduate students are required to take courses that meet all four of these learning outcomes.

Past President Sturm said that he had not considered the last point. He asked: Do you think at this point in time that if we propose a curriculum that intends very purposefully to expose students to a wider and more holistic understanding of issues of diversity (gender, sexuality, race, or ethnicity), that legislators may see that as an end run around on their legislation against “divisive concepts” and promoting free speech?

Associate Provost VanDerZanden was reluctant to speak for legislators. But she added that these new outcomes are different from the current outcomes. She said that Senator Oberhauser and Senator Gillette pointed out that gender is not brought into the bullet points as clearly. She suggested that the learning outcomes might require two or three of the four bullet points. Associate Provost VanDerZanden observed that FS has worked on this for ten years. Students want a more contemporary view of U.S. diversity and what that is. How can we do that without raising concern in legislators.

Senator Al Shihabi said that she had also considered the potential impact on legislators’ perceptions. She said that it’s important this not be presented as the personal positions of any teachers. “In the classroom” indicates that these are topics discussed within specialized courses, related to specific classes and specific teachers. She thought the most problematic of categories to be required in every course was religion, which is a lightning rod.

Past President Sturm asked Senator Gillette and others with concern about the second paragraph whether they would have time to revise the proposal before Thursday so that this proposal could be included in the agenda materials. Otherwise, he thought it would be wise to hold this proposal back. In the meantime, we can work to make this proposal seem less toxic to people outside campus, and emphasize that this proposal responds to student requests.

President Faber suggested that these revisions could be accomplished through email. Past President Faber thought it might go faster with an EB subcommittee. He suggested that President-Elect Wheeler chair the subcommittee, because she was on the working group. Senator Wallace seconded the motion.

President-Elect Wheeler asked whether AAC would be happy with this. Senator Bennett-George said that they would likely find this frustrating, but didn’t think that that should stop EB. Ultimately, AAC wants whatever stands the best chance of passing. She recommended inviting Senator Behnken to serve on the subcommittee, who was a strong voice for expertise in that area and would represent AAC.

Associate Provost VanDerZanden suggested reaching out to students to get input from them, to support the claim that this proposal responds to what students want. There were student representatives on the task force, but their attendance was spotty. Associate Provost VanDerZanden said that she did not hear from SG leadership how they felt about these learning outcomes. She thought student input would be incredibly important to support the claim that these changes better serve the needs of students. When the conversation moves forward, we can have that data point to support why we are doing this as an institution.

EB members discussed how long the subcommittee could work on revisions. Some members expressed concern that it might get pushed to the fall. President Faber thought that revisions could be made in time for the next EB meeting. EB members continued to disagree about whether the proposal for the creation of the committee (20-34) could be put on the agenda without the proposal concerning learning objectives (20-35). Senator Gillette thought that the revisions would not take a lot of time.

Senator Perkins moved to take 20-35 off FS agenda, but keep 20-34 on FS agenda. Senator Freeman seconded.

Past President Sturm recommended changing the preamble to clarify that there are two related proposals.

The motion was adopted, with one dissenting vote.

President Faber asked President-Elect Wheeler to chair a subcommittee of EB members, including Senator Gillette, Senator Oberhauser, Senator Bennett-George, and Past President Sturm.

5. Announcements

5.1. President

President Faber said that council chair elections will be held at FS meeting on April 20. Paper nominations are due to Sherri Angstrom by April 19, but nominations may be made on the floor of FS meeting.

There are two open spots for the Campus Leaders Luncheon on April 21.

Caucus chairs are asked to complete committee and council appointments by April 20.

5.2. President-Elect

No comments

5.3. Past President

Past President Sturm raised a concern about a memorandum from ISU President Wintersteen, Senior Vice President and Provost Wickert, and Senior Vice President Younger about next year (dated March 24, 2021). The memo states that online and hybrid classes will continue to be

available, “to meet students’ scheduling needs and preferred learning styles,” but in person classes will be the default. Past President Sturm said that uploading videos to Canvas and conducting class meetings via Zoom has created extra work for faculty. He worried that this university statement would not protect faculty from denying these services for students who say that that’s their “preferred learning style.” He worried that faculty may be asked or expected to teach multiple modalities even when we return to in person teaching.

Provost Wickert replied that that’s not the meaning of the sentence. Most of ISU classes will return to being conducted in person. Two to three years ago, there were some classes that were offered online and some majors that could be completed online. The largest consumer of online classes was undergraduate students who were physically on campus. The point of the paragraph is that not every class will be in person, but it will be the default. Classes that were online prior to the pandemic will continue to be offered online in the fall; there may be some new online classes too. And Provost Wickert speculated that there may be more hybrid classes. But the point of the memo was to say that in the fall we will be back to the pre-pandemic stand of in-person instruction.

Provost Wickert added that students and parents are asking for fully online courses in the fall. He said that his response has been “no.” Classes will be in person. Administrators are supporting the return to in person instruction, and reduce the double workload on faculty.

Past President Sturm said that he thought it would be helpful for Provost Wickert to say that if a faculty member elects to teach a class in person, students will not have the power to say that the faculty member is not meeting their preferred learning style by teaching in person. Provost Wickert said that students will complain, but faculty have the power and authority to say no.

5.4. Senior Vice President and Provost Budget

Provost Wickert said that there will be an article in *Inside Iowa State* which will announce that the TIAA reduction was temporary. TIAA contributions will return to normal on July 1.

Provost Wickert said that units had been directed last year to plan for 5% budget reductions for last spring and an additional 5% reduction for FY 22. Provost Wickert said that units are being told that they do not need to plan for a 5% reduction for FY 22.

The article will also provide some information about how the university will put federal stimulus money to use on campus. For example, \$10.8 million in additional financial aid money was made available in the first round. Soon, another \$10.8 million will be dispersed to students with the highest levels of demonstrated financial need.

ISU Crew Club Tragedy

Provost Wickert said that ISU just announced the names and majors of the two students who died in the tragic boat accident. He suggested that FS hold a moment of silence at FS meeting.

Provost Council to Resume In-Person Meetings

Provost Wickert said that Provost Council (which includes deans, associate provosts, and vice presidents) will have an in person meeting on April 14 in a large conference room with social distancing and masks. Future meetings will alternate, online and in person.

Term Faculty Advancement

The Provost's Office, under the leadership of Associate Provost Bratsch-Prince and her team, is working through term faculty advancement portfolios. Recommendations will be forwarded to ISU President Wintersteen.

Teaching Innovation Awards

In fall, ISU had teaching innovation awards for faculty, of which there were 30 recipients. There were also university-wide COVID awards. A donor provided funds for that purpose. We are in a position to offer the innovation awards again. The Provost's Office will work with colleges to recognize a similar number of faculty for their teaching innovation during the academic year and exemplary academic advising. The goal will be to complete this in the next month, before the semester ends.

5.5. Council Chairs Reports

5.6. Caucus Chair Reports

In the interest of time, President Faber asked Council and Caucus Chairs to send their reports in written form to Sherri Angstrom, to be included with the minutes.

6. Approval of the April 6, 2021 Faculty Senate Agenda

President Faber said that she would support holding a moment of silence. EB members recommended doing so after the consent agenda. Docket item 20-35 was removed from the agenda, and docket item 20-34 was kept.

Senator Perkins moved to approve the FS agenda. Senator Wallace seconded. The motion was adopted.

7. Good of the Order

Senator Freeman moved to enter into Executive Session. Past President Sturm seconded. The motion was adopted at 4:45 p.m.

8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Morrill Professor
Regents Faculty Excellence Award
University Professor

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 – 3:00 p.m. – WEBEX

FDAR Council report: reviewing documents from Term Faculty Advancement Working Group, next meeting March 31

College Veterinary Medicine caucus report:

- Met with Dean Grooms March 16, discussion: academic calendar, winter session, term faculty advancement processes, student evaluations and additional assessments used/available via college OCATS and CELT, budget, commencement
- Held 1st Term Faculty Advancement Workshop March 24; reviewing processes, criteria; cabinet and departmental discussions ongoing

Claire

RPA announcements for the EB meeting.

- Faculty compensation committee updates and feedback on requested salary increases
- Proposed pay equity study to build on the Aon study regarding gender and race/ethnicity salary disparities
- Work with the administration to return benefits' contribution to pre-pandemic levels

Thank you, Ann Oberhauser

Business Caucus: No Report

Human Sciences Caucus: No updates

LAS Caucus Report:

The LAS Caucus met with Dean Schmittmann on March 11th and discussed a range of topics related to current hiring and searches, college budget, and faculty response in teaching under COVID conditions over the last few semesters. The Caucus also discussed the proposed new advising model developed for the LAS College that may be implemented during the next academic year, and how the current model will change as far as having formal advisors be responsible for all formal advising functions, many of which are currently done by faculty advisors. A future caucus meeting with the Dean on April 14th will allow continuation of this discussion.

Rob Wallace, LAS Caucus Chair